Trends in Criminologist Licensure Examination Performance: A Study of Criminology Graduates from Capiz State University

Jason B. Capundan, MSCJ., Verna R. Belarmino, PhD

Capiz State University – Dayao Satellite College, Capiz, Philippines
Email: capundanjason08@gmail.com
Capiz State University – Dayao Satellite College, Capiz, Philippines
Email: verna.belarmino@gmail.com

Abstract— The Criminologist Licensure Examination (CLE) marked a significant milestone as the first conducted under the new Commission on Higher Education Memorandum Order (CMO) for Criminology and Republic Act No. 11131. This pioneering batch consisted primarily of K-12 program graduates, many of whom experienced online learning due to the global pandemic. Against this backdrop, the college's institutional performance in the CLE has shown a declining trend in recent years, raising concerns about the preparedness of its graduates and its overall standing. This study aimed to assess the college's CLE performance over the past six years, spanning twelve examination periods, and to analyze examinees' results across the six major criminology subject areas. Using the Documentary and Archival Inquiry Research Method, institutional performance data from April 2016 to December 2022 were obtained from the Professional Regulation Commission (PRC) website, while individual subject performance data were collected directly from examinees. Descriptive statistical tools, including frequency counts, mean scores, and percentages, were employed for data analysis. Findings revealed that the college exceeded the national passing percentage in only three out of twelve examinations (25%). Among the six major subject areas, "Correctional Administration" recorded the highest mean score (82.22%), whereas "Criminology" had the lowest (75.88%). These results underscore the need for targeted interventions to address performance gaps and enhance the overall quality of criminology education. This study provides valuable insights into institutional trends and key areas for improvement, offering a foundation for strategic reforms in criminology education and licensure preparation.

Keywords— Criminologist Licensure Examination (CLE), Institutional Performance, Criminology Education, Licensure Examination Trends, Exam Performance Analysis, Higher Education Assessment, Professional Regulation Commission (PRC), Criminology Subject Areas, Academic Preparedness, Education Quality Improvement

I. INTRODUCTION

The quality of graduates is a critical success indicator for higher education institutions, often measured through their performance in licensure examinations (Balagtas & Gerundio, 2014). In the field of criminology, the Criminologist Licensure Examination (CLE) serves as a benchmark for assessing the competence of future criminologists. This examination is a prerequisite for practice in various sectors, including law enforcement agencies, academia, and private security, as mandated by Republic Act No. 11131, also known as *The Philippine*

Criminology Profession Act of 2018 (RA No. 11131, 2018). The act stipulates that aspiring criminologists must pass the CLE, which aligns with Level 6 of the Philippine Qualifications Framework (RA No. 11131, 2018).

The CLE evaluates candidates across six major subject areas: Criminal Law and Jurisprudence (CLJ), Law Enforcement Administration (LEA), Forensic Science (FRC), Criminology (Crim), Criminal Detection and Investigation (CDI), and Correctional Administration (CA), as outlined in Commission on Higher Education Memorandum Order No. 05, Series of 2018 (CMO No. 05, s. 2018). On December 4–6, 2022, the pioneering batch of K-12 graduates, who were also the first examinees under Republic Act No. 11131 and the updated curriculum, took the CLE. This examination, dubbed the *"Most Difficult CLE"* since 1972, recorded a national passing rate of only 33.14% (11,098 passers out of 33,489 examinees) (Professional Regulatory Board for Criminology, 2022).

While international studies have extensively explored predictors of licensure exam success, such as demographic factors, academic performance, and study habits (Arathuzik & Aber, 1998; De Lima et al., 2011; Grossbach & Kuncel, 2011; Kaddoura et al., 2017), research in the Philippines remains limited to specific professions. Local studies have examined factors influencing licensure exam performance, including grade point average (GPA), pre-board examination scores, and internship grades (Balagtas & Gerundio, 2014; Esmeralda & Perez-Espinosa, 2015; Pasia et al., 2012; Constantino et al., 2014; Garcia, 2011). However, there is limited comparative analysis of performance across the six CLE subject areas. Notably, Bajeta et al. (2013) assessed their institution's CLE performance and proposed strategic interventions for improvement.

Given the university's declining CLE performance, this study aims to assess institutional outcomes across the six major subject areas of the CLE to identify subjects requiring targeted interventions for improvement.

Statement of the Problem

Generally, this study aimed to analyze the College's performance in the Criminologist Licensure Examination. Specifically, it aims to answer the following questions:

1. What is the Institutional Performance of the College in the Criminologist Licensure Examination for the past six (6) years?
2. What is the status of Board Performance of the graduates in the six (6) major areas of Criminologist Licensure Examination?
3. Which among the six (6) areas of Criminology has the highest and lowest performance rating in the most recent CLE?

II. METHODOLOGY

Documentary and Archival Inquiry Research Method has been used in this study to record the board performance rating of graduates in every areas of the Criminologist Licensure Examination under CMO no. 5 series of 2018 and Republic Act no 11131. Documentary and Archival Inquiry Research Method was deemed appropriate in this study as this method will gather and evaluate the licensure examination result and individual performance rating of the board takers of December 2022 Criminologist Licensure Examination.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The performance of Capiz State University – Dayao Satellite College for the past six (6) years since 2015 - 2022 (No Licensure Examinations in the year 2020 and 2021).

The institutional performance in the Criminologist Licensure Examination (CLE) from April 2016 to December 2022 reveals an inconsistent trend, with an overall passing rate averaging 25.64% and surpassing the national passing percentage in only 3 out of 12 board exams (25%). First-time takers performed significantly better, with an average passing rate of 35.66%, compared to repeaters at only 14.4%, highlighting the need for stronger remedial review programs. Performance fluctuations were evident, with the lowest recorded passing rate in April 2016 (14.44%), a temporary improvement between 2017 and 2019, peaking in June 2019 (43.94%), followed by a sharp decline post-pandemic in June 2022 (16.96%).

This suggests that external factors such as curriculum changes, review effectiveness, and the impact of online learning disruptions contributed to

inconsistent results. Strengths in pre-pandemic performance indicate that faculty strategies and review programs played a role in temporary improvements, but a lack of sustained intervention led to setbacks, particularly affecting repeaters and post-pandemic graduates. Given these findings, several targeted interventions are necessary to enhance institutional CLE performance. Specialized review programs for repeaters should be implemented, focusing on remedial instruction and subject-specific weaknesses, while comprehensive pre-board mock exams and early intervention strategies can help identify at-risk students. Strengthening core subject instruction, particularly in historically weak areas such as Criminology along with increasing practical, case-based learning, can improve knowledge retention and application. Additionally, post-pandemic recovery measures, including bridging programs and enhanced laboratory-based criminology training, are essential to address learning gaps caused by online education disruptions.

Table 1: Institutional Rating of Capiz State University – Dayao Satellite College in the Criminologist Licensure Examination since 2015.

Date of Examination	First Taker	Repeater	Overall	Remarks
April 2015	35.29%	23.33%	25.23%	Below National Passing Percentage
October 2015	36.19%	1.49%	22.67%	Below National Passing Percentage
April 2016	11.11%	14.82%	14.44%	Below National Passing Percentage
October 2016	46.02%	1.39%	28.65%	Below National Passing Percentage
June 2017	41.67%	15.15%	28.21%	Above National Passing Percentage
December 2017	28.08%	16.67%	21.09%	Below National Passing Percentage
June 2018	45.45%	22.08%	36.26%	Above National Passing Percentage
December 2018	35%	11.34%	15.38%	Below National Passing Percentage
June 2019	50%	37.1%	43.94%	Above National Passing Percentage
November 2019	42.24%	15.15%	29.77%	Below National Passing Percentage
June 2022	28.13%	10.28%	16.96%	Below National Passing Percentage
December 2022	28.77%	4%	25.07%	Below National Passing Percentage
Total Mean	**35.66%**	**14.4%**	**25.64%**	*Above – 3 Board Examinations (25%)* *Below - 9 Board Examinations (75%)*

IN – DEPTH ANALYSIS OF CLE PERFORMANCE PER EXAMINATION AREA

Criminal Law and Jurisprudence

The distribution of scores reveals that the majority of examinees (59.42%) fell within the 76-80 range, indicating a concentration of performance around the mid-to-high passing threshold. A smaller yet significant proportion (15.94%) scored in both the 71-75 and 81-85 ranges, suggesting that a considerable number of candidates performed just above the minimum passing mark while others demonstrated slightly stronger competency. The presence of only 3 examinees (4.35%) in both the 66-70 and 86-90 ranges suggests that very few candidates were on the borderline of failure or excelling towards higher scores. Notably, no examinees achieved scores in the 91-100 range, highlighting a lack of outstanding performers and possibly pointing to gaps in advanced mastery of criminology concepts. This pattern suggests that while most students achieve a sufficient level of competency to pass, there is a clear challenge in pushing performance toward excellence. The data implies a need for stronger instructional strategies and review programs that not only help weaker examinees improve but also provide enrichment opportunities for high-potential students to excel beyond the mid-

range scores. Strengthening analytical skills, reinforcing subject mastery, and implementing targeted interventions for both struggling and high-achieving students could improve the overall score distribution and increase the number of top-performing graduates.

Table 2: Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents' Rating in Criminal Law and Jurisprudence

Ratings in Criminal Law and Jurisprudence	%
66 – 70	4.35%
71 – 75	15.94%
76 – 80	59.42%
81 – 85	15.94%
86 – 90	4.35%
91 – 95	0%
96 – 100	0%
Total	**100%**

Law Enforcement Administration

The score distribution for the Law Enforcement Administration subject reveals that a majority of examinees (42.03%) scored in the 76-80 range, indicating that most candidates displayed a moderate understanding of the subject, performing just above the passing threshold. A significant portion (36.23%) scored between 81-85, suggesting that a good number of students grasped the core concepts well and performed above average. However, the higher score ranges were underrepresented, with only 8.7% of candidates achieving 86-90 and none scoring above 90**,** highlighting a gap in advanced understanding or application of law enforcement principles. The relatively low performance at the lower end, with only 1.45% of examinees scoring between 66-70**,** suggests that few students were on the brink of failing. The absence of candidates scoring between 91-100 indicates that there is room for improvement in developing critical thinking and specialized knowledge in law enforcement administration. This data suggests that while most candidates have a basic to solid understanding of the subject, there is a need for more targeted interventions to elevate students' mastery to a higher level and to foster advanced

analytical skills to improve overall performance in this area.

Table 3: Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents' Rating in Criminal Law and Jurisprudence.

Ratings in Law Enforcement Administration	%
66 – 70	1.45%
71 – 75	11.59%
76 – 80	42.03%
81 – 85	36.23%
86 – 90	8.7%
91 – 95	0%
96 – 100	0%
Total	**100%**

Criminal Detection and Investigation

The performance distribution for the Criminal Detection and Investigation subject shows that a significant majority of examinees (55.07%) scored in the 76-80 range, suggesting that most students have a moderate to solid understanding of the subject matter, with performance centered around the passing mark. Additionally, 33.33% of candidates scored between 81-85, indicating a strong grasp of core concepts, as they performed above the average range. However, the presence of only 1.45% of examinees scoring in the 86-90 range, with no candidates achieving scores above 90**,** highlights a lack of exceptional performance in this subject. This suggests that while most students demonstrate proficiency, there is a clear limitation in advanced knowledge or complex application of criminal detection and investigative techniques. The lower performance bands, with 10.15% scoring in the 71-75 range, indicate that a small group of students struggled to reach the average level, but only a minimal number (1.45%) were on the edge of failing. The absence of candidates scoring above **90** in this area reflects the need for improvements in higher-order analytical skills**,** case study applications**,** and advanced investigative methodologies**.** Overall, while a majority of examinees display adequate proficiency, there is a clear opportunity to focus on elevating both the critical thinking and practical application aspects

of criminal detection and investigation to ensure that students are not just passing but excelling in this essential area of criminology.

Table 4: Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents' Rating in Criminal Detection and Investigation

Ratings in Criminal Detection and Investigation	%
71 – 75	10.15%
76 – 80	55.07%
81 – 85	33.33%
86 – 90	1.45%
91 – 95	0%
96 – 100	0%
Total	**100%**

Forensic Science and Criminalistics

The performance distribution in Forensic Science and Criminalistics shows that a significant proportion of examinees (56.52%) scored in the 76-80 range, indicating that most students have a solid understanding of the subject, performing just above the minimum passing level. This suggests that the majority of examinees grasp the fundamental concepts of forensic science and criminalistics but may not have reached an advanced level of expertise. Additionally, 21.74% of examinees scored in the 81-85 range, reflecting above-average proficiency, indicating a better-than-average understanding of the subject matter, possibly with stronger analytical or practical skills. A relatively small group (13.04%) scored in the 71-75 range, suggesting that they have basic competence but may need further improvement to achieve better mastery of the subject. At the lower end of the spectrum, only 1.45% scored in the 61-65 range, indicating that a minimal number of examinees struggled with the subject, though this group is limited in size. Notably, the absence of students scoring above 90 (no candidates in the 91-95 or 96-100 range) points to a lack of exceptional performance in this area, which could suggest that while students understand the basics and some advanced concepts, they may not be excelling in the more complex aspects

of forensic science, such as crime scene investigation, evidence analysis, and advanced criminalistics techniques**.** This performance pattern suggests the need for focused instructional strategies that not only strengthen foundational knowledge but also enhance higher-level skills like critical thinking, complex problem-solving, and hands-on experience with forensic applications, which could help elevate student performance in this crucial subject area.

Table 5: Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents' Rating in Forensic Science and Criminalistics

Ratings in Forensic Science and Criminalistics	%
61 - 65	1.45%
66 – 70	4.35%
71 – 75	13.04%
76 – 80	56.52%
81 – 85	21.74%
86 – 90	2.9%
91 – 95	0%

Criminology

The performance distribution in the Criminology subject reveals a mixed set of results, with a concentration of examinees scoring in the 76-80 range (39.13%), indicating that a large portion of students have a moderate to solid understanding of the subject matter, performing just above the minimum passing threshold. This suggests that while most students grasp the essential criminological concepts, there may be room for improvement in mastering more advanced topics or applying critical thinking skills. Additionally, 21.74% of examinees scored in the 71-75 range, reflecting basic competency, while 18.84% scored in the 66-70 range, indicating that a notable portion of students were on the lower end of the passing spectrum. This group may require further academic support to strengthen their understanding of criminology principles. On the higher end, 20.29% of students scored in the 81-85 range, suggesting that a fair number of examinees demonstrated a stronger grasp of criminological theories and principles,

although there was a notable absence of students scoring in the 86-90 range or above, which reflects a lack of exceptional performance. The complete absence of scores in the 91-100 range highlights a potential gap in developing advanced analytical skills, comprehensive knowledge of criminology, and the ability to apply these concepts in practical scenarios. Overall, while a majority of students are adequately proficient, there is a clear need for improvements in advanced criminology education, focusing on critical thinking, application of criminological theories, and possibly research skills to push students toward higher performance levels. Additionally, targeted interventions for those on the lower end of the scale could help them reach a more competitive level of competency.

Table 6: Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents' Rating in Criminology

Ratings in Criminology	%
66 – 70	18.84%
71 – 75	21.74%
76 – 80	39.13%
81 – 85	20.29%
86 – 90	0%
91 – 95	0%
96 – 100	0%

Correctional Administration

The performance distribution in Correctional Administration shows that a majority of examinees (43.48%) scored in the 81-85 range, indicating that a significant portion of students have a strong grasp of the subject matter and demonstrate above-average proficiency. This suggests that most candidates have a solid understanding of key concepts in correctional administration, such as prison management, rehabilitation, and legal frameworks related to corrections. A large number of students (34.78%) also scored in the 76-80 range, indicating that many students performed adequately and have a moderate understanding of the subject. While this group is competent, there is an opportunity to push these students toward more advanced levels of understanding and application. On the lower end,

7.25% of examinees scored in the 71-75 range, suggesting that a small portion of students displayed just enough proficiency to pass, though they may require additional support to solidify their foundational knowledge. The presence of 11.59% of students in the 86-90 range demonstrates that a subset of candidates displayed strong competency, though the lack of students in the 91-100 range indicates that exceptional performance in this area is rare. Only 2.9% scored in the 91-95 range, and no students scored above 96, highlighting a gap in advanced mastery of correctional administration. This suggests that while most students possess adequate knowledge, there is a need to develop higher-order analytical and problem-solving skills, especially in areas like policy formulation, advanced corrections management, and rehabilitation strategies. In conclusion, the data suggests that while a large portion of students perform competently in correctional administration, there is significant room for improvement in pushing students towards exceptional performance and developing more advanced skills necessary for complex correctional challenges.

Table 7: Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents' Rating in Correctional Administration

Ratings in Correctional Administration	%
71 – 75	7.25%
76 – 80	34.78%
81 – 85	43.48%
86 – 90	11.59%
91 – 95	2.9%
96 – 100	0%
Total	**100%**

Board Performance Rating per Major Subject Areas in the Criminologist Licensure Examination

Major Subject Areas	Total Mean	Rank
a) Correctional Administration	82.22%	1
b) Criminal Detection and Investigation	79.62%	2

c)	Law Enforcement Administration	79.43%	3
d)	Criminal Law Jurisprudence	78.32%	4
e)	Forensic Science and Criminalistics	77.54%	5
f)	Criminology	75.88%	6

IV. CONCLUSION

The analysis of the six criminology subjects in the Criminologist Licensure Examination (CLE) reveals several key findings.

1. The institutional performance in the Criminologist Licensure Examination (CLE) over the past twelve board examinations shows a consistent struggle to meet or exceed the national passing percentage, with only three out of twelve (25%) examination periods surpassing the national benchmark, while the majority (nine out of twelve, or 75%) fell below. The total mean passing rate of 35.66% indicates a moderate but insufficient overall performance, with fluctuations across different examination periods. The highest recorded performance was in June 2019 (50%), whereas the lowest occurred in April 2016 (11.11%), highlighting significant variability in examinee outcomes. Despite occasional improvements, the institution has generally failed to maintain a consistent upward trend, as seen in the declining results in recent years, particularly in June and December 2022, where performance remained below expectations. This pattern underscores the need for comprehensive institutional reforms, including enhanced curriculum development, intensive review programs, faculty training, and student support systems to improve board examination outcomes and ensure better preparedness for future criminologists.

2. The majority of examinees scored within the 76-80 range across all subjects, indicating a moderate level of competency but a lack of outstanding performance.

3. Among the six subjects, Correctional Administration emerged as the strongest, with the highest proportion of students scoring in the 81-85 range (43.48%), suggesting better comprehension in this area.

4. Criminology proved to be the most challenging, as it had the highest percentage of students scoring 66-70 (18.84%), indicating that a larger portion of examinees struggled to pass.

5. A critical concern across all subjects is the lack of top performers, as no students scored in the 96-100 range, and only a small fraction reached 91-95, specifically in Correctional Administration (2.9%). This highlights a gap in advanced application, critical thinking, and analytical skills in criminology education.

6. Subjects like Criminal Detection and Investigation, Forensic Science and Criminalistics, and Law Enforcement Administration showed a concentration of scores in the 76-80 and 81-85 ranges, reflecting general competency but limited mastery.

7. Given these findings, institutions must implement targeted interventions such as enhanced curriculum delivery, case-based learning, practical applications, and intensive review programs to help students achieve higher proficiency levels. Strengthening higher-order thinking, problem-solving, and specialized training will be essential in bridging the gap between average and outstanding performance, ensuring that criminology graduates are better equipped for professional practice.

REFERENCES

[1] Arathuzik, D., & Aber, C. (1998). Factors associated with NCLEX-RN success. *Journal of Nursing Education, 37*(8), 347–353.

[2] Balagtas, M. U., & Gerundio, M. G. (2014). Predictors of licensure examination performance of teacher education graduates in a state university. *International Journal of Education and Research, 2*(8), 563–578.

[3] Bajeta, R. F., Mendoza, A. B., & Ramirez, R. J. (2013). Criminology licensure examination performance of Philippine colleges and universities: An institutional

assessment. *Philippine Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice, 1*(1), 45–62.

[4] Commission on Higher Education (CHED). (2018). *CHED Memorandum Order No. 05, s. 2018: Policies, standards, and guidelines for the Bachelor of Science in Criminology program.* CHED.

[5] Constantino, R. E., Lorenzo, C. D., & Santos, R. M. (2014). Correlates of board examination performance among nursing graduates. *Philippine Journal of Nursing, 84*(2), 25–35.

[6] De Lima, M. M., London, K. S., & Manly, M. D. (2011). Predicting licensure examination success: A longitudinal study of nursing students. *Journal of Professional Nursing, 27*(2), 79–86.

[7] Esmeralda, G. A., & Perez-Espinosa, L. A. (2015). Academic predictors of success in the medical licensure examination. *Journal of Medical Education, 49*(3), 112–123.

[8] Garcia, R. P. (2011). Academic performance and board examination results: A correlation study among engineering graduates. *Philippine Engineering Education Journal, 5*(1), 88–101.

[9] Grossbach, A., & Kuncel, N. R. (2011). The predictive validity of nursing admission measures for performance on the NCLEX-RN. *Journal of Professional Nursing, 27*(2), 108–113.

[10] Kaddoura, M. A., Flint, E. P., Van Dyke, O., Yang, Q., & Chiang, L. C. (2017). Academic and demographic predictors of NCLEX-RN pass rates in first- and second-degree accelerated BSN programs. *Journal of Nursing Education, 56*(9), 528–532.

[11] Pasia, R. T., Cruz, A. V., & Villanueva, D. C. (2012). Factors affecting the performance of teacher education graduates in licensure examinations: A case study. *Journal of Education and Learning, 6*(4), 305–317.

[12] Professional Regulatory Board for Criminology. (2022). *Criminologist Licensure Examination results: December 2022.* Professional Regulation Commission.

[13] Republic Act No. 11131. (2018). *The Philippine Criminology Profession Act of 2018.* Retrieved from [insert official URL if available].