

Level of Board Performance of the Graduates in the Criminologists Licensure Examination: A Documentary Analysis

DARYL DON P. TAGUBA

Cagayan State University, Aparri Campus
daryldontaguba@csu.edu.ph

Abstract

The learner is the central figure in the educational system when it comes to the process of learning. Because of this ambition, schools were formed in all possible regions to quench man's thirst for greater information and to help him achieve his maximum potential. This study is concerned with the documented analysis of the level of board performance of graduates in the Criminologists Licensure Examination in relation to the following areas, as determined by the year in which the examination was taken and the campus where it was taken. Ex post facto research was employed in this study. From 2015 to 2017, the CLE mean rating decreased due to a variety of issues including insufficient learning facilities, positive attributions, background characteristics, teaching styles, class environment, and socio-economic considerations. A major emphasis was placed on institutional management and problem solutions by the administration. According to this description, it appears that the graduates lack knowledge of organizational management as well as the ability to deal with challenges that arise within the business. It follows as a result of these findings that there was no relationship between the year in which the examination was administered and the level of board performance achieved by the graduates. Inadequate learning facilities, positive attributions, background characteristics, instructional styles, class atmosphere, and socio-economic factors have all been linked to changes in licensure performances by year, and all of these have been proven.

Keyword: board performance, licensure examination, documentary analysis, licensure performance

Introduction

Education provides students with a richer tapestry of information, a more comprehensive awareness of facts, a more extensive repository of wisdom, and a more profound understanding of life, all of which contribute to the development of more responsible and upright human beings. The learner is the central figure in the educational system when it comes to the process of learning. Because of this ambition, schools were formed in all possible regions to quench man's thirst for greater information and to help him achieve his maximum potential. In fact, the school's awareness of the enormous benefits of education led to the establishment of a variety of courses, particularly at the higher level. One such topic of study is criminology, which is a highly intellectual field mostly due to the fact that the majority of the job's tasks are based on identifying and deciphering criminal patterns. As a scientific subject, criminology is concerned with investigating crimes and their causes as well as the meaning of crime in the legal system

and how people react to crime in their communities. The scientific study of criminals and criminal conduct is also a part of the field's scope, Adunola, (2011). Even more than that, criminology is a dynamic profession as well as a multi-disciplinary scientific discipline. Criminology is rapidly rising in popularity among students, and as a result, it is being given at both the undergraduate and graduate levels by a growing number of schools and universities across the United States and Canada (Eduardo, 2018).

Academic achievement of students is measured in a variety of ways, the most common of which are grade point average (GPA) and test outcomes. The grade point average (GPA) was employed by the majority of scholars around the world to assess student achievement (Galiher, 2006; Darling, 2005 as cited in Mushtaq and Khan, 2012).

The efficacy of an educational program delivered by an educational institution can be judged by the competencies of its graduates, as well as the information and skills that the graduates have gained and can apply in the workplace. The input from employers on the graduates' performance in the workplace, according to Plantilla (2017), can be used to determine the knowledge and skills that the graduates possess. The effectiveness of any educational program can be best assessed by observing how well graduates apply their university-acquired information and abilities in a real-world work environment after they have graduated.

Moreover, academic performance denotes how well a student is achieving tasks and studies. The common factors associated with academic performance are grades, attendance, attitude, motivation and behavior towards studying. As quoted by Ali, Jusoff, Ali, Mokhar and Salamat (2009), the students' performance plays an important role in producing the best quality graduates who will become great leader and manpower for the country thus possible for the country's economic and social development because this concern not only to the administrators and educators, but also to corporations in the labor market.

In the global arena, the study of Pascua & Navalta, (2011) pointed out that research on predictors of academic success should include academic variables such as GPA and standardized test scores. Moreover, valuable time may be unwisely spent studying the effects of demographic variables on academic success.

A mechanism by which the government ascertains the quality of Criminology Education received by the students is the imposition of a Licensure Examination for Criminologists. The Criminologists Licensure Examination (CLE) is a test which assesses the overall knowledge and proficiency as prospective Criminologists by which the practice can be measured and proven. A new criminology graduate cannot exercise immediately his/her profession. He has to take a standardized test first, and one of these tests is the Licensure Examination for Criminologists (LEC). Earning the title "Licensed Criminologists" is believed to be a symbol of quality education acquired from the Criminology Education Institution. The Criminologists Licensure Examination (CLE) likewise assesses the quality of educational services and provisions offered by the Criminology Education Institution, such as provisions could be curriculum, instructors, facilities and others necessary for instruction.

Statement of the Problem

1. What is the level of board performance of the graduates in the Criminologists Licensure Examination relative to the following areas according to year taken and campus?

- A. Criminal Law and Jurisprudence (CLJ)
- B. Law Enforcement Administration (LEA)
- C. Criminalistics (CTS)
- D. Crime Detection and Investigation (CDI)
- E. Sociology of Crimes and Ethics (SCE)
- F. Correctional Administration (CA)

1.1 Is there a significant difference on the level of board performance of the graduates in the Criminologists Licensure Examination relative to the following areas according to year taken and campus?

Hypothesis: There is no significant difference on the level of board performance of the graduates in the Criminologists Licensure Examination relative to the following areas according to year taken and campus.

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Research Design

As defined by Gay (1976), referenced in Sanchez (1998), ex post facto research aims to uncover the causes or explanations for existing inequalities in behavior or status between groups of individuals.

By analyzing the respondents' academic performance in the Professional Education Components subjects of Sociology of Crimes and Ethics (SCE), Law Enforcement Administration (LEA), Crime Detection and Investigation (CDI), Criminalistics (CTS), Criminal Law and Jurisprudence (CLJ), Correctional Administration (CA), and Practicum 1 & 2 (PRC 1 & 2), the researcher determined their mean performance in the L. It also determined the proposed ways to boost the percentage of qualified candidates in the licensure examination.

In order to understand the CLE disparities, ex-post facto study was used. This study also attempted to compare the performance of Criminology graduates across Aparri, Piat, Sanchez Mira, and Gonzaga campuses.

Population and Locale of the Study

This study included all 336 alumni of the College of Criminal Justice Education of Aparri, Piat, Sanchez Mira, and Gonzaga who took the Licensure Examination for Criminologists for the first time from April 2015 to December 2017. The responders were chosen from the lists of Campus registrars and Professional Regulation Commission (PRC) takers. This study included all regular and part-time regular faculty with regular loads from 2014-2015 to 2016-2017. This

survey had twelve (12) academic members as responders. The University Dean and the four (4) College Deans of the College of Criminal Justice Education were also interviewed.

The study employed complete enumeration to count the number of graduates, faculty, and administrators. Census enquiry, according to Kumar (2008), enumerates every item in the population. It is reasonable to assume that if all objects are covered, no chance is left and the highest accuracy is achieved. This method is also utilized to bolster the study's findings.

Table 2 presents the frequency and percentage of Graduates in each Campus.

Table 2

Frequency and percentage of Graduates in each campus

Campus	2015	%	2016	%	2017	%	Frequency (f)	%
Aparri	15	18.52	24	22.64	64	42.95	103	30.65
Gonzaga	13	16.05	21	19.81	25	16.78	59	54.37
Sanchez	26	32.1	20	18.87	31	20.81	77	22.92
Mira								
Piat	27	33.33	41	38.68	29	19.46	97	94.17
Total	81	100	106	100	149	100	336	100

Data Gathering Tool/s

The researcher gathered data from documents, the Professional Regulation Commission's ratings, and the Registrar's Offices of the four schools. The data were gathered from the Registrar's Office documents and entered into Microsoft Excel. Criminal Law and Jurisprudence (CLJ), Law Enforcement Administration (LEA), Criminalistics (CTS), Crime Detection and Investigation (CDI), Sociology of Crimes and Ethics (SCE), Correctional Administration (CA), and Practicum 1 and 2 were included as obtained from the individual Transcript of Records of the graduating students.

Similarly, the data were gathered from the Professional Regulation Commission's official records, which included each taker's CLE result and the school performance of CSU-CCJE in all campuses from April 2015 to December 2017.

Also, only teachers and administrators responded to the data guide. It was used to collect personal data from professors and administrators. Students Manual of Cagayan State University-College of Criminal Justice Administration and Commission on Higher Education Memorandum Order No. 21, series of 2005 shaped the data guide. The data guide also suggested ways to improve the Licensure Examination for Criminologists.

Data Gathering Procedure

The researcher wrote an official letter to the Dean of the Graduate School of Criminal Justice and Public Safety claiming that he is conducting research on the CLE performance of

Criminology graduates. To the President of Cagayan State University, Campus Executive Officer and Dean of CSU-CCJE at Aparri, Piat, Sanchez Mira and Gonzaga. So, after receiving approval, the researcher prepared a formal letter addressed to the Campus Registrars of the four campuses, asking for permission to gather the necessary information, which included the roster of BSC graduates from 2014-2015 to 2016-2017, and their individual Transcripts of Records. Graduate respondent average grades were computed and recorded each respondent from the Transcript of Records file in the Registrar's Office of the individual universities.

The official records of the Professional Regulation Commission also included the Institutional Passing Rate and the National Passing Rate for CSU-CCJE across all campuses.

The data guide was also given to teachers and administration. Informal interviews with teachers and administration in the research area were done to validate their replies to the data guide.

Treatment of the Data

The study made use of the descriptive statistics research tools as to frequency counts, percentages, weighted mean and the standard deviation, which were used to describe the academic performance of the graduates in each component of the Criminology curriculum and the level of performance in the Criminologist Licensure Examination (SOP 1, 2 and 3).

For specific problem number one and two, which focuses on the level of academic performance of the graduates and the level of board performance in the Criminologists Licensure Examination, the data are interpreted as follows (CSU Student Manual, 2016):

Scale	Qualitative Interpretation
97-100%	Excellent
93-96%	Very good
88-92%	Good
83-87%	Satisfactory
75-82%	Fair
74 and below	Poor/Failed

Finally, the Pearson Product Moment Correlation was used to determine the existence of relationship between the academic performance and CLE performance. The relationship is interpreted using Cohen's interpretation as shown in the following (Cohen, 1998):

0.50-1.0: Large/Strong

0.30-0.49: Medium/Moderate

0.10-0.29: Small/Weak

Ethical Consideration

The researcher obtained from the Professional Regulation Commission a letter of approval from the Cagayan State University President to obtain an official copy of the CLE passers, which included topic ratings and school performance of CSU-CCJE across all campuses.

After clearance, the researcher wrote a formal letter to the Chairman of the Professional Regulation Commission requesting an official copy of the CLE passers, including subject area ratings and CSU-CCJE school performance across all campuses. The University Dean of the College of Criminal Justice Education and the President of Cagayan State University signed the formal letter. The researcher then requested the Region 2 Regional Director of the Professional Regulation Commission's approval.

For the Registrar's office of the four campuses, the researcher obtained another letter of consent from the Cagayan State University President to obtain individual grades of graduates of the Bachelor of Science in Criminology from Calendar Year 2014-2015 to 2016-2017.

Also, the researcher individually sought faculty and administration personnel at their convenience for the data guide. The researcher noted respectful explanation of the data guide's nature and purpose. The researcher also requested the faculty and administration's readiness to complete the data guide.

The study's findings were shared with Cagayan State University officials in Aparri, Piat, Sanchez Mira, and Gonzaga, including the President, Campus Executive Officers, University Dean, and Associate Dean of the College of Criminal Justice Administration.

Individual grades of graduates from Registrar's office of four schools, faculty and administrative responses to data guidance, and any other connected data were managed with the highest confidentiality.

Discussion of Results and Findings

The Criminologist Licensure Examination (CLE) is one indicator of quality education. It demonstrates the academic program's achievement and the institution or university's educational excellence. The following tables represent Cagayan State University graduates' 2015, 2016 and 2017 Criminologist Licensure Examination results (CLE).

Results of graduates in the Professional Regulation Commission's licensure exams are one indicator of educational quality (Figuerres, 2013). According to Baang (n.d.), a school's graduates' performance on the licensing exam determines the level of education provided. Qualified graduates apply what they have learnt in their chosen profession or career with efficiency and effectiveness.

To become a criminologist, you must pass a licensing exam (De Vaney Olvey, Hogg, & Counts, 2002). This exam covers six topics: law enforcement administration, criminal jurisprudence, process and evidence, criminalistics, corrections administration, crime detection and investigation, criminal sociology, ethics, and human relations, among others.

Table 1 shows the average rating of 2015–2017 graduates who took their first CLE. This table shows the average CLE rating for each component of the licensure test for 2015, 2016, and 2017.

Table 1

Criminologist Licensure Examination Performance of Graduates According to Year Taken

Professional Course	Mean	Description	Std Deviation
CLJ 2015	75.4935	F	8.51566
2016	74.7451	F	7.72252
2017	74.1608	P	10.04052
Total	74.6646	F	8.98940
LEA 2015	79.2078	F	7.19345
2016	78.2745	F	6.01674
2017	78.6364	F	8.07583
Total	78.6584	F	7.25341
CTS 2015	77.3247	F	6.83728
2016	74.6863	F	7.12822
2017	72.7832	P	8.58523
Total	74.4720	P	7.93082
CDI 2015	79.3506	F	8.24584
2016	78.2157	F	7.05372
2017	78.5734	F	7.20181
Total	78.6460	F	7.40793
SCE 2015	77.9351	F	9.32080
2016	76.4608	F	9.54061
2017	72.5524	P	9.76966
Total	75.0776	F	9.84064
CA 2015	75.8442	F	8.94437
2016	74.8824	F	7.57444
2017	72.2587	P	9.42929
Total	73.9472	P	8.87330
GWA 2015	77.5675	F	7.30383
2016	76.3255	F	6.30006
2017	75.2857	F	7.82947
Total	76.1607	F	7.28426

Legend: Level of Performance: 97-100% (Excellent); 93-96% (Very good); 88-92% (Good); 83-87% ((Satisfactory); 75-82% (Fair); and 74 and below (Poor/Failed)

Table 1 shows the average rating of 2015–2017 graduates who took their first CLE. This table shows the average CLE rating for each component of the licensure test for 2015, 2016, and

2017. Table 9 shows an overall score of 76.1607, which is considered fair. Also, overall 2015, 2016, and 2017 results are acceptable.

Because the overall weighted average is near to poor or failed, the four campuses must enhance their board rating performance. Inadequate learning facilities, positive attributions, background characteristics, teaching styles, class environment, and socio-economic factors all contributed to the falling CLE mean rating from 2015 to 2017.

Also, a student's study effort and proper use of the institution's facilities, a good fit between students' learning styles, and favorably affect the student's success (Norhidayah Ali et al., 2009).

Finally, socio-economic factors such as student attendance, family income, parents' education, teacher-to-student ratio, presence of a trained teacher, sex of student, and school distance also influenced student performance.

Table 1 shows excellent performance in Law Enforcement Administration and Crime Detection and Investigation, but a lower average rating was observed in CLJ, CTS, SCE, and CA over the three-year period. The nature of these disciplines, developed with conceptions of legal realms of criminal justice, may be one cause for this conclusion.

The greatest CLE performance was 75.4935 in 2015, while the lowest was 74.1608, in 2017. Table 1 shows that the graduates only had a negative performance in 2017; however, the overall performance for the three years was reasonable.

The low score across the 3-year exam period demonstrates that graduates find the exam difficult. This finding is in line with the graduates' GPAs in their undergraduate Criminal Law Jurisprudence courses. 2015 had the highest mean CLE performance while 2016 had the lowest mean graduate performance. However, the average performance of graduates from 2015 to 2017 is 78.6584.

The administration concentrated on institutional management and problem solving. Based on this description, it appears that the graduates lack knowledge in organizational management and how to cope with organizational issues.

Along CTS Component, 2015 had the best CLE performance, while 2017 had the worst. The overall performance of CSU graduates on the CLE component did not improve, as the overall rating fell dramatically towards 2017, affecting the overall mean of 74.4720, viewed as weak.

Physical evidence used in committing crimes is studied and evaluated scientifically. It is the science of detecting and apprehending criminals (Rudin & Inman, 2000). Furthermore, while student learning is the purpose of education, proof of learning or mastery is urgently required. The professional and associate must both learn to master duties utilizing innovative diagnostic and therapeutic technologies.

In the SCE Component, 2015 graduates scored the most at 77.9351, while 2017 graduates scored the lowest at 72.5524, deemed bad. However, with a mean of 75.0776, the overall performance is acceptable.

Ethics, a study of behavior, should be learnt at home, throughout childhood and age (Bajeta et al., 2015). The large discrepancy could be due to the graduates' varied upbringing and communities.

CA Component had the best overall performance in 2015 with a mean of 75.8442, while the worst overall performance in 2017 was 72.2587.

Overall, 2015 had the highest mean performance, while 2017 had the lowest. These results demonstrate the College of Criminal Justice Education administration's and faculty's tireless efforts to prepare graduates for the 2015 licensure exams.

Despite constraints in facilities and other parts of the CSU educational process, the College of Criminology Justice Education administration and staff provided great education to graduates in 2017. With a mean score of 77.5675, CSU 2016 CLE takers performed worse than 2015 CLE takers.

Ali, Jusoff, Alis, Mokhtar, & Salamat, (2009) espoused that the criminologists' board test demonstrated minimal improvement through year-end exams compared to mid-year exams. The causal association between academic success and board exam showed a considerable influence. The discrepancy between academic and board results may be due to the program's strict evaluation of applicants.

Table 2 shows the comparison on the CLE performance of graduates according to year taken.

Table 2

ANOVA on the CLE Performance of Graduates According to Year Taken

Indicator	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p-value	Decision
CLJ Between Groups	89.856	2	44.928	.554	.575	Retain Ho
Within Groups	25849.920	319	81.034			
Total	25939.776	321				
LEA Between Groups	38.342	2	19.171	.363	.696	Retain Ho
Within Groups	16850.080	319	52.822			
Total	16888.422	321				
CTS Between Groups	1039.125	2	519.562	8.654	.000	Reject Ho
Within Groups	19151.124	319	60.035			

Total	20190.248	321				
CDI Between Groups	57.873	2	28.937	.526	.592	Retain Ho
Within Groups	17557.766	319	55.040			
Total	17615.640	321				
SCE Between Groups	1735.684	2	867.842	9.433	.000	Reject Ho
Within Groups	29349.375	319	92.004			
Total	31085.059	321				
CA Between Groups	773.958	2	386.979	5.039	.007	Reject Ho
Within Groups	24500.145	319	76.803			
Total	25274.102	321				
Gen Average Between Groups	264.660	2	132.330	2.518	.082	Retain Ho
Within Groups	16767.736	319	52.563			
Total	17032.396	321				

Table 2 shows the results of an Analysis of Variance undertaken to examine whether there are changes in the level of board performance of Criminology graduates based on the year in which they completed their program. The p-value (.082) that was calculated is higher than the alpha level (.05.) that was used. As a result, the null hypothesis is upheld as true. This suggests that there are no statistically significant differences in the mean board performance of graduates based on the year in which they graduated.

The results of Table 2 revealed that there is a statistically significant difference in the level of board performance of graduates based on the year they graduated in the areas of CTS, $p=.007$; SCE, $p=.007$; and CA, $p=.007$; as well as in the areas of SCE, $p=.007$; and CA, $p=.007$;

In terms of CLJ, LEA, and CDI, it was determined that there are no statistically significant differences. As a result, the findings indicate that the year in which the examination was administered had no influence on the level of board performance achieved by the graduates.

According to the findings of Tamayo and Mernilo (2015), out of the six subjects tested on the board exam, one subject did not demonstrate statistical significance, whereas the subjects with the highest predictors of passing the board exam are criminal jurisprudence and procedure, law enforcement administration, and criminal sociology, among others. Generally, a rating of 75 is considered adequate by colleges in determining preparedness for college (or 70 using a 5 percent margin of error).

Table 3 presents the result of post hoc analysis of the academic performance according to year taken using Tukey HSD.

Table 3

Post hoc Analysis of the Board Performance According to Year Taken Using Tukey HSD

Area	Pairwise comparison	p-value	Decision
CTS	2015 vs 2016	.064	Not significant, retain Ho
	2015 vs 2017	.000	Significant, reject Ho
	2016 vs 2017	.142	Not significant, retain Ho
SCE	2015 vs 2016	.566	Not significant, retain Ho
	2015 vs 2017	.000	Significant, reject Ho
	2016 vs 2017	.005	Significant, reject Ho
CA	2015 vs 2016	.748	Not significant, retain Ho
	2015 vs 2017	.011	Not significant, retain Ho
	2016 vs 2017	.056	Not significant, retain Ho

There are statistically significant disparities in the degree of board performance achieved by graduates along CTS, SCE, and CA, as shown in Table 3. Along the CTS, statistically significant differences were seen between 2015 and 2017, whereas no statistically significant differences were observed between 2015 and 2016, or between 2016 and 2017. Along the SCE, there was no statistically significant difference between 2015 and 2016, although there were statistically significant differences between 2015 and 2017, and 2016 and 2017. There were no statistically significant differences observed along CA between 2015 and 2017.

As shown in Table 3, there were considerable variations in the means and descriptions along the CLJ between 2015 and 2017, with the means being 74.4935 and 74.1608, which are evaluated as fair and poor, respectively, in 2015 and 2017. Graduates who took the board exams, as stated in the study's population, were less in 2015, with a total of 81 taking the exam in 2015, compared to 149 taking the exam in 2017. Furthermore, there are major discrepancies between the board's performances in 2015 (which were fair) and 2017 (which were poor) (passing). Furthermore, there were considerable differences between 2016 (fair) and 2017 (excellent) (passing).

As previously discussed, differences in licensure performances by year are attributed to a variety of factors, including inadequate learning facilities, positive attributions, background

characteristics, teaching styles, class environment, and socio-economic factors, all of which have been confirmed by some researchers, Nyangena, Getanda, & Ngugi, (2013).

CLE Performance of Criminology Education

Graduates According to Campus

Table 4 shows the overall CLE performance of Criminology Education graduates according to campus.

Table 4

CLE Performance of Criminology Education Graduates According to Campus

Professional Course		Mean	Description	Std Deviation
CLJ	Aparri	74.0707	P	9.45586
	Gonzaga	69.6909	P	10.80787
	Piat	77.4730	F	6.03466
	Sanchez Mira	75.9894	F	8.07691
	Total	74.6646	P	8.98940
LEA	Aparri	78.5253	F	6.83380
	Gonzaga	75.2000	F	10.00814
	Piat	80.2703	S	3.91099
	Sanchez Mira	79.5532	F	7.22840
	Total	78.6584	F	7.25341
CTS	Aparri	72.9293	P	8.61685
	Gonzaga	71.7818	P	10.42200
	Piat	76.8514	F	5.23341
	Sanchez Mira	75.7979	F	6.41835
	Total	74.4720	P	7.93082
CDI	Aparri	77.9697	F	7.50164
	Gonzaga	75.6364	F	8.47953
	Piat	80.3378	S	5.43524
	Sanchez Mira	79.7872	F	7.46587
	Total	78.6460	F	7.40793
SCE	Aparri	74.2020	P	9.21399
	Gonzaga	70.4909	P	12.73210
	Piat	78.7432	F	5.08843
	Sanchez Mira	75.7979	F	10.28892
	Total	75.0776	F	9.84064
CA	Aparri	73.3434	P	9.42658
	Gonzaga	69.9818	P	10.46067
	Piat	76.1757	F	6.92298
	Sanchez Mira	75.1489	F	7.86575
	Total	73.9472	P	8.87330

GWA	Aparri	75.4742	F	7.44779
	Gonzaga	72.4191	P	9.05627
	Piat	78.4405	F	4.39192
	Sanchez Mira	77.2782	F	6.91015
	Total	76.1607	F	7.28426

Legend: Level of Performance: 97-100% (Excellent); 93-96% (Very good); 88-92% (Good); 83-87% ((Satisfactory); 75-82% (Fair); and 74 and below (Poor/Failed)

Table 4 illustrates the overall CLE performance of Criminology Education graduates, assessed as fair by school. Piat has the greatest mean of 78.4405, evaluated as fair, while Gonzaga has the lowest mean of 72.4191, regarded as poor. Also, only Piat has a respectable performance combined with the professional courses LEA and CDI.

Less than satisfactory academic performance was achieved by Piat graduates in CDI (mean 80.3378), whereas fair academic performance was achieved in CA (mean 76.1757). The graduates performed satisfactorily in LEA and CDI, but only fairly in CLJ, CTS, SCE, and CA.

In this survey, Piat grads consistently outperform other campuses. Unlike other campuses, graduates revealed in interviews. Piat offers in-house evaluations with graduates after graduation to prepare for the licensure exam. This method. The grads are fully overseen, and questions are answered during reviews.

The Aparri graduates had fair performance on two courses (LEA, CDI) and low performance on four courses (CLJ, CTS, SCE, CA). The greatest mean is LEA at 78.5253, while the lowest is CTS at 72.9293, viewed as poor.

A mean of 75.6364 (fair) was achieved by Gonzaga graduates on CDI, whereas a mean of 69.6909 (poor) was achieved on CLJ. Only two courses (LEA and CDI) have a mean of fair, while four (CLJ, CTS, SCE, and CA) have a fair description.

The highest academic achievement for Sanchez Mira graduates was in CDI with a mean of 79.7872 and the lowest on CA with a mean of 75.1489, both fair. The table shows that the graduates of this school did well in all professional courses.

Table 5 shows the comparison on the CLE performance of graduates according to campuses.

Table 5

ANOVA on the CLE Performance of Graduates According to Year Taken

Indicator	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p-value	Decision
CLJ Between Groups	2144.091	3	714.697	9.551	.000	Reject Ho
Within Groups	23795.686	318	74.829			

Total	25939.776	321				
LEA Between Groups	927.107	3	309.036	6.157	.000	Reject Ho
Within Groups	15961.316	318	50.193			
Total	16888.422	321				
CTS Between Groups	1217.837	3	405.946	6.804	.000	Reject Ho
Within Groups	18972.411	318	59.662			
Total	20190.248	321				
CDI Between Groups	877.705	3	292.568	5.558	.001	Reject Ho
Within Groups	16737.935	318	52.635			
Total	17615.640	321				
SCE Between Groups	2276.073	3	758.691	8.375	.000	Reject Ho
Within Groups	28808.986	318	90.594			
Total	31085.059	321				
CA Between Groups	1404.166	3	468.055	6.236	.000	Reject Ho
Within Groups	23869.936	318	75.063			
Total	25274.102	321				
Gen Average Between Groups	1318.645	3	439.548	8.895	.000	Reject Ho
Within Groups	15713.750	318	49.414			
Total	17032.396	321				

An analysis of variance shows in Table 5 that there are substantial differences in the level of board performance of graduates according to campus in all areas, with a p-value of less than five percent.

According to the findings, the degree of board performance of graduates was highly influenced by their time on college. Furthermore, graduates of Aparri, Gonzaga, Piat, and Sanchez Mira schools demonstrate considerable differences in their performance on the board of education.

The disparities between the campuses can be traced to the process of in-house review implemented by the Piat campus, which involves conducting in-house evaluations among graduates after they have graduated on the Piat campus. It is believed that the in-house review played a role in the positive results of the licensure performance evaluation process.

Table 6 presents the result of post hoc analysis of the CLE performance according to year taken using Tukey HSD.

Table 6

Post Hoc Analysis of the Board Performance According to Campuses Using Tukey HSD

Area	Pairwise comparison	p-value	Decision
CLJ	AP VS G	.015	Significant, reject Ho
	AP VS P	.053	Not significant, retain Ho
	AP VS SM	.415	Not significant, retain Ho
	G VS P	.000	Significant, reject Ho
	G VS SM	.000	Significant, reject Ho
	P VS SM	.688	Not significant, retain Ho
LEA	AP VS G	.028	Significant, reject Ho
	AP VS P	.378	Not significant, retain Ho
	AP VS SM	.745	Not significant, retain Ho
	G VS AP	.028	Significant, reject Ho
	G VS P	.000	Significant, reject Ho
	G VS SM	.002	Significant, reject Ho
CTS	P VS SM	.915	Not significant, retain Ho
	AP VS G	.814	Not significant, retain Ho
	AP VS P	.006	Significant, reject Ho
	AP VS SM	.013	Significant, reject Ho
	G VS P	.002	Significant, reject Ho
	G VS SM	.013	Significant, reject Ho
CDI	P VS G	.002	Significant, reject Ho
	P VS SM	.816	Not significant, retain Ho
	AP VS G	.225	Not significant, retain Ho
	AP VS P	.148	Not significant, retain Ho

	AP VS SM	.305	Not significant, retain Ho
	G VS SM	.005	Significant, reject Ho
	P VS G	.002	Significant, reject Ho
	P VS SM	.962	Not significant, retain Ho
	SM VS P	.962	Not significant, retain Ho
SCE	AP VS G	.096	Not significant, retain Ho
	AP VS P	.011	Significant, reject Ho
	AP VS SM	.650	Not significant, retain Ho
	G VS AP	.096	Not significant, retain Ho
	G VS P	.000	Significant, reject Ho
	G VS SM	.006	Significant, reject Ho
	P VS SM	.193	Not significant, retain Ho
CA	AP VS G	.099	Not significant, retain Ho
	AP VS P	.147	Not significant, retain Ho
	AP VS SM	.471	Not significant, retain Ho
	G VS P	.000	Significant, reject Ho
	G VS SM	.003	Significant, reject Ho
	P VS G	.000	Significant, reject Ho
	P VS SM	.871	Not significant, retain Ho
GWA	AP VS G	.050	Significant, reject Ho
	AP VS P	.032	Significant, reject Ho
	AP VS SM	.284	Not significant, retain Ho
	G VS P	.000	Significant, reject Ho
	G VS SM	.000	Significant, reject Ho
	P VS SM	.712	Not significant, retain Ho

In accordance with CLJ, Table 6 demonstrates that there are statistically significant disparities in the board performances of Aparri and Gonzalez, Gonzaga and Piat, and Gonzaga and Sanchez Mira.. Between Aparri and Gonzaga, Gonzaga and Piat, as well as between Aparri and Sanchez Mira, considerable differences were seen along the LEA. Aparri and Piat, Aparri and Sanchez Mira, Gonzaga and Piat, and Gonzaga and Sanchez Mira are among the neighborhoods where there are considerable variances along CTS. Significant disparities were found between Gonzaga and Sanchez Mira, as well as between Piat and Gonzaga, along the CDI. Between Aparri and Piat, Gonzaga and Piat, as well as between Gonzaga and Sanchez Mira, there are substantial disparities in terms of quality of life. Along CA, there were statistically significant disparities between Gonzaga and Piat, as well as between Gonzaga and Sanchez Mira.

Along the GWA, there are considerable variances between Aparri and Gonzaga, Aparri and Piat, Gonzaga and Piat, and Gonzaga and Sanchez Mira. There are also significant differences between Aparri and Piat.

It is possible to distinguish between graduates' licensure performances due to a variety of reasons such as insufficient learning facilities, positive attributions, background characteristics, instructional styles, classroom environment, and socio-economic considerations.

Additionally, Piat Campus is the only campus that conducts in-house reviews after graduation since it contains the graduates on the school campus for the purpose of conducting the reviews in-house. This allows the dean and faculty members to respond to questions from students, who can then seek clarification on the subjects covered in the course. In accordance with the idea of existentialism, this practice is encouraged. Teachers who adhere to existentialism see the individual as an entity existing within a social environment in which the learner must confront the perspectives of others in order to clarify his or her own ,Fiquerres, (2013). Individual responsibility for decisions is emphasized in the process of character development. Students engage in authentic learning experiences when they examine life through the lens of authentic thinking.

Conclusion and Recommendation

The better a student's academic accomplishment, the greater the likelihood that he or she will receive a higher rating on the Criminologists Licensure Examination. Since grade point average has been found to be substantially correlated with performance in criminology, it is recommended that students be subjected to rigorous screening prior to entering the program.

References

1. Adunola, O. (2011). "The Impact of Teachers' teaching Methods on the academic performance of primary school pupils in Ijebu-Ode local cur area of Orgun State," Ego Booster Books, Ogun State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Business and Management: Vol. 8, No. 2.*
2. AL-Mutairi, Abdullah. (2011). 'Factors Affecting Business Students' Performance in Arab Open University: The Case of Kuwait'. *International Journal of Business and Management: Vol. 6, No. 5.*
3. Ali, Norhidayah, Jusoff, Kamaruzaman, Ali, Syukriah, Mokhtar, Najah and Salamt, Azni Syafena Andin. (2009). 'The Factors Influencing Students' Performance at Universiti Teknologi MARA Kedah, Malaysia'. *Canadian Research & Development Center of Sciences and Cultures: Vol.3, No.4.*
4. Ali, N., Jusoff, K., Alis, S., Mokhtar, N. & Salamat, A. (2009). The Factors Affecting Students' Performance atuniversi teknologi MARA Kedah, Malaysia. *Management Science and Engineering. (3) 4, 81-90.*
5. Anoyo, J.C. V., Jimenez, J. I., Matunog, R. M., Mendoza, M. V., Sarmiento, R. S., & Mojares, R. E. (2015). Factors affecting work performance of criminology interns in an Asian university. *Studies in Social Sciences and Humanities, Vol. 2 (4), 225.*
6. Baang, M. A. (2011). Investigating the macro perspectiveaffecting the passing rate in board examinations: A take-off point in designing a causal model. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research, Vol. 15(4), 108-120.*
7. Bajeta, A. A., Manalo, M. M., Montalbo, N. V. V., Vino, J.C. M., Mojares, R. E. (2015). Performance in the Criminology Licensure Examination as Basis for Improvement of one Private School in the Philippines. Batangas City: College of Criminal Justice, Lyceum of the Philippines. *College of Criminology Research Journal, Vol. 6.*
8. De Vaney Olvey, C., Hogg, A., & Counts, W. (2002).Licensure requirements: Have we raised the bar too far. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 33(3), 323.*
9. Fiquerres, O. (2013). An analysis of the performance of the University of Northern Philippines in the licensure examinations for teachers. *IAMURE International Journal of Education. Vol.6.*
10. Hafalla, V. Jr. & Calub, E. (2011). Modelling the Performance of Electronics and Communications Engineering Students in the Licensure Examination. *UB Research Journal. Vol. XXXV No. 1*

11. Hasbullah, A.; Yussof, W. Z W.; Ismail, M.; & Vitasari, P. (2011). A framework study of school facilities performance in public primary school of Batubara district in Indonesia. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences. International Journal of Advanced Research*, 3(15), 3708-3712.
12. Ibrahim, W. Y.; Umar, H. A.; & Clement, I. (2017). Impact of school facilities on students' academic achievement. *International Journal of Advanced Research*, 5(12), 878-889.
13. Nabe, N., Revisa, W., & Serion, E. (2011). Performance of UM Criminology Graduates in Pre-Review Licensure Examination: Basis for an Intervention Scheme. *UM Research Journal*, 6(1).
14. Navarro, R. R. and Rialubin, M.R. (2000). Perception on the success of the CPA licensure examination. *UNP Research Journal 2000*. UNP Vigan City.
15. Nyangena, E., Getanda, A., & Ngugi, S. (2013). Factors influencing success of Bachelor of Science in Nursing graduates in nursing council of Kenya Licensure Examinations. *Baraton Interdisciplinary Research Journal*, 3(1), 11-21.
16. Olakoya, O. K. (2004). Effective instructional materials in teaching of business studies. *International Journal of Educational Research and Technology* 5(1), 51.
17. Pachejo, S. & Allaga, W. (2013). Academic predictors of the licensure examination for Teacher's performance of the Rizal Technological University teacher education graduates. *International Journal of Educational Research and Technology*, 4(4), 31-39.
18. Pariñas, M. M., Obrero, R. L., & Obrero, R. L. (2014). Relevance of the Topics in the Criminologist Licensure Examination Review Program of the University of Northern Philippines. *UNP Research Journal*, 21(1).
19. Pascua, J. & Navalta, J. (2011). Determinants of LET performance of the teacher education graduates in a State University. *JPAIR Multidisciplinary Journal*, 6, 90-102.
20. Soriano, H. (2009). Factors associated with the performance of USM college of education graduates in the 2007 licensure examination for teachers. *USM R & D*, 17(2), 151-159.
21. Visco, D. (2015). Predictors of performance in the licensure examination for teachers of the graduates of higher education institutions in Abra. *International Journal of Management Research and Business Strategy*, 4(1), 181-191.