

Status of and Problems on Open Admission Policy of Pangasinan State University, Philippines

Asia Pacific Journal of
Multidisciplinary Research
Vol. 3 No.5, 19-24
December 2015 Part IV
P-ISSN 2350-7756
E-ISSN 2350-8442
www.apjmr.com

Nova E. Arquillano¹, Potenciano D. Conte, Jr.²,
Sally A. Jarin³, Edna C. Queriones⁴
Pangasinan State University-Lingayen
nova_arquillano@yahoo.com

Date Received: November 2, 2015; Date Revised: December 13, 2015

Abstract - An open admission policy was implemented in the campuses of Lingayen, Bayambang and Urdaneta City of Pangasinan State University, Philippines in school year 2008-2009. The purpose of the policy is to maximize the university resources and serve more poor students. Through this, student-applicants can choose from non-quota courses offered in different campuses of Pangasinan State University. For almost seven years of implementation, the study found out that the administrators considered inability to teach by teachers, campus security and food center highly serious. They rated problem on number of computer units as moderately serious. The inability to manage class, food center and number of chairs and computers were rated moderately serious by faculty members and students. Difficulty in learning was highly serious by the faculty members and moderately serious by the students. This open admission policy implemented in Pangasinan State University resulted to the rise number of enrollees year after year since its implementation in school year 2008-2009. The school personnel encountered challenges because of this. Administrators experienced higher degree of seriousness of problems related to open admission policy compared to the groups of faculty members and students. This study recommended that administrators should conduct seminar-workshop for teacher's relation to classroom management and teaching approaches. They should also prioritize the monitoring of security and safety of students. Also, they should meet the faculty members on a semester basis in order to get their experiences, feedbacks and suggestions. With regards to university administrators and planners, they consider construction of more classrooms and comfort rooms, and procurement of chairs and computer units to accommodate the growing number of students.

Keywords: open admission policy, enrolment, facilities

INTRODUCTION

The Philippine education system adopted the concept of inclusive education. It is about providing equitable access to education to all walks of life. One the strategies to make higher education accessible to all is the open admission. As defined by the Princetown Review, college open admission offers admittance to all students who completed high school. In the United States, open enrolment policies were introduced during the 1960s and 1970s, especially to disadvantages or unprivileged students as a mechanism to remove barrier to higher education [1]. Open admission is also called unselective enrolment and non-competitive college admission process; the only criteria is a high school diploma [2] and general education development certificate [3]. The University of Arkansas, University of Nebraska, Wilmington

College and Eastern Oregon University are adopting open admission and admitting 98 per cent or more applicants [4]. With regards to the cost of education in higher education using the open admission policy, the average annual state college tuition in Texas with open admission is \$10,626 for academic year 2014-2016 [3] and \$14,625 in Ohio [5]. Historically speaking, community colleges have adopted open enrolment policies to low income and lesser-prepared students [6].

Same as the concept of open admission in the United States, Pangasinan State University adopted the policy during the school year 2008-2009 in the campuses of Lingayen, Bayambang, San Carlos, and Urdaneta. The open admission policy was implemented for non-quota courses to maximize the

university resources and serve more poor students who cannot afford to enter private universities and colleges or for curricular programs not requiring licensure examinations [7].

With the implementation of open admission policy by higher education institutions, there are issues and concerns on the choice of teaching approach [9], class participation [9], school security [11], and school facilities [12] [13] [14] [15]. The above mentioned concerns made the researchers feel the recent or the timing of the conduct of this study related to the status and problems of open admission policy adopted by the Pangasinan State University. It is high time to have a research like this in order to describe, in general, the utilization of university facilities and equipment, and instructional delivery in relation to open admission policy.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

This study described the open admission policy implemented in Pangasinan State University as it manifested on the utilization of university facilities and equipment, and the instructional delivery after seven (7) years of implementation. It also revealed the problems behind its implementation. These problems were grouped into human resource-related and non-human resource-related. Ultimately, the researchers hope to provide factual information to the head of the agency so as to improve the service delivery along instruction, library and other student support services.

METHODS AND MATERIALS

Population and Sample

A letter requesting to float the questionnaire to the respondents were provided to the head of the campus for approval. Upon approval, the researchers sought assistance of the chief administrative officers, the department heads and program advisers for the actual administration of questionnaire. There were six (6) administrators, seventy seven (77) faculty members and three hundred sixty nine (369) students of PSU Lingayen Campus who provided data for this study.

Table 1 shows the population and sample of student respondents from six different academic programs with highest enrolment during the School Year 2012-2013. The sample was computed using the Slovin’s formula. Equal allocation of student-respondents across year level and class section was adopted to obtain representative sampling.

Table 1. Student-Respondents of the Study

Academic programs	Population	Sample
BA English	560	43
BA Public Administration	375	29
B Industrial Technology	875	64
BS Business Administration	1195	91
BS Hospitality Management	1146	87
BS Information and Communication Technology	726	55
Total	4836	369

Instrumentation

The status of open admission policy of PSU Lingayen Campus was determined using documentary analysis. These documents were provided by the Registrar’s Office and Assessment Office of PSU Lingayen. Questionnaire was used to determine the problems encountered by administrators, faculty members, and students of PSU Lingayen Campus on open admission policy. The respondents were given scales to weight their experiences on these problems. The scale of 5 has the descriptive meaning of very high serious (range is 4.21 to 5.00), 4 is highly serious (3.41 to 4.20), 3 is moderately serious (2.61 to 3.40), 2 is slightly serious (1.81 to 2.61, and 1 is very slightly serious (1.00 to 1.80). The content of instrument was validated by research experts in educational planning composed of the University Officials and obtained a rating of 4.24.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The results of the findings are presented below.

The data on enrolment size of PSU Lingayen Campus from S. Y. 2007-2008 to S. Y. 2012-2013 were provided by the Registrar’s Office of PSU Lingayen. This enrolment size is based from first semester of each school year.

Table 2. Enrolment Size from S.Y. 2007-2008 to S. Y. 2012-2013

School Year	Number of enrollees	Percentage increase
2007-2008	3310	
2008-2009	4219	27.0
2009-2010	5128	22.0
2010-2011	6324	23.0
2011-2012	7000	11.0
2012-2013	7034	.5

Table 2 shows that PSU Lingayen Campus has a total enrolment of 3310 in first semester SY 2007-2008, 4219 enrolment in SY 2008-2009, 5128 in SY 2009-2010, 6324 in SY 2010-2011, 7000 in SY 2011-2012 and 7034 in SY 2012-2013. The percentage increase of enrolment in PSU Lingayen Campus is 27% in SY 2008-2009, 22% in SY 2009-2010, 23% in SY 2010-2011, 11% in SY 2011-2012 and .5% in SY 2012-2013.

The trend in enrolment of PSU Lingayen Campus from the start of open admission policy in S. Y. 2008-2009 is increasing. With the implementation of open admission policy, it provided opportunity to a larger clientele.

It can also be gleaned from the table that the percentage increase of enrolment from SY 2007-2008 to SY 2012-2013 is decreasing. This could be attributed to the establishment of another campus of Pangasinan State University in Alaminos City. Aside from its attractive courses, prospective clients from western Pangasinan opted to enroll in PSU Alaminos Campus for proximity and economic reasons. Also, Alaminos City Campus offers popular courses like Bachelor in Secondary Education and Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management while Binmaley Campus offers Bachelor of Science in Criminology and BS Hospitality Management. In addition, scholarship and discount on tuition fee provided by private universities and colleges in Pangasinan affect the enrolment of Pangasinan State University-Lingayen Campus.

Pangasinan State University, being a public higher education institution with lower tuition fee compared to private universities and colleges, is a university for the masses. Before the implementation of open admission policy in PSU Lingayen Campus, each academic program accepts up 50 or 60 enrollees. PSU Lingayen Campus draws attention from prospective clients because of the opportunity to enter college and enroll in non-quota or non-board courses. As a result, the enrolment size increases in an annual basis.

Table 3 shows that there are 63 classrooms in PSU Lingayen Campus. These classrooms have size area ranging from 44 m² to 168 m². The smallest size is located in CAS building while the biggest size in technology building. There is one (1) chemistry laboratory (size=65.84 m²), one (1) biology laboratory (64.73 m²), four (4) computer laboratories (64 m² each), one (1) library (515 m²), one (1) convention hall (825.6 m²), canteen (combined size of 420 m²

combined), and 1 hotel and restaurant training center (784 m²).

Table 3. Facilities of PSU Lingayen Campus

Facilities	Number	Size
Classrooms	63	From 44 m ² to 168 m ²
Chemistry laboratory	1	65.84 m ²
Biology laboratory	1	64.73 m ²
Computer laboratory	4	64 m ² (each)
Library	1	515 m ²
Conventional hall	1	825.6 m ²
Canteen	2	420 m ² (combined)
HRM Training Center	1	784 m ²

PSU Lingayen Campus is implementing the three shifts day-class. The classrooms were used based on teaching load and room assignment. But, in cases where faculty members do not have assigned classroom, study sheds and covered court were available. As of this writing, a three-storey academic building is being construction to address this concern.

As to other school facilities like convention hall and function room located at the Hotel and Restaurant Management Training Center that could accommodate 100 individuals, these are used for activities like student assembly, seminars, trainings, and others. Likewise, instructional media center located at De Venecia Information Technology Center could hold educational activities with a minimum of 20 individuals. Since the capacity of these facilities is limited, the holding of activities is subject for approval of the administration on the basis of educational purposes, number of participants and first-come first-served.

Problems Encountered Open Admission Policy

Table 5 shows that administrators rated the teacher-related problems with mean of 4.17 or highly serious while equipment with mean of 3.08 or moderately serious. On teacher-related problems, administrators rated inability to teach by the teachers with mean of 4.17 or highly serious while inability to manage class was rated moderately serious by the faculty members and students with mean of 3.17 and 3.07, respectively. This means that administrators noticed that open admission policy affect the teaching force of PSU Lingayen Campus. The campuses of Lingayen, Bayambang and Urdaneta used the dual-shift policy wherein the first shift begins at 7:00 AM

to 4:00 PM while the second shift at 10:00 AM to 7:00 PM [7] [8]. Aside from the dual shift, an adjustment on class size of 60 students and more was experienced by the faculty members. Studies reveal that class size and use of lecture vs. discussion overlap [9]. In large class size, lecture is dominated. Lecture was found to drop off student attention and concentration after 10 to 20 minutes of continues instructor discourse [16] [17].

Also, large class size has been found to be a dissatisfying factor among students [9] and deterring factor from asking questions even the instructor told them to do so [18] There is also a consistent correlation between the number of small class size taken by students and their grade point average [20].

Table 5. Problems Encountered by Administrators and Faculty Members

Human Resource	Administrator N=6		Faculty N=77		Students n=369	
	Mean	DE	Mean	DE	Mean	DE
a. Teacher related						
1. Inability to teach according to scheduled time	4.17	HS	3.36	MS	3.05	MS
2. Inability to manage the class	4.17	HS	3.17	MS	3.07	MS
3. Less patience to deliver teaching mode	4.17	HS	3.10	MS	2.99	MS
4. Less energy to teach in afternoon classes	4.17	HS	3.22	MS	3.05	MS
AWM	4.17	HS	3.21	MS	3.04	MS
b. Student related						
1. Campus security	4.00	HS	3.23	MS	2.93	MS
2. Difficulty in learning lessons	3.50	MS	3.87	HS	3.05	MS
3. Less focus on studies	3.33	MS	2.78	MS	3.17	MS
Average weighted mean	3.61	MS	2.96	MS	3.02	MS
Overall AWM	3.89	MS	3.08	MS	3.04	MS
Non Human Resource						
a. Facilities						
Insufficient number of/space for.....						
1. Classrooms	3.00	MS	2.99	MS	3.17	MS
2. Laboratories	3.00	MS	2.95	MS	3.15	MS
3. Sports and relaxation area	3.50	HS	2.96	MS	3.11	MS
4. Comfort rooms	3.00	MS	2.94	MS	3.23	MS
5. Food centers	3.83	HS	3.03	MS	3.07	MS
Average weighted mean	3.27	MS	2.97	MS	3.14	MS
b. Equipment						
Insufficient number of						
1. Computer units	3.16	MS	2.95	MS	3.23	MS
2. Ventilation	3.00	MS	2.91	MS	3.15	MS
3. Laboratory equipment	3.16	MS	2.97	MS	3.02	MS
4. Chairs	3.00	MS	3.17	MS	3.04	MS
AWM	3.08	MS	3.00	MS	3.10	MS
c. Reference						
Insufficient number of.						
1. Books	3.50	HS	2.91	MS	2.96	MS
2. Periodicals/journals	3.83	HS	2.81	MS	3.03	MS
3. Maps and charts	3.50	HS	2.86	MS	2.56	SS
Average weighted mean	3.61	HS	2.86	MS	3.03	MS
Overall AWM	3.32	MS	2.94	MS	3.09	MS

On student-related problems, campus security was rated by administrators as highly serious with computed mean of 4.00 while difficulty in learning was rated 3.87 or highly serious by the faculty members and 3.05 or moderately serious by the students. According to a study, security measure is more likely to be found in large schools, typically with 1000 and more students, located in a city, with less discipline students and at least one serious crime reported [11].

On facilities as non-human related problems, food center was rated 3.83 or highly serious by the administrators while food center was rated 3.17 or moderately serious by faculty members and 3.07 or moderately serious by the students. On equipment as non-human related problem, the number of chairs was rated 2.94 or moderately serious by the faculty members and 3.23 or moderately serious by the students. On computers units, the number of computer units was rated 2.95 or moderately serious by the faculty members while students rated it 3.23 or moderately serious and 3.16 or moderately serious by the administrators. Studies reveal the positive relationship between school facilities and effectiveness [12] [13] [14] [15] and the need to provide adequate, available and relevant facilities for effective teaching and learning [20] [21].

As a whole, administrators have the highest overall average weighted mean of 3.89 or moderately serious for human resource and 3.32 or moderately serious for non human resource. This means that administrators had seen the problems in all aspect of implementation of open admission policy. This also could be attributed to the inherent function of administrators and additional work related to open admission policy like human resource planning, teaching load, recruitment of new faculty members, monitoring of increased number of faculty members and inventory and request of needed facilities and equipment.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The open admission policy implemented in Pangasinan State University resulted to the rise number of enrollees year after year since its implementation in school year 2008-2009. Generation of number of students mainly came from leading academic programs in terms of enrolment size, namely: Bachelor of Science in Business

Administration, Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management, and Bachelor in Industrial Technology.

Open admission policy brings educational opportunity for poor but deserving high school graduates in the province. However, school personnel encountered challenges because of this. Administrators experienced higher degree of seriousness of problems related to open admission policy compared to the groups of faculty members and students. They are concerned with their faculty members on how to handle the students inside the classroom and to maintain the learning environment. Due to the open admission policy, faculty members have the tendency to experience fatigue and students are concerned about the facilities of the campus.

This study recommended that administrators should conduct seminar-workshop on classroom management, teaching approaches appropriate for big class size and monitor security and safety of students. There should be physical and mental relaxation among faculty members during break time. Department chairpersons as administrators should meet the faculty members on a semester basis in order to get their experiences, feedbacks and suggestions as basis for coming up of a faculty work load and mechanisms to improve the teaching process. University administrators and planners to consider construction of more classrooms and comfort rooms, and procurement of chairs and computer units to accommodate the growing number of students in Pangasinan State University-Lingayen Campus.

REFERENCES

- [1] [1]What are open admissions? <http://www.bestcolleges.com/features/best-colleges-with-open-admissions/>. Date retrieved: January 11, 2016.
- [2] Nelson, Vicki. What does college open admission mean? <https://www.collegeparentcentral.com/2013/02/what-does-college-open-admission-mean/>
- [3] Texas opens admissions colleges, cost and affordability for 2016. <http://www.collegecalc.org/colleges/texas/open-admissions/>. Date retrieved: January, 2016.
- [4] <http://www.centerforpubliceducation.org/Main-Menu/Staffingstudents/Chasing-the-college-acceptance-letter-Is-it-harder-to-get-into-college-At-a-glance/What-do-you-mean-by-a-competitive-college.html>
- [5] Ohio open admission colleges, cost and affordability for 2016.

- <http://www.collegecalc.org/colleges/ohio/open-admissions/>. Date retrieved: January 11, 2016
- [6] Hilmer, M.J. (1997). Does community college attendance provide a strategic path to a higher quality education? *Economics of Education Review*: (16)1, 59-68.
- [7] PSU Annual Report. (2008). Pangasinan State University, 19-20.
- [8] PSU Annual Report. (2009) Pangasinan State University, 2-3.
- [9] McKeachie, W. (1980). Class size, large classes and multiple sections, *Academe*, 66, 24-27.
- [10] Wulff, D. H., Nyquist, J. D., and Abbott, R. D. (1987). Students' perceptions of large classes. In M. Weimer (Ed.), *Teaching large classes well*. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, no. 32. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- [11] Heavyside, Sheila, Cassandra Rowman, Catrina Williams, and Elizabeth Farris. (1998). *Violence and Discipline Problems in U.S. Public Schools: 1996-97*. (NCES 98- 030). Washington, D. C.: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.
- [12] Adebeyeje, R. A. (1984). *Management of school physical facilities in Ondo State, Nigeria: a case study of Ikale and Ondo Local Government Area*. An unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Ife, Ile-Ife, Nigeria.
- [13] Adedeji, S. O. (1998). *The relationship between resource utilisation and academic performance in Osun State secondary schools*. An unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria.
- [14] Owoeye, J. S. (2000). *The effect of interaction of location, facilities and class size on academic achievement of secondary school students in Ekiti State, Nigeria*. An unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria.
- [15] Ajayi, I. A. (2002). Resource factors as correlates of secondary school effectiveness in Ekiti State. *Nigerian Journal of Counselling and Applied Psychology*. 1(1): 109—115.
- [16] Penner, J. (1984). *Why name college teaches cannot lecture*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas. Policy Center on the First Year of College (2003, January). *Second national survey of first-year academic practices*, 2002. <http://www.Brevard.edu/fyc/survey2002/findings.htm>. Date retrieved. January 12, 2016.
- [17] Verner, C., & Dickinson, G. (1967). The lecture: An analysis and review of research. *Adult Education*, 17, 85-100.
- [18] Stones, E. (1970). Students' attitudes toward the size of teaching groups. *Educational Review*, 21(2), 98-108.
- [19] Light, R. J. (2001). *Making the most of college: Students speak their minds*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- [20] Ahunanya, S. I. and Ubabudu, M. C. M. (2006). Enrolment, facilities and financial allocation in Lagos higher education: implication for quality graduates. *Nigerian Journal of Educational Administration and Planning (NAEAP)*. 6(1): 153—164.
- [21] Oni, J.O. (1992). *Resource and Resource Utilisation as Correlates of School Academic Performance*. Unpublished Ph.D Thesis, University of Ibadan.

COPYRIGHTS

Copyright of this article is retained by the author/s, with first publication rights granted to APJMR. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)