

IAMU-PAES-P PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION BENEFITS: THE MAAP EXPERIENCE

ANGELICA M. BAYLON

* External Relations Office
Maritime Academy of Asia and the Pacific (MAAP)
Kamaya Point, Brgy. Alas-asin, Mariveles, Bataan, Philippines
email: ambaylon@gmail.com, <http://maap.edu.ph>

Abstract. *This paper presents a study on the benefits of the Peer-Assisted Self-Evaluation Scheme (PAES)-P (Philippines) conducted on October 25-26, 2017 in MAAP Philippines, by a group of international experts from IAMU. Further, this paper presents background and rationale on the participation of MAAP, the purpose, and tools used in the PAES-P self-evaluation; the principles, methods, process, phases, and tools used in the PAES-P peer – evaluation; the PAES evaluation form and its coverage. Further, the benefits from the PAES-P project as perceived by the MAAP community composed of the MAAP officers, faculty and staff and by the randomly selected students who were interviewed in the process were analyzed. The 30 comments or qualitative data generated were reduced to 20 and further quantified using the Likert 5-rating scale to determine the extent of satisfaction on the identified benefits of the said project. Likewise, the 20 comments were categorized or summarized into eight significant benefits, and the MAAP community ranked the same. The eight implementation benefits were abbreviated as IAMU-PAES with identified P or perceived Problems or challenges in the implementation of the IAMU-PAES-P project. The paper ends with concluding remarks and recommendations.*

INTRODUCTION

This paper focuses on the implementation benefits of the *IAMU- PAES-P project* at the Maritime Academy of Asia and the Pacific which was conducted in partnership with the Philippine Maritime Industry Authority (MARINA). The PAES-P project consists of 3 distinctive phases: Self- evaluation; Verification and Validation.

Self-evaluation

Evaluation is a process of judging the value of institutional accomplishments. It is an act or process that involves the assignment of a numerical index to whatever is being assessed. Evaluation is an act or process that allows one to make judgment about the desirability or value of a measure. Self- Evaluation, on the other hand, is defined according to De McFarland as judging the quality of one's work based on evidence and explicit criteria to do better work in the future. Riley Guide on the other hand, defines self-evaluation as looking at progress, development, and learning, to determine what has improved and what areas still need improvement. Usually involves comparing a *"before situation with a current situation."*

In this PAESP project, self-evaluation is defined as rating the entire MAAP institutional system based on personal opinion on the prevailing or current situation at the time the various areas with statements have been measured or evaluated. Self- evaluation was done using the PAES evaluation forms. The PAES self-evaluation forms consist of statements describing academics or STCW standards, covering a distinctive group of activities typically done in a modern higher educational MET institution, with marks ranging from 0- 10 of a degree of compliance for each statement. The PAES form covers nine (9) areas: *Organization and Management; Students, Program, Education and Process; Academic Staff and support Personnel; Professional Training and Internships; Facilities and Resources; Program objectives and stakeholders involvement and Continuing Education*

The said forms were rated by three (3) MAAP evaluators namely: *The Quality Management Representative (QMR)*; the *Assistant Vice-President for Academics (AVP)* and his *Academic Dean*. All these three have management experiences and were requested to answer the survey forms based on his opinion of the entire MAAP institutional system on the current situation at the time the questionnaire have been rated. All the answers have been standardized using the standardization formula: $Z = (X - u)/6 + 5$. Wherein: x is the mark given to the degree of compliance with the statement

u is the mean value of all marks given by one person

6 is the standard deviation of the whole set of marks and

5 is added to make the data more meaningful

Scores have been assigned to the PAESP evaluation forms by MAAP self-evaluators, and the scores has been computed by the MAAP External Relations Office (ERO) using the standardization formula. The entire accomplished excel file was then forwarded to the PAES-P team for peer assistance to further evaluate MAAP, if MAAP is on the right track and to suggest areas to be improved to be globally competitive per international standards.

Verification

The basis of external peer evaluators were those supplied in advance by the host institution. These include the PAES forms accomplished in September 2017, by not more than three senior staff at MAAP (Quality Management representative *Mr. Michael Amon*, the Asst Vice President for Academics *Dr. Leogenes Lee* and the Academic Dean *Capt. Daniel Torres*). Other basis includes data collected from the institution's web pages and other web-

based sources of information, including data available from other official sources, before their visit at MAAP on October 25-26, 2017. During the two day visit of the IAMU-PAES *Working Group (WG) Team*, there were twenty-seven (27) from the MAAP community led by MAAP President Vadm Eduardo Ma R Santos, AFP (Ret), who have been involved either directly (interviewed) or indirectly to verify the accomplished PAES forms.

The tools for PAES peer evaluation included meetings and interviews with the management and staff responsible for the different areas listed in the PAES form. Supporting academic staff and students from all years of study were also interviewed. Various MAAP documents, resources, and facilities following the site visit program schedule were visited. Various documents were shown thru both formal and informal procedures. The checklist provided guidance in collecting relevant evidence used to determine the merits, worth or significance of the nine areas indicated in the PAESP form.

The PAES project followed the principle of peer evaluation wherein the peers are of the same rank. Hence, the external peers were either Vice-President, Dean or Head of a Maritime Program while those who answered the PAESP forms from MAAP were the Assistant Vice-President, the Dean, and the QMR. The peer evaluation conducted was a process by which ones' colleague assesses the other colleagues' quality and accuracy against accepted standards and vice versa. It is indeed an organized effort, whereby practicing professionals review the quality and appropriateness of services rendered or performed by their professional peers. They had conducted direct observation and also had passively and actively engaged in various activities while at MAAP. The conduct of peer evaluation at MAAP was brief, but it was based on objective methodologies with trained observers who provided constructive feedback under an open communication and trust.

Validation

After the external peers had verified and learned in depth about MAAP's mode of operation and its compliance with general educational principles and PAES statements, on February 11, 2018, MAAP finally received the 14-page PAES-P report on MAAP site visit. The report consists of commendable findings in the nine areas: *Organization and Management; Students; Programs; Education and Process; Academic Staff and Supporting Personnel; Professional Training and Internships; Facilities and Resources; Program Objectives and Stakeholders Involvement and Continuing Education*. Importantly, the report has valuable suggestions to improve the overall educational experience at MAAP with emphasis that their recommendations can be carried out as part of the MAAP procedures with no need for the external peers' further involvement.

RELATED LITERATURE OR STUDIES AND METHODOLOGY

This study utilized the following methods of data collection: *observation; interview; questionnaire and literature review search*. There is NO published related literature or studies on how those involved in the implementation of the PAES project view the methods and its benefits. Most of the relevant studies or related works of literature about self or peer assessments deal with different assessment forms and their benefits for students and teachers in general. Hence, this study about the benefits of the PAES-P implementation is a challenge and the first of its kind.

In January 2018, the MAAP community who took part in the (Oct 25-26, 2017) PAES-P site visit was asked individually about their perceived benefits of the PAESP visit at MAAP. The thirty (30) comments were noted, and the same was pilot tested and finally reduced to twenty (20).

In February 2018, the respondents were requested to rate the 20 statements. The fixed choice response formats were designed to measure levels or extent of their agreement or satisfaction to the series of statements. The 20 comments were further analyzed and categorized into eight (8) similar significant benefits which were ranked by the same MAAP respondents.

MAAP satisfaction is defined as the institutional reaction to the salient aspects of the context, process and result of their experience during the PAES-P visit. It may also be described as the extent of the resemblance between the expectations and the lessons or experiences from the visit. The following data collection tools have been used for monitoring MAAP community perceived benefits: *Interview*, *Observation*, and a *Survey Questionnaire* to objectively quantify and validate the qualitative comments generated from the interview. The results or findings are discussed below.

DISCUSSION /FINDINGS

The perceived benefits of the PAESP project Implementation were noted from three (3) perspectives: the **MAAP PAES-P coordinator**/member of the working group; the **MAAP community** who participated directly or indirectly in the PAESP visit and the **MAAP students** who were interviewed:

From MAAP-PAESP- P working group member/coordinator perspective

There was no conflict of interest. As a member of MAAP system serving as IAMU-PAES-P member/coordinator, she did not take part in the interview; nor had influenced the accomplishment of the survey forms. Her participation in the PAESP project was: the initial kick-off meeting held in IAMU headquarters Tokyo Japan in May 2017; the 2nd meeting with the PAES-P team in Varna Bulgaria in Sept 2017 and the needed coordination at MAAP from September to October 2017 for the PAESP site visit at MAAP and STCW 2017 Workshop on “Quality Education at the MHEIs”. Finally, she is tasked to determine the benefits of the PAESP project implementation in the Philippines and present them in the IAMU-MARINA STCW 2018 Conference with theme “*Philippine MET Towards Globally Competitive Officers*” on February 22-23, 2018 at Midas Hotel, Manila

As coordinator, the PAES-P project is perceived as an educational and training experience, with the opportunity to have traveled and learned from foreign counterparts. The PAES-P project had provided copies of many learning materials. The PAES Manual, and most especially the different IAMU works of literature on Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) and papers on managing universities, which were collated and / or prepared by the expert co-IAMU member institutions, are worth reading and sharing. All these documents were shared with MAAP President, MAAP Library, MAAP-QMR and the MARINA-STCW Office.

As a member of the PAES-P team, she was excluded in accomplishing the PAES forms. Nevertheless, as a member of the PAES-P working group, she noted the meager scores of two (2 out of 10) provided by a colleague in charge of the areas/programs being evaluated, believed to be strengths in MAAP. This situation is an example of an internal professional disagreement that is resolved thru the PAES-P project by an external peer.

All concerned at MAAP from top to bottom, strictly followed the PAES-P guidelines to never interfere with the rate provided by colleague's self-assessment or evaluation as it is the role of the external PAES-P working group to validate and give an objective feedback report on their site visit. Indeed, the foreign peer evaluators had provided an actual assessment report with commendable findings. This exercise is believed to be one of the benefits of the

PAES-P project. Those items that were rated low by MAAP, were viewed as commendable and those items that were rated very high by MAAP were provided some suggestions for improvement.

The PAES-P team members had exhibited the highest standard of professionalism, honesty, and integrity in their interaction with the institutional personnel and students which is indeed an excellent learning and networking opportunity, as everyone focused on their similarities rather than differences. This exercise had strengthened the ties or international cooperation between MAAP and co-IAMU member institutions represented by the University of Rijeka, Croatia; SIMAC of Denmark and Chalmers University of Technology of Sweden.

From MAAP Community Perspective

It is deemed sensible to interview the MAAP community who took part in the PAESP visit about their perceived benefits of the PAESP project implementation site visit at MAAP to make the study objective. Thirty (30) comments have been noted, and the same has been reduced to twenty (20) statements. In this paper, an analysis of the views of the MAAP officers /faculty /staff (N= 27) who experienced the PAESP visit with their comments (30 reduced to 20) are presented. A questionnaire has been prepared. The same MAAP community has been requested to rate the following statements, to quantify the 20 perceived benefits. The signed attendance sheet during the PAES visit became the basis for the distributed 27 questionnaires to MAAP officers/faculty/staff. Out of the 27 surveys, only 22 accomplished forms were returned on time, and the same were analyzed using the SPSS version 25. **MAAP President was the first** to submit the accomplished questionnaire to ERO as shown in Figure 1 with his signature. **Table 1** presents the mean perceptions of 22 out of 27 MAAP officers, faculty and staff who participated/interviewed during the PAES-P Site visit. The mean ratings are based on a scale of 1 to 5 with five as the highest and one as the lowest. Evidently, the respondents of this survey provided a relatively overall high regard to the PAES-P implementation visit having a **composite mean of 4.60**.

Table 1: Perceived Benefits of PAESP Implementation Site Visit

Rank	Name	Mean	Final Rank
1	Provided venue for MAAP share its best practices and initiatives	4.82	1
2	Provided information on areas of potential improvement, best practices, or alternatives that will enhance MAAP operation.	4.73	2
2	Confirmed that the MAAP documents prepared for PACUCOA Level 3 Accreditation indicates that MAAP system is at par with International standards and best practices	4.73	
4	Provided an objective assessment of MAAP programs and operations	4.68	3
4	Supported MAAP's external peer evaluation or benchmarking	4.68	
6	Encouraged the institution to innovate, improve competitiveness, attractiveness and self-perception	4.64	4
6	Encouraged teamwork and involvement of all concerned in MAAP processes when preparing for audits	4.64	
6	Lifted MAAP's role and status from being passive to being active IAMU member	4.64	
9	Promoted external objective assessment and critique in order to yield a quality product or program.	4.59	5
9	Assured the faculty and administrators that MAAP programs are performing at peak efficiency to meet stakeholder needs	4.59	
9	Encouraged MAAP management and personnel to strive for a more advanced and deeper understanding of its processes	4.59	
9	Encouraged a deeper approach to quality system	4.59	

9	Brought combined expertise across all areas of administration, unlikely to occur with a single consultant. The peer evaluators share a common approach and work collectively.	4.59	
14	Increased responsibility and autonomy	4.57	6
15	Initiated talks about possible future developments and strategic goals	4.55	7
15	Encouraged MAAP to consider certain education activities being done by other co-IAMU members	4.55	
17	Provided a new system of evaluation and standards common with other co-IAMU member	4.50	8
18	Helped peers resolve internal professional disagreements	4.45	9
18	Provided an avenue to bring education and information to MAAP faculty and administrative participants	4.45	
20	Ensured objective measurement of KPI level (high or low) for future success of the organization	4.41	10
Composite		4.60	

Specifically, the respondents provided the highest mean rating of 4.82 on PAESP visit: providing a venue for MAAP to share its best practices and initiatives. The other top benefits include the provision of information on areas of potential improvement, best practices, or alternatives that will enhance MAAP operation; and confirmation that the MAAP documents prepared for PACUCOA Level 3 Accreditation indicate that MAAP system is at par with International standards and best practices. These are followed by PAES-P visit having provided an objective assessment of MAAP programs and operations and supported MAAP’s external peer evaluation or benchmarking.

On the other hand, three (3) out of the twenty (20) benefit statements obtained the lowest mean ratings as reflected in Table 1. The statement helping peers resolve internal disagreements have been identified by only one at MAAP - the MAAP coordinator who is the member of the PAES-P team who cited this as one of the benefits. The other two statement benefits that were ranked lowest pertain to KPI or key performance indicators and on information and education. These findings could indicate that the respondents who rated this as the least have not participated in any IAMU training workshop on KPIs or have not read the various information materials or PAES forms provided by the PAES-P team. An indicator, that training or seminar about PAES prior to its implementation would be beneficial. Further, the above 20 statements were categorized into eight significant benefits, and the MAAP communities were also requested to rank them. **Table 2** reveals the ranking of the respondents on the considerable benefits of PAESP visit for the Academy.

Table 2. Rank of Major Benefits of PAESP Project Implementation

Major Benefits of PAESP Project Implementation	Rank	Final Rank
1. Promotes Communication/ Collaboration and Cooperation	1	1
2. Improves Effectiveness/ Efficiency	2	2
3. Provides Proofs/Validation/Confirmation	2	
4. Objectivity/ Independence / Neutrality	2	
5. Educates and trains	5	3
6. Demonstrates Responsibility/ Duty /Concern	6	4
7. Presents a Balanced View/ Sensible or Well-Adjusted	7	5
8. Ensures Accountability/ Answerability	8	6

As evident in **Table 2**, promoting communication, collaboration, and cooperation or Unity topped the significant benefits of PAESP project implementation as perceived by the respondents. The next considerable benefits include improving Effectiveness/Efficiency, provision of Proofs, validation and confirmation, and objectivity, independence, and neutrality. On the contrary, as listed in **Table 2**, the least perceived benefits include ensuring

Accountability/ Answerability and then presenting Support sensibly/ balanced view. The analysis of MAAP community perceptions revealed eight (8) general benefits that were extracted from the twenty (20) statements of benefits of the PAESP project implementation. The results both support and confirmed previous PAESP reports but this MAAP study had given a more detailed picture of the benefits of the PAES implementation. The general dimensions of benefits found were: *Information; Accountability/Assurance; Motivation; Unity; Proofs/Objectivity; Assistance; Effectiveness/Efficiency* and *Sensible Support/Balanced View*. Whereas the perceived Problems or challenges include: change in schedules and specific additional cost and workloads.

The practical implications of these findings are further analyzed and discussed below. The PAESP project having been appropriately implemented had offered the following benefits which can be summarized into eight benefits and is abbreviated as **IAMU-PAES- P** for easy recall with the last **-P** as the perceived problems or challenges.

I –Information (Educates or Trains) - External expertise is an avenue that had brought education and information to MAAP faculty and administrative participants. The dialogue and discussions were opportunities to identify and at times enlightened misunderstandings or misperceptions about the organization or administration. External peers had encouraged the international transfer of knowledge and competencies while taking into account local culture, tradition and social and economic environment. International peers shared a lot of reading materials on key performance indicators and concepts on strategic management in a university set-up. Moreover, the PAES-P team had facilitated a one-day seminar –workshop for MAAP and selected HEIs in the country that was organized by MARINA on Oct 27, 2017. Indeed MAAP community has been informed and inspired with the visit of the IAMU-PAES-P as it increased awareness of new techniques and more significant insights into thinking.

A - Accountability/ Autonomy /Authenticity and Assurance- Faculty and administrators gained assurance that MAAP sponsored programs are performing at peak efficiency to meet stakeholder needs as it also provided all concerned, the opportunity to demonstrate their respective duties, responsibilities or accountability during the visit. MAAP always welcome external assessment or evaluations as it is the only time that MAAP being accountable for its actions, can present and share its best practices and initiatives and at the same time be assured that MAAP is on the right track.

M- Motivation- All concerned were motivated, inspired and duty-bound to strive for a more advanced and more in-depth understanding of its processes; more profound approach to quality system and possibly consider specific education activities being done by co-IAMU members. The action motivated collegiality and open-minded discussions among management, staff members, students and peers for possible improvements in the organization. Indeed, motivation regarding continuing self-evaluation and reflection that promotes ongoing responsibility, innovative approach and had encouraged professional growth in areas of institutional interest.

U- Unity or Teamwork -The PAES implementation at MAAP promoted 3 Cs (*“communication, collaboration, and cooperation”*–which is the MAAP slogan for 2018) as it brought all concerned together in strengthening cross-institutional dialogue on core administrative functions. Teamwork, flexibility, and involvement of all concerned in MAAP process were enhanced.

P- Proofs/Validation/Objectivity-The external experts, who are newly exposed to MAAP as a new institution, had recognized its strengths, weaknesses, and ways to improve the institution, which may have been overlooked by those working within the system. They had provided more breadth and depth of expertise to the analysis than that available within the internal evaluator's pool, resulting in a more effective and meaningful review. They had been more open, frank, and challenging to the MAAP status quo in their comments than internal reviewers, who may feel constrained by organizational concerns.

Objective assessments of MAAP sponsored programs operations, as well as the constructive critiques, were provided and aimed to yield a better product or program. Institutional history can develop misconceptions that impact current operations or strategic goals. The external peer evaluation by experts in the field brings objectivity to the recommendations offered to assist the institution in responding to these misconceptions. MAAP documents prepared for the other accreditation bodies have been confirmed, proving that MAAP system is at par with international standards and best practices.

A-Assistance - Having met and gained new friends who are experts from IAMU, provoked a change in attitude as they also directly or indirectly helped resolve internal disagreements. All concerned were provided the confidence that in case of questions or need for advice or assistance, MAAP can count on them for a systematic approach to identification of activities that may be improved, methods to decide on and actions leading to identified goals as well as verification process.

E- Effectiveness/ Efficiency- MAAP embraces peer evaluation both institutional and external (CHED, PACUCOA, MARINA, PSB, OPIT), DNV-GL, etc.). The Implementing external peer evaluation by the co-IAMU members from Europe provided a fresh new evaluation and expectations for all units and operations. Information on areas of potential improvement, best practices, or alternatives that will enhance MAAP operation, were provided as the external peers brought a lot of their international experiences. Planning skills were enhanced to ensure more effective task management.

S- Sensible Scorecard / Support well-balanced - The PAES-P Team brings combined expertise across all areas of administration, unlikely to occur with a single consultant. The peer evaluators share a standard approach and work collectively to provide the most reasonable and sensible recommendations to MAAP. IAMU-PAESP has also presented an external score card or measurement of KPI level (high or low) for the future success of the MAAP organization. MAAP experiments with new approaches that will move them to a higher level of performance which were supported thru this PAESP project. The peer assessment activities were supported by detailed and explicit criteria and standards in the form of scores that were rated with no bias depending on the current situation at MAAP.

P- Problems or Challenges Perceived- With the above benefits come the perceived challenges. Considering that the site visit lasted for three days, the only problem experienced was the changes or interruption in the regular schedule or activities by all concerned to fit into the program of the external peer evaluators. Likewise, specific additional cost or workloads were shared by interested management, selected evaluators, heads of the departments and staff members. Nevertheless, the benefits and joy gained from this exercise had beaten the challenges.

From MAAP Students Perspective

Students (N=20) who took part in the PAES-P visit were identified because of their souvenir photo with the four members of the IAMU-PAESP team. The students composed of 4th classmen, 3rd classmen, and 1st classmen were randomly selected and interviewed by the IAMU-PAES-P team. There was no 2nd Classmen at that time, as all of them were on board for the shipboard training.

For this study, the same students have been interviewed about their PAES-P visit experience. They said that they had come to know about the MAAP foreign visitors only that day when they were all gathered in one room and had introduced themselves and their purpose. The students also remembered being asked, how they are being assessed at MAAP, how MAAP study call is being conducted; for them to identify the various equipment used at MAAP, and a lot more. The comments provided by the students on the PAESP visit have been noted as follows:

- 1) *Privileged as it is not always that we are called by foreign visitors for an interview*
- 2) *Proud to be part of MAAP*
- 3) *Excited to be interviewed*
- 4) *Mixed emotions including being nervous*
- 5) *Confirmation that MAAP is excellent*
- 6) *Enhanced confidence*
- 7) *It was our shore leave but glad to be at MAAP during the PAES-P visit*
- 8) *Confirmed that MAAP is the best maritime school to be visited by PAES-P*
- 9) *Honored to be called and included in the group of students called for the interview*

It can be surmised that the students' perceived benefits of the PAES-P visit, were entirely different from the MAAP community as it was more about their emotions or thoughts about its effect on them and to MAAP as their institution.

CONCLUDING REMARKS /RECOMMENDATIONS

Indeed, a **key factor** in the success of the PAES-P project implementation was the MAAP leadership and its community **receptivity** to the process. Everyone expressed appreciation for being able to access independent expert opinions on various issues. MAAP community viewed the external peer review team as valued partners and the process as collegial. That sense of partnership and collegiality was essential for the effective and efficient implementation of their recommendation, following the external peer review.

In general, MAAP is grateful to have been visited by outside experts and thought leaders in MET. Having self- evaluated the nine important areas of institutional operations with the assistance of expert peers from IAMU, had certainly provided objective feedback and guidance needed by the respective institutions to optimize and to provide the best standard of MET. In MAAP, the PAES-P experience highlighted the importance of the on-going relationship with local and international accrediting bodies such as: **PACUCOA** (*MAAP level 3 BSMT and BSMarE accredited programs*); **DNV-GL ISO 9001:2015** (*MAAP as first maritime academic institution certified under the provision of MET to the national and international shipping industry*); **PSB 100:2002 Singapore** (*MAAP provision of MET for the shipping Industry*) ; **OPITO** (MAAP as an accredited training provider) and the Japan Ministry of Land Infrastructure, Transportation and Tourism (**JMLITT**) **audit** (*MAAP graduates exempted from Japanese test for international and non -domestic seafarers*) which MAAP intends to maintain. Although the Philippines government does not universally require external peer MET evaluators at this time, this is a good best practice to possibly

consider by MARINA that would intensify quality education and training services, as everyone in MET would like to maintain. Furthermore, it is also given in any works of literature, like that of the studies of Ricky Lam in 2010 and Min in 2005, that to gain benefit from any peer-assisted evaluation schemes or projects, those involved, need **training or at least be informed** in the specific scheme or system being used. This exercise is ideal, as those involved may play an important role in developing the PAES form for its improvement, hence is able to evaluate or assessed other areas which may have been overlooked or missed. The participations reported here, which involved (N =22) group of MAAP community, had no training for measures on PAES process. Only the MAAP President, MAAP-PAES-P coordinator and the three MAAP executive staff (*QMR, Assistant VP and Dean*) who answered the PAES-P forms as per PAES guidelines have been informed about the PAES-P by the IAMU-PAES-P team. Nonetheless, the results show that MAAP community who were directly or indirectly involved in the PAESP implementation felt that they benefited from their participation. The results also present clear evidence that **training/education/information on Key performance indicators or KPIs** or other measures (*having been ranked the least perceived benefits*) might be beneficial for the success of succeeding PAES-P implementation. Trainers training on PAES-P implementation for a domino effect may be done in the Philippines by two IAMU member institutions (*JB Larson and MAAP*) that have had experienced the IAMU-PAES project.

The PAES-P project is focused on **education and data collection processes** based on nine areas, guided by external peers from IAMU, is indeed a unique process. It is recommended that an open-ended question should be included in the PAES form to cover other areas or topics which the PAES form may have missed and to provide more information about the institution's initiatives or accomplishments not found in any other MET institutions. From the MAAP experience, PAES project in the Philippines is absolutely a valuable quality improvement tool and a key to any institution long-term success.

REFERENCES

- [1] Francic, V. Askholn, J, Ljungklint, J. and Yutaka E (Feb 11, 2018), a 14-page IAMU-PAESP Report on the Site Visit to MAAP
- [2] Lam, Ricky (2010) A Peer Review Training Workshop: Coaching Students to give and Evaluate Peer Feedback in TESL Canada Journal Vol 27 No 2 Spring 2010 pp. 114 -127 Retrieved at <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ924064.pdf> on Feb 14, 2018
- [3] McLeod, S. A. (2008) LIKERT Scale. Retrieved from www.simplypsychology.org/likert-scale.html on February 11, 2018
- [4] Min, H.T. (2005) Training students to become successful peer reviewers. System, 33, pp 293-308.
- [5] Savita (2017) Self -evaluation, peer-evaluation, patient satisfaction and utilization review retrieved from www.slideshare.net/MnSavita/self-evaluation-peer-evaluation on February 15, 2018
- [6] Zec, Damir (2015) IAMU Peer Assisted Self - Evaluation Scheme (PAES) Manual, University of Rijeka