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A Comparative Study of the Library School Accreditation Systems in U.S.A. and R.O.C.

INTRODUCTION

Librarianship plays an indispensable role in the communication process of society and acts as an important instrument of education, information, aesthetic appreciation, research, and recreation. Competency of librarians in rendering quality library services therefore is a key to the advancement of scholarship and culture, which are enhanced by librarians' ability to identify, select, acquire, preserve, organize and disseminate recorded knowledge. (42, pp. 358-63) It is imperative continuously to improve and upgrade the quality of professional library education in order to assure to the public adequate service and accurate interpretation of knowledge. The accreditation process, being the control of academic standards, is recognized as one of the effective methods for maintaining quality education. (18, p. 150)

This study will compare the accreditation systems used in the United States and the Republic of China on the first professional degree programs in library education. No attempt will be made to compare the contents of the curricula or to discuss the justification of library education offered at the post-graduate or the under graduate levels.

Pertinent rules, regulations, standards, interpretations of standards, statements, guidelines, self-study samples, evaluation reports and related documents from the two nations have been examined in depth. Writings on accreditation and related topics — including those by Bingley, Bidlack, Allen, Carnovsky, Churchwell, Dressel, Conant, Galvin, Gitler, Gaver, White, Chou, Wang, Whalan, and Kuo — have been read. Definitions of accreditation and evaluation are identified. The governance, purpose, criteria, methods, and procedures of such operations are discussed and compared. The conclusions will be presented as recommendations to improve upon present practice.

ACCREDITATION AND EVALUATION

Websters New International Dictionary defines “accredit” as “to certify as maintaining or surpassing a prescribed or desirable standard” (44, p. 17). According to Selden, however, “accreditation” is defined as the process whereby
an organization or an agency recognizes a college or university or a program of study as having met certain minimum qualifications on standards. (13, p. 29) It is a means by which a society of its segment maintains a measure of control over standards of accomplishment. (42, p. 489) “Evaluation”, on the other hand, means placing a value upon, or drawing value from an action, decision, or experience. It is both a judgment on the worth and impact of a program, procedure, or individual and the process whereby the judgment is made. “Educational evaluation” is bringing about identification and examination of values and thereby fostering a rational approach to decision making in full realization of the value involved. (30, p. 6) Only at the time of evaluation, can the values of the programs be brought out for identification. Once the values are identified, weakness can be overcome, improvements made, and strength reinforced. The first step in the accreditation process is therefore that of evaluation. Evaluation takes the form of self-study, evaluating visits, and evaluation reports, without which accreditation itself is groundless. Because the end result of accreditation in the ROC and the USA has become somewhat different from what the accreditation process originally intended, (25) (45) these two words — “accreditation” and “evaluation” — are used interchangeably and with similar connotations at the present time.

U.S. PRACTICE

The American accreditation/evaluation process, different from that in other countries, is a unique American practice, dominated by the laissez faire concept (18, p. 13). Instead of centralized execution by the government, the accreditation of the educational institution is carried out in a voluntary, self-disciplinary, and bipartite manner. For the improvement of educational institutions and for the development of effective working relationships among educational institutions, six voluntary non-profit, regional accrediting agencies have been set up since 1885 to accredit individual institutions. The New England Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Western College Association, North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools and Southern Association of Colleges and Schools perform the task of institutional accrediting, under the overall guidelines of the National Commission on Accreditation. Professional associations, on the other hand, are responsible for segmental (e.g., specialized
professional education) accrediting as it is manifested in the American Library Association’s accrediting of library schools (33, p. 63).

The process of library school accreditation in the USA has increasingly attracted attention and interest since the first appearance of C. C. Williamson’s report on library education in 1923. In answer to Williams’s call, the American Library Association has since 1924 carried the responsibility of accrediting library schools, first through its Board of Education for Librarianship and, since 1956, by its Committee on Accreditation. Operating under the Council of the Association, COA is responsible for developing standards for education in librarianship and for the execution of the accreditation program of the Association. (6, p. 1) It is carried out under the following principles:

1) The purpose of accrediting is to improve the service of libraries through the improvement of professional education of librarians; 2) The spirit of accrediting should be that of constructive evaluation of a library school; 3) Accreditation of library education programs at the national level should continue to be coordinated through a single agency which is authorized by the members of the library profession and the professional library schools for advice and assistance in developing and administering standards; 5) In administering the accrediting program in the field of librarianship, the accrediting agency should cooperate with accrediting groups in other fields in the general interest of improving higher education; 6) An accrediting agency should continually re-examine and revise its policies and procedures. In the application of standards, it should avoid rigidity and inflexibility which would hamper general progress in the education of librarians; 7) An accrediting agency should evaluate the library school in its institutional setting; 8) The standards should be set in a framework which will permit a library school to initiate experiments in professional education and operate without conflict with the policies and organization of its own institution; 9) The standards should emphasize qualitative rather than quantitative criteria. Without setting up arbitrary specifications, they should indicate clearly those levels of achievement which contribute to continuing progress in the education of librarians; 10) The standards should represent the minimum of achievement consistent with the needs of the library profession; 11) The standards should emphasize key criteria which represent elements of most importance in the profession of the librarians. (2, pp. 62-63)

In spite of the distinctively separate functions between the regional and
the professional associations in accreditation, there have been cooperative and coordinating efforts, such as joint visits, exchanges of reports, and sometimes even funding support by regional associations (13, pp. 36-37). The accreditation of a library education program by ALA is contingent upon the accreditation of the whole institution by the regional accrediting agency. The process is carried out only upon the request from the institution, and then only after it has already produced at least one class of graduates.

American Library Association, at the present time, is not concerned with the undergraduate programs because of its beliefs that professional library education should be offered at the graduate level instead of the undergraduate, and that the first professional degree should be the master's degree. Margaret Rufsvold has drafted "The Standards and Guide for Undergraduate Programs in Librarianship" which has been adopted by the ALA Council as a guide for institutional self-evaluation, and as a means of assisting both the regional accrediting associations in their overall evaluation of institutions, and as an aid to the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) in its evaluation of teacher training institutions which offer undergraduate programs in library science. (9, p. 1) The only accreditation handled by ALA is at the masters level in the graduate school. (10, p. 1)

THE CHINESE PRACTICE

Entirely different from the unique American practice, the accrediting and evaluation system in the Republic of China is centrally directed and administered. In the past two decades, the accreditation of schools has been carried out by MOE when schools first started organizing. The Ministry of Education has evaluated the applicant in view of its proposed goals, curriculum, faculty, facilities, governance, and financial support in accord with the stipulations of the University Laws of the Republic of China. Once a program or department got underway, there has been no follow-up evaluation in the sense of American "accreditation". The MOE has recently come to realize the importance of constant upgrading of the quality of education, and in 1975 started the evaluating process. It has been carried out by categories of major fields. The evaluating process for library education was started for the first time in 1979. The purpose as stated by MOE is to ascertain an understanding of the educational level, the faculty qualifications, the facilities, the instructional
and research performances of the library education programs. (20) The aim is to gain better understanding of the present status, which eventually facilitates the improvements of education itself.

Initial accreditation results in the permission to establish, while subsequent accreditation results in grading by five ranks, indicating the adequacy and the quality of the program. The Chinese approach, being less straightforward, nevertheless, still serves as a means to improve professional education in accord with suggestions and recommendations made by a visiting team. Its impact on the maintenance of quality education is quite powerful. In Taiwan, the first professional degree in librarianship is offered at the undergraduate level. (37) The subsequent evaluation, therefore, is also done at the undergraduate level. The first graduate degree program has just started operation in the fall of 1980. Previous graduate programs were short or limited courses offered in the Graduate School of History at the Cultural University.

STATE OF ART ON LIBRARY EDUCATION EVALUATION

In order to have a comprehensive picture of the differences between the American and Chinese accreditation systems in library education, this paper will summarize the state of art under the following headings:

1. Accrediting responsible bodies and their functions;
2. Criteria used in evaluation;
3. Self-study;
4. Accrediting procedure.

Accrediting Responsible Bodies

In the United States, the Committee on Accreditation (COA) of the American Library Association is a standing committee of twelve members (26, p. 10) and a chairman appointed by the ALA Executive Board at the recommendation of the President-elect. An ALA Accreditation Officer and staff serve as ALA liaison. (6)

In the Republic of China, the Ministry of Education fulfills its accrediting responsibility by organizing Ad Hoc Committees of qualified and experienced leaders from among both practitioners and library educators. The liaison staff is provided by the Department of Higher Education at the Ministry.
Criteria Used in Evaluation

The various focuses of evaluation are the same for any type of academic program. (30, p. 6) The items usually evaluated are those concerning:

1. educational program;
2. research program;
3. public service;
4. institutional operations, management, and administration.

Criteria are usually developed for these four focuses. They can be broken down into the following categories: faculty, curriculum, student personnel, organization/administration, resources, and facilities. They are independent of educational level in a university. Whether it is a university graduate program or an undergraduate program, the focuses of evaluation are identical.

The accreditation standards developed by the American Library Association have been changed three times in the last half a century. The 1925 standards formulated four types of library schools with quantitative measures; in 1933, the standards used were based on admission requirements and programs; there were also 1951 standards which were superseded by the present 1972 standards. (3, pp. 18-21). The latest standards are indicative but not prescriptive and have as their aim to provide guidance for the present and to allow flexibility for future development. (10, p. 3) Each statement of the standard is preceded by a rationale and followed by sources of evidence suggesting proofs to be presented.

The six main categories for evaluation are summarized as follows:

1) **Program goals and objectives:**
   A. Are they consistent with the general principles of librarianship and library education?
   B. Are they responsive to the needs of the constituency which the school seeks to serve?
   C. Are they sensitive to the emerging concepts of the role of librarians in the library and of libraries in a multicultural society?
   D. Are they aware of the contributions of other disciplines to librarianship?

2) **Curriculum:**
   A. Do they emphasize the unified whole rather than the aggregation of courses?
   B. Do they stress understanding rather than learning of facts; principles and skills rather than routines?
C. Do they emphasize the significance and functions of subjects taught?
D. Do they reflect the findings of basic and applied research in librarianship and related disciplines?
E. Do they respond to current trends in library development and professional education?
F. Do they promote continuous professional growth?
G. Are the curricula based on the goals and objectives which will enhance the total learning experience of the students?
H. Are they also to be reviewed and revised continually?

3) Faculty:
A. Is there a corps of full-time and part-time academically qualified faculty members who reflect a diversity of background; a substantial body of library experience, advanced degrees from different academic institutions; specialized knowledge, record of scholarship, aptitude for educational planning, administering, evaluation?
B. Do the faculty members have close and continuing liaison with the field?

4) Students:
A. Are the admission requirements, procedures, and policies well formulated?
B. Is the assessment of application based on evaluation of academic, personal and intellectual qualifications?
C. Are there regular assessments of student performance and progress?
D. Are there opportunities for guidance and counseling provided?

5) Governance:
A. Is the library school an integral, distinctive academic unit with autonomy?
B. Are the titles and status, and authority the same with comparable representation in policy making for advisory committee of the institution?
C. Are qualities required of the administrator to include understanding of the academic environment and management skill?
D. Is participation of faculty, staff and students allowed?
E. Does the institution give sufficient and comparable financial support to the library school?

6) Physical resources and facilities:
A. Are the physical resources and facilities adequate and suitable?

Criteria developed by the Chinese Ministry of Education are for general use by all departments of the university. Being both quantitative and qualitative, they are incorporated in the University Accreditation Guidelines and the Guidelines for Evaluating Report Writing. The important items evaluated in the ROC standards are quite similar to those of the 1972 ALA Standards and the Undergraduate Standards, except that they omit mention of goals and objectives (21).

1) Faculty:
   A. Are 2/3 of the required courses as stipulated by the MOE in the Curriculum Standards taught by full-time faculty members?
   B. Faculty members are evaluated on the following bases:
      a. Has the faculty member been certified by MOE?
      b. What is his highest degree?
      c. How is his teaching experience?
      d. How is his research activity/performance?
      e. How is his instructional methodology/attitude?
      f. How is the counseling given to students?
   C. Does the faculty member publish? Are the publications scholarly? Are they associated with the research in his subject specialization? Are they published within the past five years?
   D. Is the ratio between full-time and part-time instructor proportionate?

2) Curriculum:
   A. Are the required courses the same as the ones stipulated by the Ministry of Education?
   B. Are the sequence, credit hours and course contents appropriate?
   C. Are the electives related to the required courses? Are they academic or practical?
   D. Are the required and elective courses proportionately balanced and appropriately arranged?
   E. Are the instructional materials appropriate and do they meet the demands?
   F. Are the students observing credit load regulations?
      a. No less than 16 and no more than 25 credits per semester for freshmen.
      b. No less than 16 or no more than 22 credits for sophomores and juniors?
      c. No more than 15 and no less than 9 credits for seniors.
d. No less than 24 credits for master program students for the entire year, and no less than 18 credits for PH.D. students.

3) **Library Resources:**
A. Are there adequate library materials? Are they related to the subjects?
B. The existence of the departmental libraries should be dependent on the environment of each individual department rather than evaluated in uniformity.
C. The usage made of books and resources is to be ascertained from the circulation statistics.
D. Is the library building well ventilated, well lighted, and well equipped with ample seating?
E. Are the library administration, opening hours, and circulation systems satisfactory?

4) **Facilities:**
A. Are the instructional and research facilities appropriate? How are they used and maintained?
B. Do the faculties have offices or laboratory spaces for their research and counseling?
C. Is there laboratory equipment in proportion with the number of students? Is it adequate? How is it used and maintained?
D. Does laboratory equipment meet instructional needs?
E. Are the laboratories well ventilated and well lighted? What are the safety measures? Are they appropriate?

5) **Students:**
A. Is the practicum for students well organized and supervised? Is the allocation satisfactory?
B. How are the field trips and student practice arranged? Are they appropriate?
C. What are the criteria for evaluation?
D. Are the time for advising well allocated?
E. Are the graduates positions in line with their majors? What is the ratio?
F. How many graduates passed the examination to enter the graduate schools? What is the ratio?
G. How many graduates passed the examination to pursue advanced studies abroad on government scholarships in the past five years?
H. What is the number of graduates pursuing advanced study abroad and
what is the ratio?

6) Administration and financial support:
   A. Is the fund allocation appropriate in proportion to the entire university budget?
   B. Are the salaries of full-time faculties following the *Standard Salary Scale for the Full-Time Faculty*?
   C. Is the administrative structure sound?
   D. Is the personnel arrangement appropriate?
   E. Can the chair of the department participate in decision making regarding department appropriation of funds and the appointment of faculty members?
   F. Is the department head full time? Is his specialization qualified for the position?

These standards are evidently inadequate and are handicapped by many problems, out of which the following ones are the serious ones:

   A. They are not specially designed for library education.
   B. They are neither comprehensive nor complete.
   C. The omission of goals and objectives, which is rationalized as having been evaluated at the initial accreditation, leaves the entire evaluation meaningless. All the other criteria should be evaluated in light of the defined goals and objectives, which are also subject to changes after the initial accreditation.
   D. The contents of other relevant standards used are not incorporated into these criteria, such as *University and College Libraries Standards, Salary Scale Standards, Curriculum Standards and Safety Measure Standards*. How can the library resources be judged without the standard's existence?

**Self Study**

1) **Purpose:**

The first and most important step of evaluation is the self-study which is a composite statement about the library school's program, the present status and future prospects supported by factual data and evaluative comments.

In the United States, four purposes are attributed to the self-study: (11)

   A. To encourage a candid evaluation of the goals of the school, the objec-
tives of its program and the degree to which the goals and objectives have or have not been realized;
B. To provide information for the use of COA in assessing the readiness of a library school for a state visit;
C. To present basic documentation about the program to be evaluated and indication of where the strengths and weaknesses of the program are.
D. To be kept as an important document for the future of the library school which may serve as a point of departure in program development and revision as well as an aid in preparing for periodic revisits scheduled by COA.

2) Procedures:
The preparation should involve the executive officer, faculty, students and staff of the library school as fully as possible through open meetings and in accordance with the instructions given in the Self-study: A Guide. (11, 12)

3) Format:
In the United States, a seven-part document consists of an introduction and sections dealing with each of the six standards for accreditation. Within each of the six sections, there are two subsections:
A. descriptive and statistical data;
B. result of self-study deliberations.

In Taiwan, the required self-study is to provide more factual information than self-evaluation. The questionnaire type of forms are designed to incorporate all items under evaluation in a compact format. The ten forms after completion should summarize the pertinent data. The items on the form are correlated, so that the relationship can be ascertained, with individual and correlated information available for each item. An additional textual explanation should be added, but it is not required. In most cases, such supplementary information is necessary, because of the compactness of the forms (23) (See Appendix I)

Accrediting Procedures

1) Initiation of Accrediting Process:
In the USA the process starts with a letter of intention submitted by the institution seeking accreditation six months before the twelve-month period during which a visit is to be arranged. The self-study, a letter from the President of the institution, and other documents are submitted to COA no later than
November 15 or April 15 each year. Following examination of the self-study by COA members, they vote upon the readiness of the institution to be evaluated. If the vote is favorable, the evaluating process will begin by arranging a site visit. A meeting between the institution representative and Accreditation Officer can be arranged at ALA midwinter or annual conference upon request.

In the ROC, the only voluntary request for accreditation occurs when the institution starts a new program or a department. The accreditation of existing library schools is an action imposed upon the institution by MOE, usually in the spring semester of the year. The institutions are officially notified about it two months ahead of the accreditation visit. The required forms and instructions are also sent together with the notification.

2) The formation and organization of the visiting team:

The visiting team in the United States is usually composed of three to five members (not more than six) representing library educators and practitioners with at least one present or former member of COA. Consideration is given to such factors as economy of time and expenses of travel, appointment of faculty of other library schools, geographic representation, and representatives of specialized field emphasized. The schools can make suggestions for certain specific types of representation (not specific individuals) with reasons stated. They can also reject a member of the visiting team proposed by COA. The Accreditation Officer can go along as an observer.

In the Republic of China, four representatives of both library administrators and educators are picked objectively by the MOE to be members of the Ad Hoc Committee on Accreditation and the visiting team. There is not such a distinctive demarcation between administrator and educator, because most of the leading administrators in China are also educators. The committee elects its own chairman. A team member can turn down the invitation to go on a particular visit if he is associated with the institution under evaluation or simply for personal reasons. A member from the Department of Higher Education at MOE can serve as the coordinator and the secretary of the team, but without voice in the actual process of evaluation.

3) Preparation of Visiting Team Members:

The 1972 Standards for Accreditation, Manual of Procedures for Evaluation, self-study, and pertinent materials from the library schools are made available to the team members who are expected to master them. Periodic sessions to prepare prospective members of visiting teams are given by COA. A previsit conference
convened by the chair of the visiting team is required.

In the ROC, The University Accreditation Guidelines, and the Guidelines for Evaluation Report Writing, self-study, and other pertinent materials are presented to the team members during a pre-visit conference convened by the Minister of Education in person. The accrediting standards are not issued separately and are merely incorporated into the Guidelines.

4) Time for Visit:

In the U.S., four days are spent for each evaluation site visit starting from Sunday afternoon or evening and ending the following Thursday.

In Taiwan, visiting team members discuss the time for visiting during the pre-visit conference within the specific span of time given by the MOE, usually in the month of February or May. One day is spent for each library school. Since there are four universities offering library science programs, the visiting team spends four days in total on the process.

5) Visit Formats:

In the United States, the work of accreditation is divided into three parts:

A. A preliminary meeting to plan the visit is held on the first day.

B. Meetings are scheduled with executive officers of the library school at the beginning of the visit, information sessions with faculty members early in the visit, talks with faculty members individually as arranged by the team chair, meeting with students and with representative alumni, conferences with the present and other appropriate executive and administrative officers of the institution including the affirmative action officer, conferences with the school’s non-instructional staff to determine their roles in support of the program, conferences with persons in charge of placement, the institution’s head librarian, and the librarian having responsibility for library service.

C. Visits are made to at least one class of each full-time instructor is possible, representative student records are examined to verify the school’s admission and procedures, distribution of financial aid to students, academic requirements and counseling procedures, observing the physical resources and facilities of the school, examining the evidence represented by the library school to demonstrate that its program meets the standards including course outlines, syllabi, faculty publications, faculty evaluations and student projects, conferring as a group within the team as often as necessary during the visit on observations made by the indi-
individual team members that should be verified by similar observations by other team members; planning the report to COA and preparing a draft with recommendations on site.

In the ROC, the preliminary meeting is held at the MOE when the meeting is convened by the Minister to plan the visit. Meeting with the executive officers of the library schools at the beginning is combined with the conferring with the head librarian, placement officers, graduate counselors, the president, and other administrative officers of the institutions. Information sessions with the faculty and students are usually immediately following the meetings with the executive officers. Individual or sample conferring is arranged with individual faculty members and students. No conferring with alumni is scheduled. Class visitation is recommended but not required, as it is impossible to attend classes of all full-time faculty, and there is no conferring with non-instructional staff in the supportive capability. Observing physical resources and facilities, and examining the evidence of the program (course outlines, syllabi, faculty publications, faculty evaluations, and students projects) are done in great detail. Admission requirements are not examined because the entrance examination is given nation-wide on a very competitive basis. Those who have passed the joint entrance examination in accord with their subject interest will definitely be up to the academic standards. The visit concludes with a meeting with the school administrator.

6) Preparation of the Evaluation Report:

The report of the American visiting team provides information on which COA can base its judgment as to the accreditability of the school’s program. The team is responsible for the preparation on site of a draft of the evaluation report. Verification of the factual section is obtained from the school. The chair of the team assumes responsibility for writing the report and may assign specific sections to individual team members. In the ROC, each member of the visiting team fills in the prescribed evaluation form, grades the items, comments on the program, and makes recommendations. These individual reports are given to the chair for consolidation, averaging and summarization. Comments and recommendations are expected to be explicit and in detail.

7) Format and Contents of the Report:

COA requires the visit report to contain the following:

A. Introductory section giving the name of the library school, names of the
visitors, dates, purpose of the visit, and a brief description of the development of program under evaluation;

B. Factual section: description of the program of the school organized according to the six major headings of the standards with descriptive and statistical data gathered during the visit or extracted from the school’s documentation and verified during the visit;

C. Evaluation section covering the team’s evaluation of the program organized according to each of the six standards. Comments are included under each heading dealing with desirable features and conditions, weaknesses, observations and comments, suggestions for improvements, and recommendations;

D. A consecutively numbered list of the principal recommendations of the report with clear justification in the standards for accreditation 1972. It is usually concluded by the recommendations for COA actions.

The Chinese evaluation report covers faculty, educational program and curriculum, library facilities and resources, facilities, student practices and practicum, placement, financial support, and administrative performances. Under each heading, there are ten questions pertaining to the headings, and a grade is given to each heading. There are four grade levels for each heading, ranging from the best to the worst. Each heading is given a fixed percentage, e.g. faculty 25%; teaching and curriculum 20%; library, facilities and resources 20%; student practice and practicum 20% and placement, financial support/administration performance 15%. The rank of the school depends on the total grades obtained. There are five levels of ranks: (21)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Grade Range</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Standing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>80 or above</td>
<td>Most satisfactory</td>
<td>Excellent standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>75–79</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Very good standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>70–74</td>
<td>Fairly satisfactory</td>
<td>Good standing Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>65–69</td>
<td>Not satisfactory</td>
<td>Poor standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>64 or below</td>
<td>Least satisfactory</td>
<td>Bad standing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional comments are required after each heading, and recommendations are also requested. No evaluation is made of the objectives and goals of the program. Findings contrary to the school’s self-description should be written in the space designed for comments. (See Appendix II)

8) Appearance of Visiting Team Before the COA:

After the presentation of its report to COA, the visiting team is requested to discuss it with the chair of the COA. The visiting team cannot take part in the
final decision on accreditation. The action to be taken depends on seven affirmative votes within COA. However, in the ROC, no more consultation is necessary between the visiting team and the MOE. The ranks of the schools depend upon the judgement of the visiting team. Whatever the decision of the visiting team is, the MOE follows automatically.

9) Distribution of Evaluation Report:

   In the USA the chair of the visiting team mails the original and one copy of the team's full report to the Accreditation Officer within twenty-eight days of the conclusion of the visit. The Accreditation Officer sends copies of the report to the President of the institution. Upon receipt of the team's full report, the school sends one of the following four responses to the Accreditation Officer for transmittal to the COA:

   1) A statement of acceptance of the report, or
   2) A statement of withdrawal of the request for accreditation, or
   3) A written response to the report which becomes part of the documentation which must be received no later than three weeks prior to the COA meeting at which consideration of the report is scheduled, or
   4) A notice of intent to respond in writing no later than three weeks prior to the next regularly scheduled COA meeting. Otherwise, COA will consider the team's report and make its decision.

   In the Republic of China, visiting team members send their reports to the chairman within fifteen days after the visit, and the chairman sends one original and one copy of each of the individual reports and summary report to MOE within thirty days after the visit.

10) Notification of Decision or Action Taken:

   Three copies of the final COA report will be sent by the Accreditation Officer by certified mail to the President or the Executive Officer of the university with the final recommendation from the visiting team omitted. An appended statement as the following serves as notification:

   "A its meeting ______________ , the Committee on Accreditation of the American Library Association received and discussed the report of the visiting team on ______________ (exact name of the school), it was VOTED, that the Committee on Accreditation of the American Library Association (Insert here the action)
   1. accredit ....
   2. not accredit ....
3. continue accreditation of
4. accredit conditionally to (date)
5. discontinue accreditation ....

the program leading to the (exact name of the degree) offered by (the exact name of the school), under the standards for accreditation adopted by the ALA Council, "June 27, 1972" (5)

Whereas the decision on accreditation is made completely upon the report of the visiting team, within twenty days after MOE receives the report from the visiting team, it sends the reports and the recommendations to the President of the institution for their improvements, and the ranking of the program is announced publicly in newspapers. Comments or recommendations pertaining to MOE operations, support, or policies are distributed for further study to the MOE offices concerned within twenty days. Case-by-case study and implementation are required after careful planning and concrete study. The COA Office, on the other hand, releases the accreditation information to the ALA Executive Board, the library press, the Association of American Library Schools, the appropriate units of the ALA, and other appropriate organizations in the field of library education; to the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, the Division of Eligibility and Agency Evaluation of the U.S. Office of Education, and the appropriate regional accrediting associations. In case of denial of accreditation to a program, the COA and the Office hold such action confidential, but leave to the library school and its parent institution the decision regarding the release of information concerning such action. A list of ALA-accredited programs is distributed to the above mentioned organizations as well.

11) Appeal Process:

This process may be requested by the institution which believes that it has sufficient reason to question the procedures followed by COA in examining its program, such as:

A. whether the COA and the visiting team have conformed to the procedures described in the Manual of Procedures for Evaluation Visits under the Standards for Accreditation 1972;
B. whether the visiting team fully determined the facts of the case in accordance with the provision of the Standards of Accreditation;
C. whether the visiting team and COA correctly applied the Standard for Accreditation to the facts. Any institution which is not granted full accreditation for its program by COA may appeal the COA decision.
within six weeks after the receipt of the final report. A Select Committee appointed by the Executive Board will hold hearings in order to conduct a full and detailed investigation. In Taiwan, on the other hand, MOE will consider a petition for re-evaluation of its improvements within six months following the time of public announcement. No appeal is allowed because MOE considers the evaluation of the visiting team authoritative.

12) Miscellaneous:

A. In America, the Manual of Procedures for Evaluation Visits under the Standards for Accreditation 1972 particularly mentions safety measures to prevent corruption, such as "no social gatherings, no contact between visiting team members and the institutions, etc." Such a precaution is also taken in the ROC in a letter accompanying the letter of appointment to the visiting team by the MOE.

B. Advisory and consultant services are available from COA in the United States, whereas MOE does not provide consulting services, but advice is available upon request to MOE.

C. Revisits take place every seven years, in the States. MOE does not specify any definite duration within which a revisit should take place. It merely indicates that a re-run of the operation will take place as soon as all the programs have been evaluated.

D. Annual reports are required by both countries.

E. The chair of the visiting team in the States is responsible for trivial administrative tasks, such as matters of transportation arrangements, appointments, and scheduling. In China, the secretary from MOE will coordinate such matters at the instruction of the chair. Reimbursement for travelling and expenses are made directly to the visiting team members and the Accreditation Officer by ALA, which is again reimbursed by the library school. It is also possible for the visiting team to charge its expenses directly to the account of the institution. The evaluation work itself is offered on a service basis in the United States. The Ministry of Education in Taipei pays the visiting members a fixed amount of renumeration according to government standards, in addition to the provision of hotel rooms, food, and transportation expenses.
FINDINGS

From the conditions described above, the important differences and similarities in these two systems may be summarized in this section of the paper as follows:

1) Governance:

Professional association execution in contrast to government supervision is the paramount difference. The structures of the visiting team and committee are completely different. The team does not have the final say in the United States, because non-COA members are not to participate in the final decision. The visiting team in China at the invitation of MOE are members of the ad hoc committee, but they are entrusted with greater authority. Their decision and judgement are highly regarded by the government. In spite of the difference in governance, however, the entire philosophy of this evaluation mechanism is identical because it is based on peer evaluation.

2) End Result and Effects:

In spite of all the actions taken — such as “disaccreditation”, “unaccreditation”, or “Rank I”, and “Rank IV” in US and China — those organizations that really want to get accredited can get to that status, because opportunities are provided for reversing decisions in the States, and in China, MOE aims at improvements only. According to Shera, White, and Carnovsky, the accreditation process is not as threatening as it appears. The actual result and effect lies only in what needs to be improved. Advising and consulting is a more accurate description of the function of such a process. In Taiwan, responsibility for shortcomings is not completely attributed to the institutions; instead, MOE admits that some of the shortcomings might be caused by MOE itself. It therefore expresses willingness to study each case if the suggestion is made to MOE regarding the support or the policy given to the institution by MOE. This shows that MOE considers the business of education its business. No matter how much an individual institution is to be blamed, MOE cannot shirk its own due responsibility. (20, 21)

3) The Chinese MOE evaluates all the programs that are in existence. Theoretically COA accepts applications upon acceptance of their eligibility and receipt of workable documents as shown in their self-study. With the COA consulting service available, any institution which is interested in seeking accreditation will in fact be given the opportunities.

4) Criteria:
Goals and Objectives:

The COA accreditation is to determine how well a school's program meets its own intentions and how successfully the specific parts of the program meet the requirements of library education as interpreted by the Committee. (46, p. 2378) The entire existence and value of a program depend on its goals and objectives; unfortunately, however, this concept is ignored by MOE, which makes the whole evaluating system considerably less valuable than it could be.

The importance of goals and objectives has also been emphasized by Shelton (41) and specifically by the *IFLA Standards for Library Schools*, which states the case as follows: “These are the main criteria presented in the standards. The school should function at a university level. It should have clearly formulated and accepted GOALS AND OBJECTIVES.” (36) In the process of planning any performance, goals and objectives are basic echelons. The general standards incorporated in the *Guidelines* by MOE are not appropriate to be used for library education, because they are not specifically designed to be used in library school evaluation. Even though Allen points out that there is difference of opinion regarding uniform or specialized criteria, when goals and objectives are involved, professional consideration must be taken into account in the design of the set of criteria. (4) In Taiwan, in the case of library schools, four other types of standards have to be used together with the uniform standards:

A. University and College Library Standards,
B. Salary scale standards,
C. Safety measure standards, and
D. Curriculum standards.

None of these are incorporated into the *Guidelines*. As a result, both the institutions and the visiting team members have to look into different documents to find out if they are meeting the standards. Among the above-mentioned standards, the University and College Library Standards, drawn up by Library Association of China, have not been officially adopted by the MOE, and the curriculum standards have not been revised in the last six years. These outdated curriculum standards are deficient in themselves. (43) The only two which are of use are those with regard to salary and safety measures. The criteria used in China are highly quantitative, but they are sometimes subject to subjective evaluation as well. For example, the visiting team member is supposed to decide whether an item under examination or evaluation belongs to "a very large portion", "large portion", "fair amount" or "poor". Then what is fair? What justifies "a large
portion”? How poor is “poor”? In a supposedly quantitative standard, there is not definite basis for one’s judgement. The association affiliations and service aspects of faculty members, and non-print library resources are overlooked by the Chinese criteria. Thus they are neither sound nor comprehensive.

The American standards, on the contrary, are flexible and qualitative, allowing subjective evaluation to come into the scene. Dean White and Bingley have suggested that some quantitative criteria should be included with reference to faculty size, student enrollment, course offerings and minimal facilities. (46) Bingley even points out that “only quantitative standards can be measured with any certainty.” “To attempt to apply so called qualitative standards, except in the most general terms is a very dangerous practice.” (17, p. 88)

Accreditation in the United States aims at evaluating the program from the result, or the end product, of the education. It is carried out only after the school has graduated at least one class. In China, the precaution against inferior education starts prior to the beginning of the program. Before the program starts, the efforts have to be directed to ascertain whether the program is appropriate, whether facilities proposed are sufficient and adequate, and whether the curriculum planned is in line with MOE regulations. Such safeguard measures and precautions are probably a good way to prevent inferior education.

5) Time for Evaluation:
There is a revisit cycle within seven years in the United States, whereas in China, there is more flexibility which may result in laxity.

6) Self-Study:
The American self-study is very explicitly explained, and the Chinese self-study is compact. The merits of the latter lie in the presentation of objective data with correlations, and little room is left for subjective interpretation on the part of the institution.

7) *The Manual of Procedures for Evaluation* by COA is a very detailed and informative document, but in many cases, the contents are redundant. The Chinese guide is more straight-forward and simplified.

**CONCLUSION**

In spite of pros and cons on the process of American library school accreditation as viewed by sixty-two library schools reported by Bidlack (16), the survey conducted by Edward Holley and Muriel Howick indicates that, “there is a gener-
ally positive view of the ALA standards of 1972, the procedures, the visiting teams, and the role ALA plays in the accreditation process. " (34, p. 84) The problems confronting the accreditation process as indicated by Dean White, and the dissatisfaction with the process revealed by Galvin, Gitler, Bingley, Shera and Carnovsky in their writings, the importance of and the necessity for the existence of "accreditation" have never been doubted. Although many suggestions have been made to find a better way to accredit, to improve the procedures, and to seek better standards, (18, p. 150), discarding the practice has never been seriously proposed. Dean White suggested eight ways to improve the process, of which three are very important:

1) The addition of certain quantitative minimum standards regarding faculty size, students enrollment, course offerings, and facilities;
2) the broadening of the COA member representation; and
3) the continuation of an appeal process only on matters regarding procedures, but not about judgements. (46).

In addition, the following recommendations also appear warranted:

1) Pre-establishment evaluation/accreditation be conducted by ALA on institutions intending to start new library schools.
2) Financial support from the government be given to COA. The autonomy of professional accreditation in the United States has won world-wide admiration. However, this process and purpose should also be very much a concern of the government. Greater assistance and concrete support, from either the federal or state government, in the form of funding should be given to professional associations in conducting accreditation and in formulating standards. Accreditation itself, however, should remain independent of government interference.

3) In spite of the fact that the first professional degree should be offered at the graduate level, existing undergraduate programs and Ph.D. programs should also be evaluated in order to have better articulation and solid foundation and so as to avoid redundancy and inferior quality. All professional education accreditation should be in the hands of American Library Association in order to achieve coherence and consistency.

4) Re-examination of existing standards should be done as soon as possible for the following reasons:

a. The present standards are eight years old. Social technological, economic and cultural changes have taken place during this time.
These changes have been much greater than those that occurred during the previous twenty years. New requirements should be re-estimated.

b. There is need for the incorporation of quantitative standards.

The Chinese evaluation process as described above presents a somewhat haphazard picture. There are some merits, but these do not lessen the serious existing problems. A lack of standards specifically geared to wholesome library education, the lack of goals and objectives, and over-dependence on the judgement of the visiting team are some of the principal drawbacks.

A basic problem lies in the fact that there is no centralized agency in the ROC government responsible for library service. Library service has been allocated to the Department of Social Education, and library education is assigned to the Departments of Higher Education and of Vocational Education. In this arrangement little attention has been given to some matters of importance and magnitude.

There is little coordination between the planning of library service and of library education. In each of the two departments that handle library education and the one that handles library services, no full-time person has been assigned to look after matters concerning both library service and education. A fundamental problem to be solved is the lack of an organization in charge of such affairs. Better planning and development, better coordination and cooperation could thus be enhanced. A proposal to solve all these problems was proposed to the Government during the National Development Seminar which took place in Taipei in July, 1980. The recommendation was made to organize a special Commission on Cultural Development which is to be placed in the Executive Yuan, above the Ministries, and reporting directly to the Premier. This Commission would be charged with the responsibility of overall planning and execution of library and information services and other cultural activities throughout the nation. The planning will cover every facet of the cultural activities of the nation, including that of librarianship, library services, library education, library standards, and laws which will have great impacts on one another. Better coordination, planning, and performance can be expected through a centralized administration at a higher level. Such a set-up is inevitable to achieve expected performance, because the structure of the nation is traditionally in the centralized mode. Approval of this proposal was officially announced on November 22, 1980. With the establishment of this organization in the next six months, library education and services will greatly benefit from long-range and short-range planning and from management
by objectives.

With the preliminary standards of library services, library laws, and planning well handled by the Commission on Cultural Development, some of the basic problems pertaining to library education in general and accreditation in particular can be solved. With reference to library school evaluation/accreditation, the following are recommended:

1. Organization:
The present ad hoc committee should be replaced by a standing committee with members holding overlapping two-year terms. Eight to ten library educators, administrators, practitioners, and lay readers of high professional competence, scholarship, and integrity should be invited to form such an accrediting group which should retain its present autonomy and authority.

2. Procedure:
The existing one-day evaluation does not lead to a thorough understanding of the program. The complete reliance on individual judgment might result in personal bias. More discussion among visiting team members is recommended.

3. Standards
Accreditation Standards for Library Schools should be formulated in accordance with the philosophy and theory of library science and library education. Goals and objectives should be stressed.

4. Execution
Strict execution of the accreditation results should take place rather than the present advisory function.

POSTSCRIPT

Accreditation as a means of educational quality control is advocated by educators. This is evidenced by the proliferation of accreditation agencies and the popular execution of such practice by the professional associations in the United States. The procedures and standards used may have always been the focuses of argument in pursuit of perfection, even though it is not possible to reach perfection, especially in the case of accreditation where the process is contingent upon many factors exerted by external changes in society and the inner aspirations of mankind. Although it is a restraint, accreditation should be considered as a stimulus leading the profession in its striving for the optimal instead of the minimal. Real progress usually originates in self-motivation instead of in the passive observation of external standards of criteria. Being a means by which quality is to be
elevated, accreditation should be viewed as a vehicle for progress but not an ending itself. Meeting certain prescribed norms should not be the aim of the institution which strives ever to be "better", on a successive and continual basis. It is therefore necessary to emphasize the stimulating and the provoking functions of accreditation, with which the real essence of quality education is able to accomplish its mission.

This study has revealed some basic differences in the accreditation/evaluation systems of these two countries – differences in structure, governance, criteria and procedures. It is not intended to judge which system is better, because there are unique social and cultural traditions in each nation which forbid an absolute judgment on values or the blind adoption of foreign practice. Moderate adaptation, however, will facilitate improvement. Mutual adaptation of these two types of systems is the area for future investigation.
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APPENDIX I

INFORMATION TO BE FILLED ON SURVEY FORMS FOR THE UNIVERSITY EVALUATION

FACULTY (Forms 1 and 2) PROFILE:
Form 1 Full time faculty profile:
Title, name, sex, birth date, birth place, education (Schools attended, graduation dates, degrees)
Experiences, present position (appointment by library school, by other department, or joint appointment), total years taught, certification number, present courses taught, courses taught in the last five years, part time job elsewhere (if part time teaching elsewhere, identify subjects and hours taught every week, part time job title)

Form 2 Part-time Faculty profile:
For each part-time faculty member, the information required is identical to that of the full-time faculty with additional information on his present position (full-time); and/or if he has retired from his full-time position and the date of retirement.

Form 3 Faculty Publications and research activities:
Title of the faculty member, part-time or full-time, name, list of publications in the last five years (excluding mimeographed or manuscript works), publishers, journal titles, volume numbers, dates of publication, research grants received from National Science Council (year of awards received) (On-going projects), Research grants from other academic institutions (nature, date and amount of funding), Research supervision given to students (list of counseling or discussion topics)

CURRICULUM PROFILE:
Form 4 Course Profile:
Course titles, year offered (freshman, sophomore, junior and senior), credits, required or elective, taught by (name of faculty title, full-time or part-time), number of students taking the course.
Interdisciplinary electives
Interdisciplinary practicum
Laboratory work
Reserve books (number and titles in Chinese and English) assignments

Form 5 Course Profile:
Subject or course title, instructional materials used or major reference works assigned, course outlines, instructional method, laboratory and practicum guidance method. Research directed (individual and/or team research)
Assignment correction

RESOURCES PROFILE:
Form 6 Monographs:
A. Source of funds, budget allocation in the past three years, budget allocation in the coming three years. Expenditures plans, acquisition method and procedure.
B. Volumes listed with identification of:
a. Type of library (main, college, school and department)
b. Volumes of work in Chinese and in English
c. Method of acquisition: purchased or gift
d. Total number
e. Related books (Chinese/English)
Items a–c can be correlated, the combination of all factors can be ascertained. Combined information can be obtained.
f. Subject related books (Chinese and/or English)
g. Circulation rate.
C. Seating capacity and reading rooms:
a. University library capacity
b. Reading rooms capacity
c. College library seating capacity
d. Departmental library seating capacity
D. Opening hours for the main, college and departmental libraries; opening hours for reading rooms in the main, college and departmental libraries.
E. Library personnel:
a. numbers of full time workers
b. number of part-time workers
c. number of librarians
d. numbers of non-professionals
These figures can be correlated again.
F. How are the collections managed and maintained
G. Acquisition: Volume acquired and amount of fund spent in the past five years (list number by year)

RESOURCES PROFILE:
Form 7 Serials:
A. Source fund, budget allocation in the last three years, budget allocation in the next three years plan of expenditures, acquisition method and procedure, journal types and number of volumes indicate by themselves independently or by correlation with the followings:
1. related serials or subject serials, unbound or bound;
2. separate and total number of serials;
3. purchased by the department
4. gift or donations.
Number of periodicals purchased and fund spent in the last five years (list by year)
Library buildings and reading rooms:
structure
lights
setting
orderliness
fire extinguishing and safety devices.
Form 8 Research Facilities:
Source of fund, budget allocation for the past three years (list by year), budget allocation expected for the next three years, plan for expenditures, purchase method and procedures.
List major equipments: by name in Chinese and English, year of make, unit, quantity, inventory number.
List major consuming equipments: by name in Chinese and English, unit, annual consuming amount.
Use of equipment: adequate to support instruction, adequacy in function.
Are the faculty offices or research laboratories sufficiently used?
How are equipments maintained?
How are the ventilation, fire extinguishing and other safety measure of the research laboratories?
The numbers and funds of equipment and consuming equipments purchased in the past five years (list by year) (separate and combined figures are given for each year)

Form 9
Students laboratories or practicum facilities:
Items regarding research facilities are the same listed in form 8, only this section covers what is used by students.
Laboratories and practicum locations:
For practical or experimental subjects?
Size of the laboratories or lication?
Ventilation, lighting and security measures adequate?
Laboratory or practicum performance conducted by groups or individually, how many groups?
Number of participants in each group.
Condition of equipment maintenance.
Laboratories and practicum results
Exhibition of project: date held, location held.
Fund used on purchasing equipment and consuming products in the last five years (list by year).

Form 10
Administration:
Faculty meetings held: number of times, dates, number of participants, case discussed and how are the resolutions executed?
Development plan in the past three years.
Faculty appointment in the next three years:
courses to be added
credits
number of faculty to be added
Budget: total budget, source of budget, method of allocation, executed according to plans
Personnel (faculty and staff included)
Title, full time or part time, name, courses and hours taught or administration duties taken, date of appointment, monthly salary.
Number of students: list by freshmen, sophomore, junior, senior, 1st year in graduate school, second year in graduate school, third year in graduate school.

Alumni status: Number of graduates in the 1st five years (list by Year)

Employment of graduates: number and percentage for each of the following:
- research institute
- government work
- public or public service organization
- education
- other line of work

Advanced studies pursued: number of graduates entering graduate schools, number of graduates studying abroad.

Historical sketch of the department

Special features of the department

Problems encountered.
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APPENDIX II

EVALUATION REPORT FORM

1. Faculty (25%, the highest grade for each item listed below is 2.5%)
   a. Are the professional or subject related courses taught by full-time or subject specialized faculty members.
      A very large portion ( ), 2/3 ( ), 1/3 ( ) less than 1/3 ( )
   b. The number of certified faculty members:
      More than 2/3, ( ), 2/3 ( ) 1/3 ( ) less than 1/3 ( ).
   c. The degree held by full-time and part-time faculty members:
      Mostly MS or above ( ), mostly BS ( ) Few holding bachelors degree ( ), mostly non-degree holder ( ).
   d. Courses taught by full-time faculty members:
      A very large portion ( ), 2/3 ( ), 1/3 ( ) very few ( ).
   e. The ratio and proportion between full-time faculty members and students.
      1 full-time to 16-25 students ( )
      1 full-time for every 26-35 students ( )
      1 full-time faculty for every 36-45 students ( )
      1 full-time faculty for more than 45 students ( )
   f. How is the experience and the leadership capability of the department head?
      excellent ( ) good ( ) fair ( ) unsatisfactory ( )
   g. Methods taken to ask full-time faculty members to stay in school for counseling:
      There are plans with satisfactory results ( )
      There are plans with moderate effects ( )
      No plans and no result ( )
   h. Faculty Interest in Research:
      Excellent ( ) good ( ) fair ( ) poor ( )
   i. Quality of faculty research:
      Excellent ( ) good ( ) fair ( ) Poor ( )
   j. The working and teaching experience of the faculty:
      Excellent ( ) good ( ) Fair ( ) poor ( )

* After each item, please make comments and recommendations.
2. Curriculum: 20% (2.0% for each item)
   a. The proportion of required and elective courses:
      Most appropriate ( ) appropriate ( ) quite appropriate ( )
      not appropriate ( )
   b. The arrangement of curriculum is about to facilitate the fulfillment of
      the objectives and goals of that school.
      Yes ( ) probably ( ) Unlikely ( ) unable ( )
   c. Are the electives properly arranged (are there flexibilities)?
      Very appropriate ( ) appropriate ( ) rather appropriate ( )
      not appropriate ( )
   d. Are the instructional materials up to date, practical and appropriate;
      A very large proportion is appropriate ( ) large proportion ( )
      small portion ( ) Very little ( )
   e. Are the teaching and course plans carried out as scheduled;
      A very large portion ( ) Large portion ( ) fair portion ( ) Small
      portion ( )
   f. How are the faculty attitudes toward teaching and counseling;
      Very conscientious ( ) conscientious ( ) Rather conscientious
      ( ) not conscientious ( )
   g. Are the students practicum supervised;
      A very large portion ( ) large portion ( ) fair portion ( ) small
      portion ( )
   h. Are the examinations properly given to test students' knowledge on the
      topic?
      A very large portion ( ) large portion ( ) fair portion ( )
      small portion ( )
   i. What are the criteria used for grading? Are they proper?
      Very large portion ( ) large portion ( ) Fair portion ( ) small
      portion ( )
   j. Are the notes taken by students evaluated?
      A very large portion ( ) large portion ( ) fair portion ( )
      small portion ( )

3. Library facilities and resources: 20%
   a. The quality and quantity of the professional collection and related
      publications:
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Excellent in quantity and quality ( ), good in quality ( ), good in quantity ( ), poor in both quantity and quality ( ).

b. Are the library reading rooms well-ventilated, well-lighted, well situated and adequate in quantity;
   All four items are excellent ( ), three items are excellent and one item poor ( ), two items excellent and two poor ( ), one item excellent and three items poor ( ).

c. Is there adequate funding for acquisition;
   Adequate ( ), almost adequate ( ), not adequate ( ), very little allocation ( ).

d. Are the requests for book acquisition very convenient and simple?
   Very simple ( ), simple ( ), fairly simple ( ), complicated ( ).

e. Are the collections well managed and well circulated?
   Both excellent ( ), both good ( ), good in management but poor in circulation or good in circulation and poor in management ( ), both poor ( ).

f. Are the instructional and research equipments adequate?
   Both very adequate ( ), adequate ( ), fairly adequate ( ), both inadequate ( ).

g. Are all the equipment and facilities fully utilized?
   A very large portion ( ), a large portion ( ), small portion ( ), very small portion ( ).

h. How are the equipment and facilities maintained?
   Very well maintained for a very large portion ( ), well maintained in large portion ( ), fair portion ( ), and very little portion ( ).

i. Are the equipments correlated with practicum and teaching?
   Well correlated ( ), correlated ( ), fairly correlated ( ), poorly correlated ( ).

j. Are the facilities well planned and how are the qualities;
   A very large portion is well done ( ), a large portion well done ( ), fair portion well done ( ), and small portion well done ( ).

4. Student practice and practicum: (20%)
   a. Is the professional practicum appropriately arranged?
      Very proper ( ), proper ( ), fairly proper ( ), not proper ( ).
   b. Are the practicing locations supervised by persons who can coordinate
practicing work?
A very large portion ( ), large portion ( ), fair portion ( ), and small portion ( ).

c. Are the materials used for practices well provided?
Very sufficiently provided ( ), sufficiently provided ( ), fairly sufficiently provided ( ), and not sufficiently provided ( ).

d. Are there reports required after the practicum or laboratory work;
A very large portion ( ), large portion ( ), fair amount ( ), very little ( ).

e. Are the laboratory or practicum instructional procedures satisfactory?
Very satisfactory ( ), satisfactory ( ), fairly satisfactory ( ), not satisfactory ( ).

f. Are there sufficient opportunities for students to participate in practicum?
Very sufficient ( ), sufficient ( ), fairly sufficient ( ) not sufficient ( ).

g. Are the working laboratories well situated, well ventilated, well lighted and equipped with safety measures?
All very good ( ), three items are good ( ), one item is poor, two are good, and two are poor ( ), one is good and three are poor ( ).

h. Are there field trips or outside practicum?
Very frequently arranged ( ), frequently arranged ( ), fairly frequently arranged ( ), little arranged ( ).

i. Are the grading methods of practicum appropriate?
Very appropriate ( ), appropriate ( ), fairly appropriate ( ), and not appropriate ( ).

j. Are the practicum results and performances satisfactory;
Very satisfactory ( ), satisfactory ( ), fairly satisfactory ( ), not satisfactory ( )

5. Placement, financial support and administrative performance: (15%)

a. Are there special units or offices or persons responsible for placement and graduate counselling? Are they responsible?
Yes, very responsible ( ), yes, responsible ( ), yes, but not responsible ( ), no ( )

b. Are there records of student placement;
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Very detailed records ( ), detailed records ( ), fairly detailed records ( ), insufficient records ( )

c. What is the ratio of graduates employment records in the last five years?
Very high ( ), high ( ), fairly high ( ), not high ( )

d. Is the fund application appropriate and in proportion with the entire school budget?
Very appropriate ( ), appropriate ( ), fairly appropriate ( ), not appropriate ( )

e. Are the salaries of full-time faculty members following the Standards of Salary for the full-time faculty?
Same as the government pronounced standard ( ), close to the standard ( ), far from the standard ( ), very far from the standard ( )

f. Standards of salary for the part-time faculty members.
Same as the government pronounced standard ( ), close to the standard ( ), far from the standard ( ), very far from the standard ( )

g. Is the administrative structure sound?
Very sound ( ), sound ( ), fairly sound ( ), not sound.

h. Is the personnel arrangement appropriate?
Very appropriate ( ), appropriate ( ), fairly appropriate ( ), not appropriate ( )

i. Can the chairman of the department participate in decision making regarding department appropriation of funds and the appointment of faculty members?
Yes ( ), fair amount of opportunity for participation ( ), very little opportunity ( ), cannot participate ( )

j. Is the department head full-time? Is his specialization qualified for the position;
Full-time and qualified ( ), full-time and specialization not qualified ( ), part-time specialization qualified ( ), part-time and specialization not qualified ( )

Total Grade and Rank
80 for Rank I, 75% to 79 for Rank II, 70 to 74% for Rank III, 65 to 69 for Rank IV and 64 or below Rank V
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