



**DEPARTMENT OF BUDGET AND MANAGEMENT
COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION**

JOINT CIRCULAR NO. 03, series of 2022

Date: Oct. 18, 2022

TO : HEADS OF STATE UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES
DIRECTORS OF DBM REGIONAL OFFICES
DIRECTORS OF CHED CENTRAL AND REGIONAL OFFICES
ALL OTHERS CONCERNED

SUBJECT : GUIDELINES ON THE RECLASSIFICATION OF FACULTY
POSITIONS IN STATE UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES (SUCs)

1. Background

The National Budget Circular No. 461 (NBC 461) issued on 01 June 1998, provides the rules and regulations governing the implementation of the Revised Compensation and Position Classification Plan for Faculty Positions in State Universities and Colleges, CHED-Supervised Higher Education Institutions, and TESDA-Supervised Technical Education Institutions in accordance with the modified Common Criteria for Evaluation of Faculty Positions. This has been the basis for the reclassification of faculty positions since the 1st cycle of implementation in 1998 until the 8th cycle in 2019.

Since the issuance of NBC 461 in 1998, there have been significant developments in the higher education sector: The institutionalization of the Philippine Qualifications Framework by virtue of RA 10968, provides a set of national standards and levels of qualifications to encourage lifelong learning and qualifications aligned with industry requirements; the impact of the ASEAN Integration 2015 on higher education sector in terms of the mobility of students and faculty; the internationalization of higher education programs; and the emergence of the 4th Industrial Revolution that brought about the digitalization in education.

These developments in higher education brought new demands on the competencies of faculty that necessitated enhancement of their qualifications. The hard work and perseverance of the faculty members in SUCs for the enhancement of their qualifications must be compensated accordingly.

Moreover, the veto message of President Rodrigo Roa Duterte on FY 2019 General Appropriations Act (GAA) directed the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) and the Department of Budget and Management (DBM) to review and revise the instrument and guidelines for the reclassification of faculty in SUCs that will be implemented for the subsequent evaluation cycle.

In view of these developments in the higher education sector and in compliance with the directive from the President, the criteria and guidelines for the faculty position reclassification in SUCs are being updated.

2. Purpose and Objectives

This Joint Circular (JC) is issued to establish and prescribe rules and regulations governing the implementation of the Guidelines on the Reclassification of Faculty Positions in State Universities and Colleges.

This JC has the following objectives:

- 2.1. To provide an updated and revised policies and guidelines for the reclassification of faculty positions across SUCs;
- 2.2. To serve as basis for policy decisions for faculty development in SUCs; and
- 2.3. To motivate a faculty to upgrade his/her rank and compensation by improving his/her academic qualifications, achievements and performance.

3. Coverage and Exemption

- 3.1. This JC shall apply to all faculty members with permanent plantilla positions in SUCs, except those with separate faculty position reclassification plans provided by existing law, rules and regulations.
- 3.2. These criteria and guidelines shall only be used for the reclassification of faculty positions in SUCs apart from the institutional faculty merit and promotion system as approved by the Civil Service Commission.
- 3.3. Faculty who were promoted through the institutional faculty merit and promotion system may still be eligible for reclassification but the credentials used for his/her institutional promotion shall no longer earn points.

4. Guiding Principles

- 4.1. There must be a balance between the three (3) main functions of instruction, research, and extension in the evaluation criteria. The SUC Governing Board (GB) may impose stricter or additional minimum requirements for reclassification.
- 4.2. Only the performance and accomplishments of the faculty within the specified period shall be considered in the evaluation, except for those who are being evaluated for the first time or those who did not apply for reclassification in the previous evaluation period.
- 4.3. There shall be no double counting of points. An item that has already been counted in one criterion can no longer be counted in another criterion.
- 4.4. The criteria shall consider both academic and administrative accomplishments/ involvement of the faculty.



- 4.5. The respective governing boards of the SUCs shall have the final decision on who and to what extent the faculty will be reclassified based on Republic Act (RA) 8292, also known as the “Higher Education Modernization Act of 1997.”

5. Definition of Terms

- 5.1. **Adjunct Faculty** – is a recognized expert in a specific field from another HEI who is designated to teach, conduct research, or serve as mentor, critic, or panel member in the graduate program at a particular HEI on a part-time basis. The adjunct faculty arrangement must be supported by a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) or its equivalent.
- 5.2. **Creative Work** - Includes but is not limited to literature, artwork, music, dance, drama, productions, architecture, and games and apps. [Institutional Sustainability Assessment Self-Evaluation Document, 2017]
- 5.3. **Designation** – movement that involves an imposition of additional and/or higher duties to be performed by a public official/employee which is temporary and can be terminated anytime at the pleasure of the appointing officer/authority. [2017 ORAOHRA, Revised 2018]
- 5.4. **Detail** – temporary movement of an employee from one department or agency to another which does not involve a reduction in rank, status or salary. [2017 ORAOHRA, Revised 2018]
- 5.5. **Extension** - refers to the provision of services to communicate and transfer knowledge and technology to specific sectors.
- 5.6. **Industrial Design** – focuses on the physical appearance, functionality and manufacturability of a product. An industrial design application is an application for protection against the unauthorized use of new, original, and ornamental designs for items of manufacture [Intellectual Property Glossary of Terms, IPOPHL 2021].
- 5.7. **Innovation** – refers to a new method, idea, device, or product, which is replicable and applicable as a solution to a particular need. [Institutional Sustainability Assessment Self-Evaluation Document, 2017]
- 5.8. **Invention** – original work which is either patentable or non-patentable and has direct contribution to knowledge, science, technology, and community.
- 5.9. **Invention Patent** – is a government-issued grant, bestowing an exclusive right to an inventor over a product or process that provides any technical solution to a problem in any field of human activity which is new, inventive, and industrially applicable. [<https://www.ipophil.gov.ph/patent/>]
- 5.10. **Patentable Invention** - is any technical solution of a problem in any field of human activity which is new, involves an inventive step and is industrially applicable. It may be, or may relate to, a product, or process, or an improvement of any of the foregoing [Intellectual Property Glossary of Terms, IPOPHL 2021].
- 5.11. **Permanent Appointment** – an appointment issued to a person who meets all the qualification requirements of the position to which he/she is being appointed,



including the appropriate eligibility, in accordance with the provisions of law, rules and standards promulgated in pursuance thereof [2017 ORAOHRA, Revised 2018].

- 5.12. **Promotion** – is the advancement of a career employee from one position to another with an increase in duties and responsibilities as authorized by law, and usually accompanied by an increase in salary [2017 ORAOHRA, Revised 2018].
- 5.13. **Reclassification** – is an advancement of a faculty position from one rank/sub-rank to another rank/sub-rank based on evaluation of the achievements and performance of faculty during a particular period of time using a standard set of criteria.
- 5.14. **Refereed Publication** – refers to proceedings, journals, monographs that were subjected to independent peer review. The reviews are often blind, i.e., the names of the author and the reviewer are withheld. Conference presentations are generally not counted as publications unless the papers are published in refereed conference proceedings of the recognized professional society/organization.
- 5.15. **Textbook** – is a book which is an exposition of generally accepted principles in one (1) subject, intended primarily as a basis for instruction in a classroom or pupil-book-teacher situation (Item b, Section 3 of RA 8047).
- 5.16. **Utility Model** – A utility model is any technical solution to a problem in any field of human activity which is new and industrially applicable. It may or may not have an inventive step [Intellectual Property Glossary of Terms, IPOPHL 2021].

6. Minimum Requirements for Reclassification

6.1. Minimum Requirements for Reclassification of Faculty

- 6.1.1. In order to qualify for reclassification, the faculty must be a holder of a permanent plantilla position with at least an earned master’s degree in the area of specialization or its allied/related fields as prescribed in relevant Civil Service Commission (CSC) issuances.

6.2. Minimum Educational Qualifications per Faculty Rank

Table 1. Minimum Educational Qualification

Faculty Rank	Educational Qualification
Instructor (I-III)	Earned Master’s degree
Assistant Professor (I-IV)	
Associate Professor (I-V)	
Professor (I-VI)	Earned Doctoral degree
College/University Professor	

The Board of Regents/Trustees of SUCs, consistent with best practices of leading HEIs in the Philippines and abroad, and/or as part of the internationalization policies, are encouraged to impose stricter minimum educational qualifications for Instructors, Assistant Professors, and Associate Professors for promotion/reclassification purposes.

7. Evaluation Criteria, KRA Weights, and Point System,

- 7.1. The evaluation criteria are grouped into four (4) key result areas (KRAs), namely: 1) Instruction; 2) Research, Invention and Creative Work; 3) Extension; and 4) Professional Development.
- 7.2. Each KRA has criteria and each criterion has at least one indicator.



Table 2.1. Point System

Key Result Areas	Pts	Maximum Pts
1. Instruction a. Teaching Effectiveness b. Curriculum and Instructional Materials Development c. Thesis, Dissertation and Mentorship Services	60 30 10	100
2. Research, Invention and Creative Work a. Research Outputs b. Inventions c. Creative Works	100 100 100	100
3. Extension Services a. Service to the Institution b. Service to the Community c. Extension Involvement	50 30 20	100
4. Professional Development For All Faculty a. Involvement in Professional Organizations b. Continuing Development c. Awards and Recognitions *For New Entrants Only a. Academic Experience b. Industry Experience	20 60 20 10 10	100

**Serves bonus indicator to newly appointed faculty members from HEIs or industry who have not yet undergone the reclassification process. However, the maximum points will still be 100.*

- 7.3. The weights assigned to each KRA vary from one faculty rank to another, depending on the functions that are expected of them. As the faculty rank advances; more research, invention, and creative work outputs are expected. For instance, faculty occupying Instructor positions are expected to display exemplary performance in the area of instruction. However, this should not prevent them from doing their research or extension function. On the other hand, those occupying Professor positions are expected to produce more research, invention and creative work; but these should not sacrifice the quality of instruction.

Table 2.2 KRA Weights per Faculty Rank

Faculty Rank	Key Result Areas (KRAs)			
	Instruction	Research, Innovation and/or Creative Work	Extension	Professional Development
Instructor (I-III)	60%	10%	20%	10%
Asst. Professor (I-IV)	50%	20%	20%	10%
Assoc. Professor (I-V)	40%	30%	20%	10%
Professor (I-VI)	30%	40%	20%	10%
Col./Univ. Professor	20%	50%	20%	10%



8. Determination of Ranks and Sub-ranks to be Awarded

Table 3.1 Score Bracket and Corresponding Number of Sub-rank Increment

Score Bracket	No. of Sub-rank Increment
41-50	1 sub-rank
51-60	2 sub-ranks
61-70	3 sub-ranks
71-80	4 sub-ranks
81-90	5 sub-ranks
91-100	6 sub-ranks

8.1. Table 3.1 shows the number of sub-rank increments that may be awarded based on the total score received by the faculty. The faculty may be awarded to a maximum of six (6) sub-ranks.

Table 3.2 Faculty Positions in SUCs

Rank	Sub-rank
INSTRUCTOR	Instructor I (SG-12) Instructor II (SG-13) Instructor III (SG-14)
ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	Assistant Professor I (SG-15) Assistant Professor II (SG-16) Assistant Professor III (SG-17) Assistant Professor IV (SG-18)
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Associate Professor I (SG-19) Associate Professor II (SG-20) Associate Professor III (SG-21) Associate Professor IV (SG-22) Associate Professor V (SG-23)
PROFESSOR	Professor I (SG-24) Professor II (SG-25) Professor III (SG-26) Professor IV (SG-27) Professor V (SG-28) Professor VI (SG-29)
	College/University Professor (SG 30)

8.2. Table 3.2 specifies the different ranks of faculty from Instructor to Professor and their corresponding sub-ranks.

8.3. In cases wherein, the number of sub-rank increments awarded to the faculty results in the crossing of ranks (e.g. from Instructor II to Assistant Professor III), a re-computation shall be conducted using the weights of the next rank following Table 2.2 of this Joint Circular. If after the re-computation the faculty qualifies for the next rank, this shall be awarded. However, if the faculty does not qualify for the next rank, the highest sub-rank of the current rank shall be awarded.

8.4. There are selected indicators in KRA IV that are equivalent to automatic one sub-rank reclassification.

8.4.1. Completion of a doctorate degree shall be given automatic one sub-rank reclassification, subject to the conditions specified in KRA IV, Criterion B, item 1.5 of Annex II. This shall only be applicable to positions from Instructor I to Associate Professor V positions.

8.4.2. National or International Awards received by the faculty from recognized organizations specified in KRA IV, Criterion E, item 1.2 of Annex II.

9. Reclassification to the Professor Rank

9.1. Reclassification to the Professor rank shall be subject to the following conditions applicable to faculty who qualify for the first time:

9.1.1. The faculty met the required number of sub-rank increase/s to reach the Professor rank specified in Section 8;

9.1.2. The faculty complied with the minimum educational qualifications of the Professor rank specified in Section 6.2., and

9.1.3. The faculty passed the accreditation process of the Evaluation and Accreditation Committee (EAC) detailed in Annex III.

9.2. A faculty who qualifies for a Professor rank but failed in the accreditation process will be awarded the Associate Professor V position.

10. Reclassification to College/University Professor

10.1. Reclassification to College/University Professor rank shall be subject to the following conditions:

10.1.1. The faculty holds a Professor position.

10.1.2. The faculty met the required number of sub-rank increase/s to reach the College/University Professor rank.

10.1.3. The faculty passed the Professorial Certification Process by the Certification Committee (CC) detailed in Annex III.

11. Modified Quota System

11.1. The quota for the rank of Professor shall be 20% of the total number of authorized faculty positions of each SUC.

11.2. Only one (1) position of the College/University Professor per institution shall be authorized for every cycle, provided that the total of which shall not exceed 5% of the total professor positions in a college/university.

11.3. The College/University Professor position shall be coterminous with the incumbent and the Governing Board may have the option to revert it to its original position or convert it to a lower position, subject to the usual process for position conversion of the DBM.



12. Funding Source

- 12.1. The expenses to be incurred by the Institutional Evaluation Committee (IEC), Regional Evaluation Committee (REC), Evaluation and Accreditation Committee (EAC), and Certification Committee (CC) during the evaluation process will be fully subsidized by the SUCs.
- 12.2. For faculty who will undergo the accreditation process for professor position or certification process for the college/university professor position, the expenses of the EAC/CC will be subsidized by their institution. However, if the faculty does not pass for the first time and needs to undergo another accreditation/certification process, the faculty shall shoulder the expenses for the EAC/CC.
- 12.3. The funds needed to implement the reclassified positions of the faculty shall be charged against the authorized Personnel Services Allotment of the respective SUCs under the GAA.

13. Evaluation Period

- 13.1. The initial implementation of this JC shall cover the evaluation period of four (4) years accomplishment of faculty from July 2019 to July 30, 2023.
- 13.2. The succeeding evaluations shall be for every three (3) years starting from August 1, 2023 to July 30, 2026.

14. Resolution of Cases

Issues and concerns that may arise in the implementation of this Joint Circular, shall be resolved by the DBM and/or CHED, whichever is applicable.

15. Repealing Clause

Any and all provisions of circulars, rules, and regulations or parts thereof which are inconsistent with this Joint Circular are hereby repealed and/or modified accordingly.

16. Effectivity

This Joint Circular shall take effect fifteen (15) days after its publication in the Official Gazette or in a newspaper of national circulation and shall remain in force and effect until otherwise revoked or suspended.


AMENAH F. PANGANDAMAN
Secretary, DBM


J. PROSPERO E. DE VERA III
Chairman, CHED 

**ANNEX I
EVALUATION CRITERIA**

CRITERIA	POINTS	SOURCES OF EVIDENCE												
KRA I - INSTRUCTION	100													
Criterion A – Teaching Effectiveness	Maximum of 60													
1. Faculty Performance Evaluation by Students and Supervisor 1.1 Student Evaluation (60%) 1.2 Supervisor's Evaluation (40%)	36 24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Student Evaluation Rating using prescribed template ● Supervisor's Evaluation Rating using prescribed template 												
Criterion B – Curriculum and Instructional Materials Developed	Maximum of 30													
1. For every instructional material developed and approved for use. 1.1 Sole author of a textbook 1.2 Co-author of a textbook 1.3 Sole author of a textbook chapter 1.4 Co-author of a textbook chapter 1.5 Sole author of a manual/module 1.6 Co-author of a manual/module 1.7 Multimedia teaching materials 1.8 Testing Materials	30 % contribution 10 % contribution 16 % contribution 16 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Copy of instructional material developed; ● Copy of evidence that the instructional material has undergone peer-review or evaluation process; and ● Copy of approval for use of the instructional material in the department/institution. ● Copy of the Testing Material and evidence that it has been validated, reliability tested, secured, and verified by the authorized body within the institution. ● For output with multiple authors - copy of certification signed by all the authors indicating their contribution in the development of the instructional material using prescribed template 												
2. Academic programs developed/ revised and implemented 2.1 Lead 2.2 Contributor	10 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Copy of certification signed by the academic unit head indicating the role of the faculty in the development/ revision of academic degree program using prescribed template ● Copy of governing board resolution approving the implementation of the academic program developed/ revised. 												
Criterion C – Special Projects, Capstone Projects, Thesis, Dissertation and Mentorship Services	Maximum of 10													
1. For every service rendered to students/ group of students as adviser and panel member in doctoral dissertation and master's and undergraduate theses. 1.1 Adviser 1.2 Panel	SP – Special Project CP – Capstone Project UT – Undergraduate Thesis MT – Master's Thesis DD – Dissertation <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th>SP/CP</th> <th>UT</th> <th>MT</th> <th>DD</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> <td style="text-align: center;">8</td> <td style="text-align: center;">10</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	SP/CP	UT	MT	DD	3	5	8	10	1	1	2	2	For Special Projects, Capstone Project, Thesis or Dissertation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Copy of appointment/invitation as adviser or panel member. ● For Panel: copy of proof of participation. ● For Adviser: copy of evidence that the advisee passed the special project, capstone project, thesis, or dissertation.
SP/CP	UT	MT	DD											
3	5	8	10											
1	1	2	2											

CRITERIA	POINTS	SOURCES OF EVIDENCE									
2. For every service rendered to a student/ group of students as a mentor.	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Copy of appointment/designation as mentor for a student or a team of students; and • Copy of the award/certificate received by student/group of students mentored 									
KRA II - RESEARCH, INNOVATION AND/OR CREATIVE WORK	100										
Criterion A – Research Outputs Published	Maximum of 100										
<p>1. For every scholarly research paper/ educational or technical article and other outputs published in book, and refereed and internationally-indexed monograph, conference proceeding, technical/scientific/ professional journal.</p> <p>1.1 Sole Author of a Book 1.2 Co-author of a Book 1.3 Sole Author of a Journal Article 1.4 Co-author of a Journal Article 1.5 Sole Author of Book Chapter 1.6 Co-author of a Book Chapter 1.7 Sole Author of Monograph 1.8 Co-author of a Monograph 1.9 Other Peer-reviewed Scholarly Output</p>	<p>100 % contribution 50 % contribution 35 % contribution 100 % contribution 10</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Copy of published research output; the page where the name of the author; the date published; the title of the book, journal, monograph, etc.; are indicated; • For output with multiple authors - copy of certification from all the authors showing their respective contributions in the published research using prescribed template 									
<p>2. For every research output translated into project, policy or product.</p> <p>2.1 Lead Researcher 2.2 Contributor</p>	<p>35 % contribution</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Copy of the executive summary of the research/es translated into project; or • Copy of evidence that the research was translated into project, policy or product. 									
<p>3. For every research publication cited</p> <p>3.1 Local (max - 40 pts) 3.2 International (max - 60 pts)</p>	<p>5 10</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Copy of proof that the publication has been cited by other authors in their research (e.g. citation index database) 									
Criterion B – Inventions	Maximum of 100										
<p>1. For every patented invention, innovation, as well as creative work; of educational, technical, scientific and/or cultural value.</p> <p>1.1 Patentable Inventions, Utility Models and Industrial Design</p> <p>1.1.1 Invention Patent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sole Inventor • Co-inventor <p>1.1.2 Utility Model</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sole Inventor • Co-inventor <p>1.1.3 Industrial Design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sole Inventor • Co-inventor <p>1.2 Commercialized Patented Product</p> <p>1.2.1 Local 1.2.2 International</p>	<p>Stages of Patenting A – Acceptance P – Publication G – Grant</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>A</th> <th>P</th> <th>G</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>10</td> <td>20</td> <td>80</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">% contribution</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>10 % contributions</p> <p>5 % contribution</p> <p>5 (max = 20) 10 (max = 30)</p>	A	P	G	10	20	80	% contribution			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Copy of certification from IPOPHL for Acceptance. • Copy of notice of publication from IPOPHL for Publication. • Copy of Patent/UM/ID certificate issued by IPOPHL for Grant. • For output with multiple inventors – Copy of certification from all the inventors indicating their respective contributions in the development of the invention using prescribed template • Copy of licensing agreement, license to operate (LTO), certificate of product registration (CPR) from FDA, or similar permits issued by relevant regulatory agencies for commercialized patent products.
A	P	G									
10	20	80									
% contribution											

CRITERIA	POINTS	SOURCES OF EVIDENCE
<p>2. For every non-patentable invention, innovation, as well as creative work; of educational, technical, scientific and/or cultural value.</p> <p>2.1 Copyrighted and utilized software products</p> <p>2.1.1 New Software products</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Sole Developer ● Co-developer <p>2.1.2 Updated Software products</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Sole Developer ● Co-developer <p>2.2 New plant variety or animal breeds developed, or new microbial strains isolated, that are propagated or reproduced</p> <p>2.2.1 Sole developer</p> <p>2.2.2 Co-developer</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">10 % contribution</p> <p style="text-align: center;">4 2</p> <p style="text-align: center;">10 % contribution</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Copy of copyright registration certificate from IPOPHL; and ● Copy of certificate of utilization from end-user/s for software products. ● For output with multiple developer – Copy of certification from all the developers showing their contribution in the output using prescribed template ● Copy of registration of new variety, breed or strain from authorized agencies; and ● Copy of certification from farm owners/breeders that the new variety, breed or strain has been propagated. ● For output with multiple developer – Copy of certification from the all the developer showing their contribution in the development of the new variety, breed or strain variety using prescribed template
Criterion C – Creative Works	Maximum of 100	
<p>1. For every creative work created, performed, presented, exhibited, and published.</p> <p>1.1 New Creative Performing Art Work (music, dance and theatre)</p> <p>1.1.1 Performance of own work</p> <p>1.1.2 Performance of work of other</p> <p>1.2 Exhibition (visual arts, architecture, film, multimedia)</p> <p>1.3 Designs (e.g. architecture, engineering, industrial design)</p> <p>1.4 Literary publications</p> <p>1.4.1 Novel</p> <p>1.4.2 Short story</p> <p>1.4.3 Essay</p> <p>1.4.4 Poetry</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">20</p> <p style="text-align: center;">10 10</p> <p style="text-align: center;">20</p> <p style="text-align: center;">20</p> <p style="text-align: center;">20 10 10 10</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Copy of copyright certificate of the New Creative Performing Art. ● Copy of invitation letter from a reputable organizer, program, and pictures of performance for Creative Performing Arts. ● Copy of letter of acceptance or letter of invitation for Exhibition. ● Copy of evidence of being juried or peer-reviewed for Designs. ● Copy of published literary work for Literary Publication.
KRA III – EXTENSION SERVICES	100	
Criterion A – Service to the Institution	Maximum of 30	
<p>1. For every successful linkages/networking/ partnership activity:</p>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Copy of MOA; ● Certification from the President that the partnership was initiated or implemented successfully by the faculty. ● Copy of implementation report or activity terminal report
<p>2. Total contribution to income generation for the 3 year period.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Copy of financial reports showing the income generated from the sale of the product developed by the faculty.

CRITERIA	POINTS	SOURCES OF EVIDENCE
2.1. Below 6 million 2.2. Above 6 million to 12 million 2.3. Above 12 million	6 12 18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Certification from the President acknowledging the faculty's contribution to income generation.
Criterion B – Service to the Community	Maximum of 50	
1. Professional/Expertise-based Services		
1.1 For Services in Accreditation, Evaluation, Assessment Works, and other related Educational Quality Assurance Activities. 1.1.1 Local 1.1.2 International	8 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Copy of appointment from the organization/agency; • Copy of proof of engagement (e.g. certificate of participation)
1.2 For Services as Judge/Examiner for local/international research awards and academic competitions 1.2.1 Research Awards 1.2.2 Academic Competitions	2 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Copy of proof of engagement (e.g. official invitation, certificate of appreciation)
1.3 For services rendered as a short-term consultant/expert in an activity of an educational, technological, professional, scientific or cultural nature (foreign or local) sponsored by a private organization or government. 1.3.1 Local 1.3.2 International	8 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Copy of contract of service or its equivalent • Copy of proof of engagement
1.4 For services through media as: 1.4.1 Writer of occasional newspaper column 1.4.2 Writer of regular newspaper column 1.4.3 Host of TV/Radio Program 1.4.4 Guesting as technical expert for TV or radio program/print media/online media	2 (max=10) 10 10 1 (max = 10)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Copy of the newspaper article for Writer of Occasional Newspaper Column • Copy of compiled articles for Writer of Regular Newspaper Column. • Copy of contract, invitation letter, or similar documents for Host of TV/Radio Program • Copy of Invitation letter for Guesting as Technical Expert
1.5 For every hour of training course/ seminar/workshop conducted as Resource Person/Convenor/ Facilitator/ Moderator/Keynote Speaker/ Plenary Speaker/Panelist 1.5.1 Local 1.5.2 International	2 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Copy of invitation letter; • Copy of program; and • Copy of certificate of appreciation or similar documents
2. Institutional Social Responsibility		
2.1. For every service-oriented project in the community participated in including advocacy initiatives. 2.1.1. Head of Extension or Production	5 (max = 30 pts)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Copy of approval for the conduct of the outreach or extension activity/ project/ program (governing board resolution, memorandum, official communication, etc.);

CRITERIA	POINTS	SOURCES OF EVIDENCE
2.1.2. Participant of Extension or Production	2 (max = 30 pts)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Copy of appointment/designation as head of the activity/project/program; and ● Copy of extension activity/project/program report
Criterion C – Quality of Extension Services	Maximum of 20	
1. Client Satisfaction Rating for Outreach and Extension Projects	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Summary of satisfaction/ evaluation ratings per evaluation period of the outreach and extension activities and its computed average using prescribed template
Criterion D – Bonus Criterion	Max = 20 pts	
1. For Administrative Designation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1 Institutional Level <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1.1 President or OIC President 20 1.1.2 Vice-President 15 1.1.3 Chancellor 10 1.1.4 Vice-Chancellor 8 1.1.5 Campus Director/ Administrator/Head 8 1.1.6 Faculty Regent 8 1.1.7 Office Director 6 1.1.8 Univ./Col. Secretary 6 1.1.9 Project Head 4 1.1.10 Institution-level Committee <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Chair 3 ● Member 2 1.2 College/Department Level <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.2.1 Dean 6 1.2.2 Associate Dean 5 1.2.3 College Secretary 3 1.2.4 Dept Head 4 1.2.5 Program Chair/Project Head 3 1.2.6 Department-level Committee <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Chair 2 ● Member 1 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Copy of Appointment or Designation with effectivity period (e.g. memorandum order, appointment letter, board resolution, notice of designation, etc.); and ● Copy of accomplishment report per designation duly submitted to the authorized official/supervisor.
KRA IV - PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	100	
Criterion A – Involvement in Professional Organizations	Maximum of 20	
1. For current individual membership and active role/contribution in relevant, recognized/registered professional organization, learned/honor/scientific society.	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Copy of proof of membership in professional organization (Certificate of membership, Identification Card, etc.); and ● Copy of certification of engagement, role, assignment from the head of the organization

CRITERIA	POINTS	SOURCES OF EVIDENCE
Criterion B – Continuing Development	Maximum of 60	
1. Educational Qualifications	(max=40)	● Copy of transcript of records, diploma or certificate.
1.1 For every post-master diploma/certificate	10	
1.2 For every post-doctorate diploma/certificate	10	
1.3 For additional master's degree	20	
1.4 For doctorate degree or additional doctorate degree	40	
2. For every participation in conferences, seminars, workshops, industry immersion	(max=10)	● Copy of the certificate of participation
2.1 Local	1	
2.2 International	2	
3. For every paper presentation in conferences	(max=10)	● Copy of letter/certificate of acceptance
3.1 Local	3	
3.2 International	5	
Criterion C – Awards and Recognition	Maximum of 20	
1. For every award of distinction received in recognition of achievement in relevant areas of specialization/profession and/or assignment of the faculty concerned.		● Copy of certificate of recognition/award ● Copy of the picture of plaque, trophy, medal, or other similar items.
1.1 Institutional	2	
1.2 Local (City, Municipality, Province)	3	
1.3 Regional (In-country)	4	
*Criterion D – Bonus Indicators for Newly Hired Faculty	Maximum of 20	
1. For every year of full-time academic service in an institution of higher learning as:		● Copy of service record, certificate of employment, notice of appointment/designation or similar documents.
1.1 President	5	
1.2 Vice President/Dean/Director	4	
1.3 Department/Program Head	3	
1.4 Faculty member	2	
2. For every year of industry experience (non-academic organization) in:		● Copy of service record, certificate of employment, notice of appointment/designation or similar documents.
1.1 Managerial/Supervisory Position	4	
1.2 Technical and Skilled	3	
1.3 Support/Administrative Staff	2	

**Applicable to new entrants only*

**ANNEX II
IMPLEMENTING GUIDELINES**

1. General Guidelines

- 1.1. Faculty shall be evaluated based on their accomplishments in the areas of 1) Instruction; 2) Research, Inventions, and Creative Work; 3) Extension; and 4) Professional Development within the evaluation period in accordance with the criteria for evaluation.
- 1.2. Only the performance and accomplishments of the faculty within the evaluation period shall be given points. The point/s received by the faculty in each KRA will be computed based on the weight/s assigned to the current rank of the faculty. The final score will determine the number of sub-ranks that will be granted to the faculty.
- 1.3. There shall be no double counting of points. An item that has already been counted in one criterion can no longer be counted in another criterion.
- 1.4. The geographical scope “Local” includes national, regional, municipal, city, and barangay levels unless otherwise specified in this guideline.
- 1.5. All declarations must be supported by appropriate documentary evidence as stipulated in Annex I.
- 1.6. The respective governing boards of the SUCs shall have the final decision which and to what extent the faculty will be reclassified based on Republic Act (RA) 8292, also known as the “Higher Education Modernization Act of 1997.”

2. Specific Guidelines

I. KRA 1 – INSTRUCTION (100 points)

A faculty may earn a total of 100 points from Criterion A, B and C. The maximum allowable points for each criterion are broken down as follows:

Criterion	Points
Criterion A	60
Criterion B	30
Criterion C	10
Total	100

A. Criterion A – Teaching Effectiveness (maximum of 60 points)

This pertains to the faculty member's ability to organize teaching-learning processes to enable students to maximize their learning potentials and/or the delivery of instruction that eventually results in academic excellence.

1. Faculty Performance Evaluation by Students and Supervisor for Existing Faculty Members

1.1. Students Evaluation (60%)

- 1.1.1. All faculty members are required to be evaluated by all of their students in all the classes they handle per semester.
- 1.1.2. For the evaluation period covering July 1, 2019 - July 31, 2023, the SUCs shall use the existing Instrument for Teaching Effectiveness prescribed by the previous Zonal Centers.
- 1.1.3. In the subsequent evaluations, the SUCs may enhance their existing instrument for Teaching Effectiveness that should be aligned with the point system in this guideline.
- 1.1.4. The points can be calculated using the formula below:

$$\text{Points} = \text{OR (Overall Rating)} \div 100 \times 36$$

Where:

- OR** = average of the ave. evaluation ratings given by students to the faculty per sem.
- 100** = the highest possible rating that can be obtained by the faculty.
- 36** = maximum points (60% of 60).

1. Sample Computation: Points for Student Evaluation

	AY – 01		AY – 02		AY – 03	
	1 st Sem	2 nd Sem	1 st Sem	2 nd Sem	1 st Sem	2 nd Sem
Ave. Student Eval. Ratings per semester	95	89	88	92	94	85
Average	$(95 + 89 + 88 + 92 + 94 + 85) / 6 = 90.5$					
	$90.5 \div 100 = 0.905$					
	0.905×36					
Points	32.58					

1.2. Supervisors Evaluation (40%)

1.2.1. All faculty members shall be evaluated by their immediate superior at the end of each semester:

- 1.2.1.1. Faculty by the Department Chair
- 1.2.1.2. Department Chair by the Dean
- 1.2.1.3. Dean by the Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA); and
- 1.2.1.4. VPAA by the President

1.2.2. For the evaluation period covering July 1, 2019 - July 31, 2023, the SUCs shall use the existing Instrument for Teaching Effectiveness prescribed by the previous Zonal Centers.

1.2.3. In the subsequent evaluations, the SUCs may enhance their existing instrument for Teaching Effectiveness that should be aligned with the point system in this guideline.

1.2.4. The points can be calculated using the formula below:

$$\text{Points} = \text{OR (Overall Rating)} \div 100 \times 24$$

Where:

- OR** = supervisors rating per semester
- 100** = the highest possible rating that can be obtained by the faculty.
- 24** = maximum points (40% of 60).

1. Sample Computation: Points for Supervisor's Evaluation

	AY - 01		AY - 02		AY - 03	
	1 st Sem	2 nd Sem	1 st Sem	2 nd Sem	1 st Sem	2 nd Sem
Supervisor's Rating	90	92	94	90	91	95
Average rating	$(90 + 92 + 94 + 90 + 91 + 95) / 6 = 92$					
	$92 \div 100 = 0.92$					
	0.92×24					
Points	22.08					

1.3. Computation points for Faculty Performance Evaluation

$$\text{Total Points} = \text{pts from Student Evaluation} + \text{pts from Supervisor's Evaluation}$$

1. Sample Computation: Points for Faculty Performance Evaluation

	Points
Points for Student Evaluation	32.58
Points for Supervisor's Evaluation	22.08
Total Points	54.66

2. Faculty Performance Evaluation by Students and Supervisor for Newly Hired Faculty

For newly hired faculty who joined the SUC within the evaluation period, the faculty shall have the option to apply for reclassification or wait for the next evaluation period wherein all his/her accomplishments during the period will still be

considered. However, if the faculty still decided to apply for reclassification, the divisor that will be used in the computation of the average will be six (6) semesters.

1. Sample Computation: Points for Student Evaluation

	AY - 01		AY - 02		AY - 03	
	1 st Sem	2 nd Sem	1 st Sem	2 nd Sem	1 st Sem	2 nd Sem
Ave. Student Eval. Ratings per semester	N/A	N/A	N/A	85	89	93
Average	$(85 + 89 + 93) / 6 = 44.55$					
	$44.55 \div 100 = 0.4455$					
	0.4455×36					
Points	16.02					

2. Sample Computation: Points for Supervisor's Evaluation

	AY - 01		AY - 02		AY - 03	
	1 st Sem	2 nd Sem	1 st Sem	2 nd Sem	1 st Sem	2 nd Sem
Supervisor's Rating	N/A	N/A	N/A	90	92	94
Average rating	$(90 + 92 + 94) / 6 = 46$					
	$46 \div 100 = 0.46$					
	0.46×24					
Points	11.04					

3. Sample Computation: Points for Faculty Performance Evaluation

	Points
Student Evaluation	16.02
Supervisor's Evaluation	11.04
Total Points	27.06

3. Faculty Performance Evaluation by Students and Supervisor for Faculty on Study Leave

- 3.1. For faculty members who went on full time study leave for less than three (3) years during the evaluation period, the divisor that will be used is the QCE results for the remaining semesters.

1. Sample Computation: Points for Student Evaluation

	AY - 01		AY - 02		AY - 03	
	1 st Sem	2 nd Sem	1 st Sem	2 nd Sem	1 st Sem	2 nd Sem
Ave. Student Eval. Ratings per semester	On Leave	On Leave	On Leave	85	89	93
Average	$(85 + 89 + 93) / 3 = 89$					
	$89 \div 100 = 0.89$					
	0.89×36					
Points	32.04					

2. Sample Computation: Points for Supervisor's Evaluation

	AY - 01		AY - 02		AY - 03	
	1 st Sem	2 nd Sem	1 st Sem	2 nd Sem	1 st Sem	2 nd Sem
Supervisor's Rating	On Leave	On Leave	On Leave	90	92	94
Average rating	$(90 + 92 + 94) / 3 = 92$					
	$92 \div 100 = 0.92$					
	0.92×24					
Points	22.08					

3. Sample Computation: Points for Faculty Performance Evaluation

	Points
Student Evaluation	32.04
Supervisor's Evaluation	22.08
Total Points	54.12

- 3.2. Faculty members who went on full time study leave for the entire evaluation period may opt to undergo reclassification process and shall use the QCE results of the previous semesters prior to the study leave.

B. Criterion B – Instructional Materials and Curriculum Development (maximum of 30 points)

This refers to the faculty member's ability to develop new instructional materials and other learning resources and formulate/revise academic programs.

1. For Every Instructional Materials Developed and Approved for Use

Instructional material pertains to digital or printed textbooks, modules, laboratory manuals, workbooks, course books, and other similar materials developed by the faculty for instructional purposes. The instructional materials should have undergone peer-review or evaluation process. Also included in this category are software, prototypes and computer aided instructional materials for the implementation of flexible learning system.

- 1.1. A textbook is a book which is an exposition of generally accepted principles in one (1) subject, intended primarily as a basis for instruction in a classroom or pupil-book-teacher situation (Item b, Section 3 of RA 8047).
- 1.2. The modules, workbooks and multimedia materials should be in a complete set per subject.
- 1.3. Author of textbook chapters includes editors who organize the whole textbook or serve as a chapter writer.
- 1.4. Testing Materials are standardized testing materials like departmental exams that are validated, reliability tested, secured, and verified by authorized body within the institution.
- 1.5. The subject matter covered in the instructional material should be within the discipline/s of the faculty member being evaluated.
- 1.6. The instructional materials must be approved for use by the department/college.
- 1.7. For output with two (2) or more claimants, each faculty involved shall declare his/her contribution in percentage. The respective points shall be calculated by multiplying the points allocated for the particular indicator with the percentage contribution of each faculty.

Sample Computation:

Authors	Output	Points	% Contribution	computation	Pts Received
Faculty A	1 Set of Module	16	60%	16 x 60%	9.6
Faculty B			40%	16 x 40%	6.4

2. Academic Programs Developed, Revised and Implemented

This pertains to the contribution of the faculty in the development of a new academic degree program or the revision of an existing academic degree program offered by the institution. For duties and responsibilities involving the development of new programs and review of existing programs that are inherent to the administrative designation of the faculty will not be counted.

2.1. These are contributions of the faculty in the entire development process of a new academic degree program or the revision process of an existing academic degree program.

2.1.1. Development of New Academic Program

2.1.1.1. These include activities such as preparation of feasibility studies, benchmarking with local and international institutions, gathering of inputs from potential employers and other stakeholders, setting of objectives and learning outcomes, curriculum development, and other related activities.

2.1.1.2. The faculty must submit a certification signed by the academic unit head indicating the contribution and the role of the faculty in the development of the new academic program as either the Lead or Contributor.

2.1.1.3. The offering of the proposed academic degree program must be approved by the governing board.

2.1.2. Revision of Existing Academic Program

2.1.2.1. These include activities such as preparation of proposal for revision, benchmarking with local and international institutions, gathering of inputs from potential employers and other stakeholders, revision of objectives; learning outcomes; curriculum; syllabi, and other related activities.

2.1.2.2. The faculty must submit a certification signed by the academic unit head indicating the contribution and the role of the faculty in the revision of the academic program as either the Lead or Contributor.

2.1.2.3. The proposed revision to the existing academic degree program must be approved by the governing board.

2.2. Contributions of faculty as members of a committee constituted for the purpose shall be given points in KRA 3 - Criterion D.

C. Criterion C – Special Projects, Capstone Projects, Thesis, Dissertation and Mentorship Services (maximum of 10 points)

This pertains to services rendered by the faculty as adviser, critic and/or panel member in doctoral dissertation, master's and undergraduate theses, and other mentorship services.

1. For Every Service Rendered to Students/Group of Students as Adviser and Panel Member in Doctoral Dissertation and Master's and Undergraduate Theses.

1.1. The academic program where the faculty will serve as adviser or panel must have a Certificate of Program Compliance (COPC) issued by CHED.

1.2. For the Adviser; the special project, capstone project, thesis or dissertation of the student must be completed and approved in order to earn points.

2. For Every Service Rendered to a Student or Group of Students as a Mentor.

2.1. Mentorship includes services as coach to a student or group of students in academic competitions such as Mathematics Olympiad, Robotics Competition, Debate Competitions, Innovation Challenge and HRM Skills Competition.

2.2. In order to earn points, the student or team of students being mentored by the faculty should win either in the regional, national or international academic and other co-curricular competitions as representative of the institution.

II. KRA II – RESEARCH, INVENTION AND CREATIVE WORK (100 points)

A faculty may get the maximum points of 100 from one criterion or through a combination of points from criterion A, B and C.

A. Criterion A – Research Outputs Published (maximum of 100 points)

This refers to scholarly research papers/educational or technical articles and other outputs published in books and refereed and internationally-indexed monographs, conference proceedings, and technical/scientific/professional journals.

For faculty who will be evaluated for the first time, the coverage of evaluation for research publications is within the last 5 years. For those who have been rated previously, the coverage is within the evaluation period.

1. For Every Scholarly Research Paper, Educational or Technical Article and other Outputs Published in Book and Refereed and Internationally-indexed Monograph, Conference Proceeding, and Technical/Scientific/Professional Journals.

1.1. Books

1.1.1. Book as defined by the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), is a printed non-periodical publication

of at least forty-eight (48) pages, exclusive of cover pages, published in the country and made available to the public (Item A, Section 3 of RA 8047).

- 1.1.2. It must be peer-reviewed and published in academic publishers locally or internationally.
- 1.1.3. It does not include textbooks which are classified under instructional materials.
- 1.1.4. For output with two (2) or more claimants, the faculty involved shall declare his/her contribution in percentage using a prescribed template. The respective points shall be calculated by multiplying the points allocated for the particular output with the percentage contribution of each faculty.

Sample Computation (with 2 authors):

Authors	Output	Points	% Contribution	Computation	Points Received
Faculty A	Book	100	60%	100 x 60%	60
Faculty B			40%	100 x 40%	40

1.2. Journal Articles

- 1.2.1. The articles must be published in a journal listed in the database of international indexing bodies such as ASEAN Citation Index, Scopus (by Elsevier), and Web of Science (by Clarivate Analytics).
- 1.2.2. Journal articles written in Filipino that are not publishable in journals that are listed in the database of international indexing bodies but published in a peer-reviewed journal.
- 1.2.3. For output with two (2) or more claimants, the faculty involved shall declare his/her contribution in percentage using a prescribed template. The respective points shall be calculated by multiplying the points allocated for the particular output with the percentage contribution of each faculty.

Sample Computation (with 3 authors):

Authors	Output	Points	% Contribution	Computation	Points Received
Faculty A	Journal Article	50	60%	50 x 60%	30
Faculty B			30%	50 x 30%	15
Faculty C			20%	50 x 10%	5

1.3. Book Chapter

- 1.3.1. These are scholarly/scientific chapters that are published by the faculty in books like compendiums, edited volumes, edited collections, as book chapters.
- 1.3.2. The book where the book chapter is published must be peer-reviewed and published in academic publishers locally or internationally.

- 1.3.3. For output with two (2) or more claimants, the faculty involved shall declare his/her contribution in percentage using a prescribed template. The respective points shall be calculated by multiplying the points allocated for the particular output with the percentage contribution of each faculty.

Sample Computation:

Authors	Output	Points	% Contribution	Computation	Points Received
Faculty A	Book	35	65%	35 x 65%	22.75
Faculty B	Chapter		35%	35 x 35%	12.25

1.4. Academic Monographs

- 1.4.1. A monograph is a detailed written study of a single subject, usually in the form of a short book.
- 1.4.2. The monograph should be peer-reviewed or its equivalent.

1.5. Other Peer-reviewed Scholarly Output

Other peer-reviewed output may include but not limited to the following: commissioned research, policy papers, maps, ethnographic/field/ research notes/data from field work transcribed in International phonetic alphabet (IPA), articles in academic magazine, case studies, full paper published in conference proceedings, and translation of scholarly work.

2. For Every Research Output Translated into Project, Policy or Product.

- 2.1. This refers to a research output of a faculty that was translated into either a project, policy or product.
- 2.2. There should be evidence that the research was completed and that the project, policy or product emanated from the research.

3. For Every Research Publication Cited by Other Authors

- 3.1. The article where the research publication of the faculty was cited should be published within the evaluation period.
- 3.2. The article where the citation was made should be published in a journal listed in the database of international indexing bodies such as ASEAN Citation Index, Scopus (by Elsevier), and Web of Science (by Clarivate Analytics).

B. Criterion B – Inventions (maximum of 100 points)

This refers to patentable and non-patentable inventions, innovations, as well as creative work of educational, technical, scientific and/or cultural value.

1. For every patented invention, innovation, as well as creative work; of educational, technical, scientific and/or cultural value.

1.1. Invention Patent

1.1.1. Each stage of invention patent application shall be given points.

1.1.1.1. Acceptance of Application - If the patent application passed the formality examination.

1.1.1.2. Publication - if the patent application has been published in the IPOPHL eGazette for opposition.

1.1.1.3. Grant - if the patent application has been granted.

1.1.2. For output with two (2) or more claimants, the faculty involved shall declare his/her contribution in percentage using a prescribed template. The respective points shall be calculated by multiplying the points allocated for the particular output with the percentage contribution of each faculty.

Sample Computation 1:

Authors	Output	Points	% Contribution	computation	Pts. Received
Faculty A	Acceptance of Patent Application	10	60%	10 x 60%	6
Faculty B			40%	10 x 40%	4

Sample Computation 2:

Authors	Output	Points	% Contribution	computation	Pts Received
Faculty C	Grant of Invention Patent	80	70%	80 x 70%	56
Faculty D			30%	80 x 30%	24

1.2. Utility Model (UM) and Industrial Design (ID)

1.2.1. For Utility Models (UM) and Industrial Design (ID), only the grant shall earn points.

1.2.2. For output with two (2) or more claimants, the faculty involved shall declare his/her contribution in percentage using a prescribed template. The respective points shall be calculated by multiplying the points allocated for the particular indicator with the percentage contribution of each faculty.

Sample Computation 1:

Authors	Output	Points	% Contribution	computation	Pts Received
Faculty C	UM	10	50%	10 x 50%	5
Faculty D			50%	10 x 50%	5

1.3. Commercialized Patented Products

1.3.1. Local refers to patented products that are commercialized in any area within the Philippines.

1.3.2. International refers to patented products commercialized at least in one (1) county outside the Philippines.

2. For every non-patentable invention, innovation, as well as creative work; of educational, technical, scientific and/or cultural value.

2.1. Copyrighted and Utilized Software Products

- 2.1.1. The software product should be both copyrighted and utilized in order to earn points.
- 2.1.2. An updated software product should have a new functionality that was not in the previous version in order to be considered.
- 2.1.3. For output with two (2) or more claimants, the faculty involved shall declare his/her contribution in percentage using a prescribed template. The respective points shall be calculated by multiplying the points allocated for the particular indicator with the percentage contribution of each faculty.

Sample Computation:

Authors	Output	Points	% Contribution	computation	Points Received
Faculty A	New Software	10	65%	10 x 65%	6.5
Faculty B			35%	10 x 35%	3.5

2.2. New Plant Varieties or Animal Breeds Developed, or New Microbial Strains Isolated, that are Propagated or Reproduced.

- 2.2.1. The new discovery should be duly registered in appropriate government and non-government agency or authority.
- 2.2.2. The new discovery should also be propagated or reproduced.
- 2.2.3. For output with two (2) or more claimants, the faculty involved shall declare his/her contribution in percentage using a prescribed template. The respective points shall be calculated by multiplying the points allocated for the particular indicator with the percentage contribution of each faculty.

C. Criterion C – Creative Works (maximum of 100 points)

This refers to creative work that was either performed, presented, exhibited, or published. Creative work includes but is not limited to literature, artwork, music, dance, drama, productions, architecture, and games and apps.

Creative work outside the discipline of the faculty shall be considered as long as it is supported by the SUC and it has brought recognition to the institution.

1. For Every Creative Work Created, Performed, Presented, Exhibited, and Published.

This refers to creative works in the arts, humanities, and other related fields of study produced originally by the faculty such as novels, poems, plays, reference works, newspapers, advertisements, films, musical compositions, choreography,

paintings, drawings, photographs, sculpture, architecture, maps and technical drawings.

1.1. New Creative Performing Artwork

1.1.1. This refers to a creative work in the performing arts produced originally by the faculty such as musical compositions, musical arrangements, choreography and stage play.

1.1.2. The new creative work in the performing arts should have undergone a peer-review process.

1.1.3. The new creative work in the performing arts should be copyrighted.

1.1.4. The faculty may perform his/her own creative work or perform the works of others. For example, a faculty may sing his/her own musical composition or sing a musical composition of others.

1.1.4.1. The performance must be in a venue organized by a reputable organization.

1.1.4.2. Only the first performance will be counted.

1.2. Exhibition

1.2.1. This refers to different forms of creative works in the visual arts that are presented to the public through exhibitions such as but not limited to paintings, sculptures, design, photograph, and film.

1.2.2. The exhibition must be in a formal venue.

1.2.3. Only the first exhibition will be counted.

1.3. Juried or Peer-reviewed Designs

1.3.1. This refers to other forms of creative works that are juried or peer-reviewed that may include architecture, engineering, and industrial design.

1.3.2. Juried Designs are those presented to a panel of evaluators such as architectural design competitions.

1.3.3. Peer-reviewed Designs are those submitted to an independent designer with expertise and experience for evaluation.

1.4. Literary Publications

1.4.1. This refers to literary works of the faculty such as but not limited to novels, short stories, dramas, essays, and poems.

- 1.4.2. The literary work should be published in books, drama, anthologies, literary magazines, by reputable presses and publishers.

III. KRA 3 – EXTENSION SERVICES (100 points)

A faculty may earn a total of 100 points from Criterion A, B and C. The maximum allowable points for each criterion are broken down as follows:

Criterion	Points
Criterion A	30
Criterion B	50
Criterion C	20
Total	100

The faculty may also earn a maximum of additional 20 points from Criterion D on top of the points earned from Criterion A, B, and C.

Criterion	Points
Criterion D	20 bonus points

A. Criterion A – Service to the Institution (maximum of 30 points)

This pertains to the services rendered to the institution by a faculty who facilitated the successful forging and implementation of partnerships and linkages with various stakeholders and contributed in the generation of income and availment of external resources for the institution in order to support its development plans.

1. For Every Successful Linkages, Networking and Partnership Activity:

- 1.1. These are contributions of the faculty in coordinating with various organizations such as professional organizations, governmental and non-government organizations, industries, people's organizations, higher education institutions among others; that led to the successful partnership.
- 1.2. The linkage, networking and partnership should be formalized through a duly signed and notarized Memorandum of Agreement (MOA).
- 1.3. There should be evidence of implementation and benefits derived from the partnership.
- 1.4. The faculty should submit a copy of the implementation report or terminal report containing the result of the implementation and the benefits derived from the partnership, networking or linkages.

2. Annual Contribution in Income Generation

- 2.1. These are contributions of the faculty in the generation of income to support the development plans of the SUC. These may come from the following:
 - 2.1.1. Income from commercialization of products or technology, whether patented or unpatented, developed by the faculty.

2.1.2. Grants received by the SUC from funding agencies through project proposals prepared and submitted by the faculty;

2.1.3. Income derived from projects with industries.

2.2. The total annual income should be based on the gross income.

B. Criterion B – Service to the Community (maximum of 30 points)

This refers to the technical/professional/expert services rendered by the faculty to the community. The term “community” can be broadly defined to include among others: academic community, professional community, and geographic community.

1. Professional/Expertise-based Services

1.1. For Services in Local or International Accreditation, Evaluation, Assessment Works, and other related Educational Quality Assurance Activities.

1.1.1. For the purpose of this guideline, “engagement” is defined as the appointment and deployment of a faculty for accreditation, evaluation, or assessment work by a recognized agency/organization within the evaluation period.

1.1.2. Points will be earned for every agency/organization that is engaged by the faculty and not by the number of deployments.

Illustration 1:

Faculty A was appointed and deployed 3 times by Local Agency X. Faculty A has no engagements with other Local Agencies. Thus, Faculty A will receive 8 points.

Illustration 2:

Faculty B was appointed and deployed by Local Agency Y once. The faculty was also appointed and deployed by Local Agency Z twice. Since Faculty B has engagements with 2 Local Agencies, he/she will receive 16 points.

1.1.3. International organization/agencies include, but not limited to the following:

1.1.3.1. ASEAN Quality Assurance Network (AQAN)

1.1.3.2. ASEAN University Network (AUN)

1.1.3.3. Asia Pacific Quality Network (APQN)

1.1.3.4. Philippine Technological Council - Accreditation and Certification Board for Engineering and Technology (PTC-ACBET)

1.1.3.5. Philippine Computing Society Information and Computing Accreditation Board (PICAB).

1.1.4. Local organization/agencies include, but not limited to, the following:

1.1.4.1. Commission on Higher Education (CHED)

1.1.4.2. Department of Trade and Industry for the Philippine Quality Award (PQA)

1.1.4.3. Accrediting Agency of Chartered Colleges and Universities in the Philippines (AACCU)

1.1.4.4. Philippine Accrediting Association of Schools, Colleges and Universities (PAASCU)

1.1.4.5. Philippine Association of Colleges and Universities Commission on Accreditation (PACUCOA)

1.1.4.6. Association of Christian Schools, Colleges and Universities-Accrediting Council, Inc. (ACSCU-ACI)

1.1.4.7. Association of Local Colleges and Universities-Commission on Accreditation (ALCUACO)

1.2. For Services as Judge/Examiner for Local/International Awards and Academic Competitions

1.2.1. Points will be earned for every engagement at any time during the cycle.

1.2.2. The awards and/or competition should be sponsored by a recognized agency/organization.

1.3. For Services Rendered as a Short-term Consultant/Expert in an Activity of Educational, Technological, Professional, Scientific or Cultural Nature (foreign or local) Sponsored by a Private Organization or Government.

1.3.1. Points will be earned for every engagement at any time during the cycle.

1.3.2. This includes services as editor, peer-reviewer, statistician, and evaluators of proposals, adjunct faculty, and technical experts (technical panel, technical committee, task force, technical working groups) of government agencies, among others.

1.4. For Services through Media

1.4.1. For writer of occasional newspaper column, points will be earned per published column article in a newspaper or in online media.

1.4.2. For writer of a regular newspaper column, points will be earned per regular column in a newspaper or in online media.

1.4.3. For host of television or radio program, points will be earned per regular program in tv or radio or in online media.

1.4.4. For occasional guesting as technical expert for television or radio program, points will be earned per guesting in tv or radio program or in online media.

1.5. For Every Hour of Training Course/Seminar/Workshop Conducted as Resource Person, Convenor, Facilitator, Moderator, Keynote Speaker, Plenary Speaker or Panelist

1.5.1. Points will be given for every hour of service as Resource Person, Convenor, Facilitator, Moderator, Keynote Speaker, Plenary Speaker, and Panelist

1.5.2. The services rendered should be at the tertiary or higher level.

2. Institutional Social Responsibility

2.1. For Every Participation in Service-Oriented Projects or Production Activities.

2.1.1. Points will be earned for every participation in outreach or extension activities to the adopted community, local government units, or identified beneficiaries.

2.1.2. The activities conducted by the faculty should be relevant to his/her field of specialization or discipline.

2.1.3. These include but are not limited to; transfer of knowledge, skills and technology; technical advice; advocacy activities; conduct of research related to extension; and other activities that are responsive to the needs of the community for people empowerment and self-reliance.

C. Criterion C – Relevance and Quality of Extension Services (maximum of 20 points)

The SUCs should not only ensure that the outreach and extension programs are relevant and responsive to the needs of the community it serves but should also be delivered with quality.

1. Satisfaction Rating for Outreach and Extension Activity/Project

1.1. For the evaluation period covering July 1, 2019 - July 31, 2022, the SUCs shall use the existing Instrument for Extension prescribed by the Zonal Centers.

1.2. In the absence of accomplished Instrument for Extension, the faculty may use the client satisfaction survey form accomplished by the beneficiaries for the activity conducted.

- 1.3. In cases wherein the client satisfaction survey for activities has a different rating system or does not total to 100 points, the respective SUCs shall formulate a system that will allow conversion or transmutation of ratings to 100 points.

Sample Computation using the existing instrument:

	AY - 01		AY - 02		AY - 03	
	1 st Sem	2 nd Sem	1 st Sem	2 nd Sem	1 st Sem	2 nd Sem
Semestral Averages	95	89	88	92	94	85
	$(95 + 89 + 88 + 92 + 94 + 85) / 6 = 90.5$					
	$90.5 \div 100 = 0.905$					
	0.905×20					
Points	18.10					

- 1.4. In the subsequent evaluations, the SUCs may enhance their existing instrument for Extension that should be aligned with the point system in this guideline.

D. Criterion D – Additional Points for Administrative Designation

1. Administrative Designation

This refers to the services rendered by the faculty as a member of the SUC administration. This shall be considered as a bonus indicator since not all faculty have the opportunity to be designated as members of the administration.

- 1.1. Points will be earned for administrative designation for at least one year within the evaluation period
- 1.2. In cases wherein, the faculty held more than one administrative position during the evaluation period, only one shall be credited, whichever is highest.
- 1.3. The creation of the committee/s where the faculty is designated as chair/member should be approved by the board of the SUC.

IV. KRA 4 – PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (100 points)

A faculty may earn a total of 100 points from Criterion A to E (for new entrants) or Criterion C to E (for existing faculty). The points for each criterion are broken down as follows:

Criterion	Points
Criterion A	20
Criterion B	60
Criterion C	20
Total	100

Additional points will be given to newly hired faculty members for their academic and industry and experience.

Criterion	Points
Criterion D	20 points

A. Criterion A – Involvement in Professional Organizations (maximum of 20 points)

1. For Current Individual Membership and Active Role, Involvement or Contribution in Relevant, Recognized/Registered Professional Organization, Learned/Honor/Scientific Society.

- 1.1. This pertains to both membership and active involvement of faculty members in professional organizations.
- 1.2. Only membership in professional organizations which are aligned with the faculty's field or area of specialization shall be considered (social clubs, faculty associations, alumni associations, shall not be considered).
- 1.3. In order to earn points, the faculty should show proof of contribution such as being an officer, event organizer, project implementor, and committee member.
- 1.4. Points will be earned for every contribution in one or more professional organizations.

B. Criterion B – Continuing Development (maximum of 60 points)

1. Educational Qualifications

- 1.1. This refers to postgraduate academic qualifications taken by the faculty after a master's degree.
- 1.2. Honorary degrees shall not be considered.
- 1.3. For newly hired faculty members who have not yet undergone the evaluation process, additional master's degree, post-master's diploma/certificate, doctorate degree, and/or post-doctoral certificate earned by the faculty before entering the institution shall be counted.
- 1.4. A faculty, with a rank from Instructor I to Associate Professor V, who completed his/her first doctorate degree shall be given an automatic one sub-rank reclassification, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1.4.1. The doctorate degree earned must be vertically articulated with the earned master's degree. The doctorate degree and the master's degree of the faculty should be within the same or in the allied field as determined from the relevant CHED Memorandum Orders on policies, standards and guidelines;
 - 1.4.2. The doctorate degree was earned from any of the following Philippine Higher Education Institution:
 - 1.4.2.1. Private HEI that has been granted Autonomous or Deregulated Status by CHED;
 - 1.4.2.2. Public HEI with least SUC Level III category;

- 1.4.2.3. HEI is included in the top 1,000 world's best universities as ranked by Quacquarelli Symonds (QS), Times (THE) and World's Universities with Real Impact (WURI); or
- 1.4.2.4. The degree program is within the department designated as Center of Excellence or Center of Development by CHED;
- 1.4.3. For doctorate degrees granted by a foreign HEI (whether earned via regular or transnational education mode), both the program and the HEI must be recognized and accredited by the respective Ministry of Education of the State of origin of the same HEI, coupled with any of the following conditions:
 - 1.4.3.1. Included in the top 1,000 world's best universities as ranked by Quacquarelli Symonds (QS), Times (THE) or World's Universities with Real Impact (WURI);
 - 1.4.3.2. Included in the Top-500 ranking based on its national ranking as determined and/or recognized by its domestic ministry of education; or
 - 1.4.3.3. At least a four-star rating by the QS Star-rating System; or
 - 1.4.3.4. Both the Program and the HEI are accredited and/or recognized under the Commission's Foreign Scholarship and Training Program and/or other similar programs initiated and/or administered by CHED; or
 - 1.4.3.5. Both the Program and the HEI are accredited and/or recognized, either by special accreditation/recognition or otherwise, by the CHED-IAS after evaluation on a case-to-case basis.
- 1.4.4. The requirements under 1.5.3., both as regards the ranking/rating requirements as well as the acknowledged international ranking providers, shall be subject to assessment and updating by CHED whenever it may deem necessary.
- 1.4.5. All such recognitions, accreditation, designation, rankings and ratings must be possessed by the Philippine or Foreign HEI during the time of study. For the purpose of this JC, the "time of study" shall be interpreted as follows:
 - 1.4.5.1. The recognition, accreditation, designation, ranking and rating is/are already possessed by the HEI at the time the faculty entered the program until graduation; or
 - 1.4.5.2. The recognition, accreditation, designation, ranking and rating is/are not yet possessed by the HEI at the time the faculty entered the program but received the status during his/her stay in the program until graduation.

- 1.5. The automatic one sub-rank reclassification shall be applied first before the computation of points earned and determination of equivalent number of sub-rank increases.
- 1.6. A faculty who was given automatic one sub-rank reclassification shall no longer earn points for his/her first doctoral degree. Those who earned doctoral degree but did not satisfy the conditions provided in 1.5 will still earn points for the doctoral degree earned.

2. For Every Participation in Conferences, Seminars, Workshops, industry immersion, and Other Capacity Building Activities

- 2.1. Only capacity building activities that were endorsed by CHED and other government agencies; organized and conducted by CHED-recognized private HEIs; professional organizations, and accrediting bodies, will earn points, provided that the participation of faculty was duly authorized by the SUC Governing Board/President.
- 2.2. The capacity building activity participated in must be relevant to the faculty's field or designation.
- 2.3. Half-day activities shall not be considered.
- 2.4. International Conference refers to a bilateral or multilateral conference or a conference with at least three (3) countries represented by the speakers and/or participants held in the Philippines or abroad.

3. For Every Paper Presentation in Conferences

- 3.1. A faculty may earn points for every paper presentation in conferences conducted within the evaluation period.
- 3.2. Only presentations in conferences that were endorsed by CHED and other government agencies; organized and conducted by recognized professional organizations, and accrediting bodies, will earn points, provided that paper presentation of faculty was duly authorized by the SUC Governing Board/President.
- 3.3. International Conference refers to a bilateral or multilateral conference or a conference with at least three (3) countries represented by the speakers and/or participants held in the Philippines or abroad.

C. Criterion C – Awards and Recognition (maximum of 20 points)

This pertains to award of distinction received by the faculty in recognition of achievement in relevant areas of specialization/profession and/or assignment of the faculty concerned.

- 1. For Every Award of Distinction Received in Recognition of Achievement in Relevant Areas of Specialization, Profession and/or Assignment of the Faculty Concerned.**

- 1.1. These are Institutional and Local or Regional Awards and Recognitions in the areas of instruction, research, extension, production and other areas such as administration, quality assurance and contribution to the discipline/field given by recognized organizations.
- 1.2. A faculty who received a National or International Award by a recognized organization shall be awarded automatic one sub-rank increase.
 - 1.2.1. National Awards such as but not limited to Metrobank Foundation, Outstanding Filipino Award for Teachers, Palanca Foundation Awards, National Academy of Science and Technology (NAST) Awards, and Civil Service Commission (CSC) Awards.
 - 1.2.2. International Awards such as but not limited to Nobel Prize, Ramon Magsaysay Award, Galileo Galilei Medal Award, and Global Teacher Prize.
- 1.3. The automatic one sub-rank reclassification shall be applied on the top of the evaluation results. This means that all the points should have already been computed/recomputed and the final number of sub-ranks determined before the automatic one sub-rank reclassification is applied.

D. Criterion D – Additional Points for Newly Hired Faculty (maximum of 20 points)

This criterion is only applicable to newly hired faculty members with relevant experience in a higher education institution or industry.

1. For Every Year of Full-time Academic Service in an Institution of Higher Learning

This refers to the experience of a faculty either as an administrator or faculty member on a full-time basis in a higher education institution.

2. For every year of industry experience

This refers to the industry experience of a faculty either in the managerial, technical, skilled, support or administrative staff positions. The experience should be in non-academic industries.

ANNEX III
EVALUATION, REVIEW, CERTIFICATION, AND APPROVAL PROCESS

Phase I – EVALUATION PROCESS

1. Institutional Evaluation

- 1.1. The initial evaluation shall be conducted by the Institutional Evaluation Committee (IEC). It shall be constituted and appointed by the respective governing boards with the following composition:

Chair	:	Vice President for Academic Affairs
Members	:	A Dean who shall be nominated by the SUC's Council of Deans or its equivalent
		Two (2) faculty representatives from different ranks
		HRMO/HRMD representative
		Secretariat will be constituted by the SUC

The governing board may create its institutional sub-committee considering the number of campuses. This sub-committee shall report to the IEC for consolidation of results and submission.

- 1.2. The IEC receives applications for reclassification from its faculty members on or before the 31st of July of the last semester of the evaluation period. The following are the required documents to be submitted by the applicant faculty to the IEC:
- 1.2.1. Written request for position reclassification.
 - 1.2.2. Duly accomplished Faculty Position Reclassification Forms;
 - 1.2.3. Supporting documentary evidence based on the list of possible evidence in Annex I. Documentary evidence shall be prepared both in hard copies and in soft copies. Hard copies are to be submitted to the IEC and the soft copies are saved in the faculty's google drive that will be shared with the evaluation committees in case of a remote evaluation and validation activity.
- 1.3. IEC conducts preliminary evaluation of the submissions and validates the Individual Summary Sheet (ISS) of the points earned by every faculty based on the evaluation criteria in Annex I.
- 1.4. IEC prepares an Overall Summary Sheet (OSS) of points earned by all applicant faculty with the recommended faculty rank based on the template to be provided by CHED. There shall be three (3) separate Overall Summary Sheets:
- 1.4.1. For all faculty who met the points required for Instructor up to Associate Professor positions;
 - 1.4.2. For all faculty who met the points for the Professor positions; and
 - 1.4.3. For all faculty who met the points for the College/University Professor position.

- 1.5. The OSS shall be printed in two (2) copies each and must be signed by all members of the IEC. The corresponding ISS should be attached to the OSS.
- 1.6. Submission of the OSS for Instructor up to Associate Professor positions: the President shall submit one (1) original copy to the Regional Evaluation Committee (REC) on or before the 31st of August and keep the other original copy in its file for future reference.
- 1.7. Submission of the OSS for Professor positions: the President shall submit one (1) original copy to the Evaluation and Accreditation Committee (EAC) on or before the 31st of August and keep the other original copy in its file for future reference.
- 1.8. Submission of the OSS for College/University Professor position: the President shall submit one (1) original copy to the Certification Committee (CC) on or before the 31st of August and keep the other original copy in its file for future reference.
- 1.9. All documentary evidence submitted in hard copies shall be retained in the SUC for reference until the results of the evaluations have been implemented. The soft copies of the documentary evidence in the faculty google drive shall be shared with the members of the REC, EAC and CC for the remote validation purposes.

Phase II – REVIEW, VALIDATION, AND CERTIFICATION PROCESSES

1. Regional Evaluation

- 1.1. The review and validation of the IEC results shall be conducted by a Regional Evaluation Committee (REC). It shall be constituted and appointed by CHED with the following composition:

Chair	:	CHED Regional Director
Members	:	Two (2) Higher Education Experts with expertise in human resource development and promotion systems in HEIs and are not connected with any of the SUCs within the Region. PASUC may recommend representation.
		Representative of the IEC of the SUC whose faculty are being evaluated. The IEC Representative of each SUC will only sit as a member of the REC when their faculty is being evaluated.
Secretariat	:	Designated SUC

- 1.2. REC shall review and validate the scores as shown in the Overall Summary Sheet (OSS) and Individual Summary Sheets (ISS) submitted by the SUC Presidents within the Region for the Instructor up to the Associate Professor positions.
- 1.3. The Committee may agree to conduct an on-campus evaluation and validation of documentary evidence or via remote validation using available teleconferencing applications such as zoom, google teams, etc. Any changes

made by the REC in the points earned by the faculty should be reflected in the ISS.

- 1.4. REC shall prepare a validated OSS with its recommendations per SUC. The validated OSS shall be printed in two (2) copies and must be signed by all members of the REC.
- 1.5. REC Chair shall submit one (1) original copy of the validated OSS to the President on or before the 31st of October, and keep the other original copy in the file of the CHED Regional Office for future reference.
- 1.6. The SUC shall inform its faculty on the results of the REC's validation and request the faculty to sign in their respective ISS to signify their confirmation to the validation results.
 - 1.6.1. If a faculty disagrees with the faculty rank/sub-rank recommended by the REC, this faculty must justify his/her disagreement and provide evidence for reconsideration of the faculty rank/sub-rank to the IEC within 3 days upon the receipt of the ISS.
 - 1.6.2. IEC shall evaluate and determine whether the justification and the supporting evidence provided by the faculty will have a material effect on the faculty rank/sub-rank recommended by the REC. If having material effect, the documents and IEC reevaluation results will be forwarded to the REC for review and revalidation. Otherwise, the REC recommendation will stand.
 - 1.6.3. REC shall review the justification and revalidate the results based on the additional evidence provided. The revalidation of the results will be done only once by the REC for a particular faculty.
 - 1.6.4. REC shall revise the validated OSS only if there is/are change/s in its recommendations, and print two (2) original copies: one copy to be submitted to the President, and the other copy to be filed by the CHED Regional Office for future reference. Both copies must be signed by all the members of the REC.
- 1.7. The President shall submit the validated OSS and confirmed ISS to the Governing Board for final decision on or before the 15th of November.

2. Evaluation and Accreditation of Professors

- 2.1. The evaluation and accreditation of Professors shall be conducted by the Evaluation and Accreditation Committee (EAC). It shall be constituted and appointed by CHED for every evaluation cycle. There will be five (5) EACs which shall be composed of 3 to 5 Regions per committee. Its composition shall be the following:

Chair	:	CHED Director from the Central Office
Members	:	Four (4) Higher Education Experts with expertise in human resource development and promotion systems in HEIs and are not connected to any of the SUCs within the zone. PASUC may recommend representation.
Secretariat	:	Designated SUC

The distribution of Regions per Zone are as follows:

EAC	Zone	Regions
1	I	CAR, I, II and III
2	II	NCR and IV
3	III	V and MIMAROPA
4	IV	VI, VII, VIII
5	V	IX, X, XI, XII and Caraga

- 2.2. The EAC shall review and validate the scores as shown in the Overall Summary Sheets (OSS) and Individual Summary Sheet (ISS) submitted by the SUC Presidents within the Region for the Professor positions.
- 2.3. The Committee may agree to conduct an on-campus evaluation and validation of documentary evidence or via remote validation using available teleconferencing applications such as zoom, google teams, etc. Any changes made by the EAC in the points earned by the faculty should be reflected in the ISS.
- 2.4. EAC shall prepare a validated OSS with its recommendations per SUC. The validated OSS shall be printed in two (2) copies and must be signed by all members of the EAC.
- 2.5. EAC Chair shall submit one (1) original copy of the validated OSS to the President on or before the 31st of September, and keep the other original copy in the file of the CHED Regional Office for future reference. The validated OSS shall include the following:
 - 2.5.1. Faculty who initially qualified and endorsed by the IEC for the Professor position but failed to meet the required points after EAC validation;
 - 2.5.2. Faculty who qualified for the Professor position after EAC validation that is lined up for accreditation; and
 - 2.5.3. Existing Faculty Professors who qualified to a higher sub-rank of the Professor position.
- 2.6. The SUC shall inform its faculty on the results of the EAC's validation and request the faculty to sign in their respective ISS to signify their confirmation to the validation results.
 - 2.6.1. If a faculty disagrees with the faculty rank/sub-rank recommended by the EAC, this faculty must justify his/her disagreement and provide evidence for reconsideration of the faculty rank/sub-rank within 3 days upon the receipt of the ISS.

- 2.6.2. IEC shall evaluate and determine whether the justification and the supporting evidence provided by the faculty will have a material effect on the faculty rank/sub-rank recommended by the EAC. If having a material effect, the documents and IEC reevaluation results will be forwarded to the EAC for review and revalidation. Otherwise, the EAC recommendation will stand.
- 2.6.3. EAC shall review the justification and revalidate the results based on the additional evidence provided. The revalidation of the results will be done only once by the EAC for a particular faculty.
- 2.6.4. EAC shall revise the validated OSS only if there is/are change/s in its recommendations, and print two (2) original copies: one copy to be submitted to the President, and the other copy to be filed by the CHED Regional Office for future reference. Both copies must be signed by all the members of the EAC.
- 2.7. The President shall return the validated OSS and confirmed ISS to the EAC for the accreditation of faculty who qualified to a Professor rank on or before the 15th of October.
- 2.8. EAC accreditation shall be required for faculty applicants who qualified to a Professor rank for the first time. This process shall be done after the scores in the OSS and ISS have been validated and confirmed, respectively. The EAC accreditation is not required if the faculty applicant is already holding a Professor position and qualifies to a higher sub-rank of that position.
- 2.9. For faculty who qualified for a Professor rank for the first time, the accreditation process shall be as follows:
- 2.9.1. Upon return of the validated OSS and confirmed ISS to the EAC in 2.7, the qualified faculty will be invited to an interview by the EAC through the SUC President. This may be done face-to-face or via a video interviewing platform.
- 2.9.2. The interviewee shall be rated based on the following criteria:

Criteria	Rating
a) Depth and breadth of area of expertise	35%
b) General knowledge/ current issues/ general issues	15%
c) Communication skills/ articulation of conceptual ideas/ ability to express	10%
d) Leadership potential/ ability to influence people	10%
e) Professional and technical assistance to government and non-government agencies	30%
Total	100%
The passing rating is 85% with no rating lower than 75% (average of the EAC members)	

- 2.9.3. The faculty who met the passing rating shall be issued an accreditation certificate by the EAC. The faculty who failed to get a passing rating shall not be accredited and this faculty will be recommended the Associate Professor V position.
- 2.10. EAC shall update its recommendations in the validated OSS based on the results of the accreditation process and submit one (1) original copy to the President on or before the 31st of October and the other copy to be filed by the CHED Regional Office for future reference. Both copies must be signed by all the members of the EAC. The accreditation certificates should also be attached to the validated OSS.
- 2.11. The President shall submit the accreditation certificates and the validated OSS to the Governing Board for confirmation of accreditation and final decision on or before the 15th of November.

3. Certification of College and University Professors

- 3.1. The evaluation and certification of candidates for College/University Professors shall be conducted by the Certification Committee (CC). It shall be constituted and appointed by CHED for every evaluation cycle with the following composition:

Chair	:	SUC President to be identified by the Commission
Vice Chair	:	President of a private HEI to be identified by the Commission
Members	:	Two (2) Higher Education Experts to be identified by the Commission
Secretariat	:	CHED Office of Institutional Quality Assurance and Governance-Quality Assurance Division (OIQAG-QAD)

- 3.2. The CC shall review and validate the scores as shown in the Overall Summary Sheets (OSS) and Individual Summary Sheet (ISS) submitted by the SUC Presidents within the Region for the College/University Professor positions.
- 3.3. The Committee may agree to conduct an on-campus evaluation and validation of documentary evidence or via remote validation using available teleconferencing applications such as zoom, google teams, etc. Any changes made by the CC in the points earned by the faculty should be reflected in the ISS.
- 3.4. CC shall prepare a validated OSS with its recommendations per SUC. The validated OSS shall be printed in two (2) copies and must be signed by all members of the CC.
- 3.5. CC Chair shall submit one (1) original copy of the validated OSS to the President on or before the 31st of September and keep the other original copy in the file of the CHED Regional Office for future reference.
- 3.6. The SUC shall inform its faculty on the results of the CC's validation and request the faculty to sign in their respective ISS to signify their confirmation to the validation results.

- 3.6.1. If a faculty disagrees with the faculty rank/sub-rank recommended by the CC, this faculty must justify his/her disagreement and provide evidence for reconsideration of the faculty rank/sub-rank within 3 days after receipt of the ISS.
- 3.6.2. CC shall evaluate and determine whether the justification and the supporting evidence provided by the faculty will have a material effect on the faculty rank/sub-rank recommended by the CC. If having a material effect, the documents and IEC reevaluation results will be forwarded to the CC for review and revalidation. Otherwise, the CC recommendation will stand.
- 3.6.3. CC shall review the justification and revalidate the results based on the additional evidence provided. The revalidation of the results will be done only once by the CC for a particular faculty.
- 3.6.4. CC shall revise the validated OSS only if there is/are change/s in its recommendations, and print two (2) original copies: one copy to be submitted to the President, and the other copy to be filed by the CHED Regional Office for future reference. Both copies must be signed by all the members of the CC.
- 3.7. The President shall return the validated OSS and confirmed ISS to the CC for the certification of faculty who qualified to the College/University Professor rank on or before the 15th of October.
- 3.8. CC Certification shall be required for faculty applicants who qualified to the College/University Professor rank. This process shall be done after the scores in the OSS and ISS have been validated and confirmed, respectively.
- 3.9. The certification process of the faculty for the College/University Professor rank shall include interview sessions by the CC members. The interview shall cover the following:

Criteria	Rating
a) Leadership potential/ ability to influence people	30%
b) Professional and technical assistance to government and non-government agencies	30%
c) Other factors that may be determined by the CC Members	40%
Total	100%
The passing rating is 85% with no rating lower than 80% (average of the CC members)	

- 3.10. The faculty who met the passing rating shall be issued a certification by the CC. The faculty who failed to get a passing rating shall not be certified and this faculty will be recommended the Professor VI position.
- 3.11. CC shall update its recommendation in the validated OSS based on the results of the certification process and submit one (1) original copy to the President on

or before the 30th and the other copy to be filed by the CHED Regional Office for future reference. Both copies must be signed by all the members of the CC. The certification should also be attached to the validated OSS.

- 3.12. The President shall submit the certification and the validated OSS to the Governing Board for confirmation of certification and final decision on or before the 15th of November.

4. SUC Governing Board (SUC-GB)

- 4.1. The respective SUC Governing Boards (GB) shall set a special meeting and act on the recommended evaluation results submitted by the REC, EAC and CC through a Board Resolution.
- 4.2. The Governing Board may constitute an independent committee that will conduct a review of the validated OSS and confirmed ISS. The report of this committee may be used by the Governing Board to determine the appropriate number of sub-ranks that will be awarded to the faculty.
- 4.3. In cases wherein, the recommendations of the independent committee are inconsistent with the REC, EAC or CC recommendations, the Governing Board shall use its discretion and act on the matter accordingly.

Phase III – SUBMISSION TO DBM AND CSC

1. The SUC President shall submit the following document to the Department of Budget and Management Regional Office (DBM-RO) on or before the 15th of December.
 - 1.1. GB Resolution of its final decision on the evaluation results;
 - 1.2. Printout of the Validated Overall Summary Sheet;
 - 1.3. Plantilla of Personnel; and
 - 1.4. Salary Adjustments
 - 1.5. Funding source as certified by the Chief Accountant and Head of the Agency
2. The DBM shall issue the NOSCA which shall be the basis of the SUC for the preparation of appointment to be submitted to the Civil Service Commission.

Figure 1: General Process Flow




Figure 2: Process Flow for Instructors, Assistant Professors and Associate Professors




Figure 3: Process Flow for Professors




Figure 4: Process Flow for College/University Professors

