



POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY OF THE PHILIPPINES
COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
COMPUTER ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

PF S.1

PARAMETER F: PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE AND SCHOLARLY WORKS

SYSTEM - INPUTS AND PROCESSES

S.1. The institution has a system of evaluating the faculty on the following:

S.1.1. professional performance; and

Documents attached:

- PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SYSTEM FOR ACADEMIC AREA
- PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SYSTEM FOR ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL



POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY OF THE PHILIPPINES
COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
COMPUTER ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY OF THE PHILIPPINES
Sta. Mesa, Manila

Performance Evaluation System
For Academic Area

Rationale

Evaluation is a management function which is positioned on the concept that personnel development is better directed by an initial analysis of the present personnel situation. The results of the performance evaluation therefore will serve as a guide in improving the individual personnel even as it defines and identifies the level and quality of his performance in a stated period.

Objective of the Performance Evaluation

The PUP Performance Evaluation for academic personnel hopes to:

- find out the level of classroom performance of the faculty based on the student, area chairperson and dean's assessment
- discover the level of performance of the faculty in teaching-related activities
- know individual faculty output in research, teaching/testing materials, educational devices, inventions/discoveries

Conceptual Framework

1. Level of faculty performance shall be classified as outstanding very satisfactory, fair and poor.
2. Classroom performance shall be base on ratings given by students, area chairpersons and deans*
 - 2.1 Student ratings shall be drawn from the results of the PUP Students Evaluation Instrument administered to four (4) classes/sections in the case of full-time faculty and two (2) classes in the case of part-time faculty.
 - 2.2 Rating of the area chairpersons and deans shall be drawn from observations or other strategies which shall be agreed upon in the College.



POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY OF THE PHILIPPINES
COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
COMPUTER ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

3. Performance in teaching-related activities shall be based on documents covering:
 - 3.1 Attendance in University functions/assignments like:
 - 3.1.1 Commencement Exercises
 - 3.1.2 Academic Council Meeting
 - 3.1.3 University Foundation Activities
 - 3.1.4 University Seminar/Workshops
 - 3.1.5 University entrance Examination
 - 3.2 Timely submission of accurate reports, like:
 - 3.2.1 Grade Sheets
 - 3.2.2 Enrolment reports
 - 3.2.3 Committee reports
 - 3.2.4 Daily Time Record
 - 3.2.5 Other reports required by the College/University
4. Research/Writing Output shall be based on:
 - 4.1 Relevant research report submitted
 - 4.2 Teaching materials submitted for use in the Department
 - 4.3 Testing materials, validated or in the process of validation submitted to the Department
 - 4.4 Original/Modified educational devices submitted
 - 4.5 Inventories, discoveries related to field of study submitted.
5. An enhancement factor like those cited below may be given an additional 5% over and above the total ratings:
 - 5.1 Voluntary assistance in college activities.
 - 5.2 Enrolment in graduate school without reducing efficient performance in the classroom and job-related activities.
 - 5.3 Tangible contribution to the University without lowering efficient performance in the classroom and job-related activities.



POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY OF THE PHILIPPINES
COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
COMPUTER ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

Measure

1. Over all Descriptive and Quantitative Evaluation

Descriptive	Overall Rating
Outstanding	Above 80% - 100%
Very Satisfactory	Above 60% - 80%
Satisfactory	Above 50% - 60%
Fair	Above 20% - 50%
Poor	20% and below

2. Performance Rating

	Weight
2.1 Classroom Performance	60%
2.1.1 Weight of Student Evaluation	30%
2.1.2 Weight of Area Chairperson's Evaluation	15%
2.1.3 Weight of Deans Evaluation	15%
2.2 Performance in Job-Related Activities	30%
2.2.1 Attendance in University Function	15%
2.2.2 Submission of Reports	15%
2.3 Output in Research/Writing/Invention/Discoveries	10%

3. Operational Interpretation of Performance Rating

3.1 Classroom Performance

	O	VS	S	F	P
3.1.1 Student Evaluation	30	24	18	12	6
3.1.2 Area Chairperson's Evaluation	15	12	9	6	3
3.1.3 Dean's Evaluation	15	12	9	6	3
Sub-total	60	48	36	24	12

3.1.4 Range for classroom performance

Outstanding	More than 48 to 60
Very Satisfactory	More than 36 to 48
Satisfactory	More than 24 to 36
Fair	More than 12 to 24
Poor	12 and less



POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY OF THE PHILIPPINES
COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
COMPUTER ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

3.1.5 Performance in Job-related Activities

3.2.1 *Perfect Attendance Outstanding
 Zero Attendance Poor

*VS to F should be based on No. of official University/College activities during the semester and number of attended/unattended activities.

3.2.2 **Timely submission of accurate reports Outstanding
 Non-submission one Month after due date Poor

**VS to F should be based on number of reports submitted/not submitted on time and number of reports accurately/inaccurately done.

3.2.3 Equivalent

	O	VS	S	F	P
3.2.3.1 Attendance in University Function (15%)	15	12	9	6	3
3.2.3.2 Submission Of reports (15%)	<u>15</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>3</u>
Sub-total	30	24	18	12	6

3.2.4 Range for Rating in Job-Related Performance

Outstanding more than 24 to 30
 Very Satisfactory more than 18 to 24
 Satisfactory more than 12 to 18
 Fair more than 6 to 12
 Poor 6 or less

3.3 Output in research, etc.

Evaluation should be based on quality and quantity of output, emphasis being on quality



POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY OF THE PHILIPPINES
COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
COMPUTER ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

3.3.1 Range for Rating

Outstanding	more than 9 – 10
Very Satisfactory	more than 6 – 8
Satisfactory	more than 4 – 6
Fair	more than 2 – 4
Poor	less than 2

3.4 Summary of Maximum Points per Level of Performance

	O	VS	S	F	P
Classroom Performance	60	48	36	24	12
Performance in Job Related Activities	30	24	18	12	6
Output in Research /Writing, etc	10	8	6	4	2
Total, Maximum For Each Level	100	80	60	50	20

3.5 Range Based on Total Points

Outstanding	above 80 to 100
Very Satisfactory	above 60 to 80
Satisfactory	above 50 to 60
Fair	above 20 to 50
Poor	20 and below

Frequency of Evaluation

Performance appraisal in the academic area shall be done at every end of the term – first semester and second semester. A schedule shall be set up by the College for the purpose.

Appeal

Any dissenting view on the final assessment rating should be discussed and settled at the College level between the faculty and the area chairperson or the Dean within two (2) weeks after the release of the ratings. The faculty has the right to appeal to the Vice President for Academic Affairs for legitimate complaint.



POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY OF THE PHILIPPINES
COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
COMPUTER ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY OF THE PHILIPPINES
Human Resource Management Division

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SYSTEM
For Administrative Personnel

Pursuant to the provisions of Rule IX of the Omnibus Rules Implementing Book V of Executive Order No. 292, which took effect on February 14, 1992, the Performance Evaluation System is hereby established. The System shall have the following integral components:

I. OBJECTIVES

1. To serve as reference in performance planning and review;
2. To promote the most effective use of manpower in the organization in order that the employee makes his/her optimum contribution in the delivery of basic services;
3. To serve as an objective basis for all personnel actions such as promotion, transfer, reassignment, demotion and separation; and
4. To serve as reference in the grant of performance-based salary step increment as provided for by the CSC-DBM Joint Circular No. 1, s. 1990; and for other incentives and rewards that may be provided under the approved Employee Suggestions and Incentive Awards System of the agency.

II. BASIC POLICIES

1. The Performance Evaluation System shall be made an integral part of the HRD of the agency.
2. Appraisal shall focus on results/outputs rather than on activities/processes.
3. Employees shall be given appropriate recognition for their performance and contribution to the overall effectiveness and efficiency of the organization.
4. Each supervisor and subordinate shall be informed of his rights and obligation under the Performance Evaluation System and be periodically informed of his progress.



POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY OF THE PHILIPPINES
COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
COMPUTER ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

5. Appropriate training opportunities shall be continually provided to facilitate effective implementation of this System.

III. **SCOPE.** The System shall apply to all career employees. Non-career employees may also use the PES for purposes of future personnel actions.

IV. **RATING PERIODS.** Performance evaluation shall be done every six (6) months ending on June 30 and December 30 of every year. However, if there is a need for a shorter or longer period, the minimum appraisal period shall be at least ninety (90) days or three months while the maximum shall not be longer than one (1) year.

V. **MECHANICS OF THE SYSTEM.** The performance evaluation procedure shall follow the following processes:

1. **Planning.** There shall be a planning session at the start of the rating period during which targets or expected outputs shall be set jointly by the supervisor and employees. Furthermore, the supervisor and employees define the job of each member of the group, agree on the duties and responsibilities attached to a particular job, and establish the standards on which specific work outputs and behaviors shall be measured.
2. **Setting Commitments.** Targets/major duties and responsibilities established during the planning session shall be listed in the Performance Evaluation Report Form under the "Planned" column. Agreements shall be jointly signed by both parties.
3. **Progress Review.** This process involves a discussion between a supervisor and subordinate using the following steps:
 - a. Subordinate reviews the progress of all the jobs assigned to him.
 - b. The supervisor reinforces progress on job goals already accomplished by recognizing employee's efforts and praising him for specific achievements.
 - c. They both discuss goals and standards not being met and identify causes.
 - d. They identify and agree on appropriate action to overcome causes of difficulties.
 - e. They re-negotiate goals and standards where necessary.
4. **Appraisal Discussion.** There shall be a highly interactive performance appraisal discussion and feedback mechanism to foster better working relationship between supervisor and subordinate.



POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY OF THE PHILIPPINES
COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
COMPUTER ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

Major Steps in the Appraisal Discussion:

1. Establish rapport with the subordinate employee.
2. Get the employee's view of his own performance.
3. Present your own view with emphasis on strengths and weaknesses.
4. Get reaction from the subordinate.
5. Discuss areas of agreement and disagreement.
6. Resolve the difference.
7. Summarize and conclude.
8. Write down agreements re rating, strengths and development areas, plans for improvement.
9. Acknowledge agreement by signing the Report Form.

To ensure the success of the discussion, the specific roles that supervisor and employee must play are hereby set:

Subordinate's role:

1. Summarize his achievements and/or failures for the whole rating period.
2. Defend the rating he thinks he deserves.
3. Offer suggestions to improve his own performance.
4. Offer suggestions on how his/her supervisor can help to make him more productive and effective.

Supervisor's role:

1. Make the employee feel at ease during the discussion.
2. Inform the employee on whether or not he is meeting job expectations.
3. Summarize the employee's performance during the rating period.
4. Defend the rating he thinks the employee deserves.
5. Give proper degree of praise and constructive criticism.
6. Listen to employee's concerns.
7. Provide encouragement and motivation.
8. Counsel on improvement areas.
9. Secure employee's acknowledgment of the employee's rating.

VI. MECHANICS OF RATING

A. Appraisal



POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY OF THE PHILIPPINES
COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
COMPUTER ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

1. The employee evaluates his own work performance and behavior using the standards set for specific work outputs and behavioral factors affecting performance.

The evaluation shall be based on the information contained in the division logbook, attendance records, production/accomplishment reports and other relevant documents.

2. The supervisor and employee must meet to discuss and agree on the rating and develop plans for work improvement.
3. The rater and employee complete the Job Accomplishment Form and accomplish the Performance Evaluation Report Form.
4. The fully accomplished forms are submitted to the authorized official for review. If the authorized official agrees with the employee's rating, he signs the Report Form. Otherwise, he shall notify the employee and rater and discuss the change in the rating with them. The revised rating shall be initiated by the employee, rater and reviewer.
5. The original copy of the final rating shall be sent to the Personnel Division/Office of the Administrator, copy furnished the employee and the rater.
6. If the employee disagrees with the final rating of his performance, he shall also sign the report and/or initial the changes. He may then appeal his rating in accordance with the rules and procedures for the purpose.

B. How to Compute the Rating for Job Accomplishment

The Performance Evaluation Report Form shall contain the statements of major duties and responsibilities of an employee.

1. To get the Average Point Score, add all the scores assigned under "Quantity", "Quality", and "Time" by the total number of entries.
2. Multiply the Average Point Score by 0.7 (70%) to get the Equivalent Point Score.

C. How to Rate Employee's Behavior

1. The graphic scale presents four (4) behavioral factors for non-supervisor and five (5) for supervisors, affecting the performance of every employee.
2. For each factor, there are five (5) levels of performance or anchors which range from Outstanding (10) to Poor (2). Choose the level of performance that gives the most accurate description of the employee's behavior.



POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY OF THE PHILIPPINES
COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
COMPUTER ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

3. Add all the corresponding scores and divide the sum by the total number of behavioral factors to get the Average Point Score.
4. Multiply the Average Point Score by 0.3 (30%) to get the Equivalent Point Score.

D. How to Determine the Overall Rating?

The overall rating is computed by adding the Equivalent Point Score for both Job Accomplishment and Behavior. The sum is the overall rating. Use the following rating scale to find the equivalent adjectival rating of the obtained overall rating.

<u>Overall Rating</u>	<u>Adjectival Rating</u>
9.4 - 10.0	Outstanding
7.6 - 9.3	Very Satisfactory
4.6 - 7.5	Satisfactory
2.8 - 4.5	Unsatisfactory
2.0 - 2.7	Poor

The adjectival ratings are defined as follows:

OUTSTANDING. An employee shall be given this rating when he exceeds his target by at least fifty percent (50%). It represents an extraordinary level of achievement and commitment in terms of quality and time, technical skills and knowledge, ingenuity, creativity and initiative. Employees at this performance level should have demonstrated exceptional job mastery in all major areas of responsibility. His achievement and contributions to the organization are of marked excellence which even his peers recognize through a forced comparison/distribution method established by the agency concerned.

VERY SATISFACTORY. An employee shall be given this rating when he exceeds the expected output/performance by at least 25% but falls short of what is considered an outstanding performance. In addition, his competence and contributions will be recognized by his peers also through a forced comparison/distribution method established by the agency concerned. Those screened out in the forced comparison/distribution for "Outstanding" performers shall be included in this category.

Only employees with "Outstanding" and "Very Satisfactory" performance ratings shall be considered for promotion.

SATISFACTORY. An employee shall be given this rating when he meets one hundred percent (100%) the standard or ordinary requirements of the duties of the position.



POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY OF THE PHILIPPINES
COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
COMPUTER ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

Those screened out in the forced comparison/distribution for "Very Satisfactory" performers shall be included in this category.

UNSATISFACTORY. An employee shall be given this rating when his performance is fifty-one percent to ninety-nine percent (51%-99%) of the minimum requirements but could stand improvement. It is expected that in the next rating period the employee, under close supervision, will either improve his performance for which he shall be given a "Satisfactory" rating, or if not, he shall get another "Unsatisfactory" rating.

Two (2) successive "Unsatisfactory" rating shall be a ground for separation from the service.

POOR. An employee shall be given this rating when he fails to meet performance requirements or meets fifty percent or below of the minimum requirements and there is no evidence to show that he can improve his performance.

A rating of "Poor" shall be ground for separation.

WHEN TO GIVE AN OVERALL RATING OF "OUTSTANDING"

An "Outstanding" rating shall be recommended only by the rater when performance evaluation indicates that all of the following conditions are fulfilled:

1. In all aspects of his work, the employee exceeds requirements so far that he should be considered for commendation for each aspect;
2. It can be demonstrated that positive, constructive results have been achieved.
3. This performance is typical of the entire period over which the rating extends; and
4. It represents actual accomplishment rather than merely extra effort.

When the supervisor feels that he can justify each of the points mentioned above, he should attach to the performance report form the following:

1. Current job description;
2. Performance standards of satisfactory performance;
3. Statements describing specific performance during the rating period which sufficiently exceeded the standards and requirements (150%); and
4. Evidence to support above statements such as copies of production records, logbook, commendations, description of incidents of unusual results achieved.



POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY OF THE PHILIPPINES
COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
COMPUTER ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

GENERAL STANDARDS

The following general standards of outputs shall be adapted in the preparation of specific standards for different functions:

A. Timeliness

- 10 - Task completed within 1/2 of the time required to finish it.
- 8 - Task completed within 2/3 of the time required to finish it.
- 6 - Task completed just before or on the deadline.
- 4 - Task partially completed at the deadline.
- 2 - Task not yet begun at the expected date of completion.

B. Quality of Written Work

- 10 - No mistakes or deficiency; every aspect of work assignment well covered;
- 8 - clearly presented; well organized.
- 6 - One or two minor errors or deficiencies; work in accordance with instructions, clearly presented; well organized.
- 4 - More than two minor errors or deficiencies; major revision needed.
- 2 - One or two major errors or deficiencies; major revision needed. Work not acceptable; needs total revision.

C. Quality of Non-Written Assignment

- 10 - Excellent result; all aspects of work assignment thoroughly covered.
- 8 - One or two minor errors in the execution of work assignment; results still very good.
- 6 - More than two minor errors or deficiencies in the execution of work assignment; results are acceptable.
- 4 - One major error or deficiency that can be overcome with help from superior.
- 2 - Haphazard or careless execution of work assignment; unacceptable results.

D. Volume of Work

- 10 - Target or quota exceeded by 50% or more.
- 8 - Target or quota exceeded by 10% - 45%.
- 6 - Target or quota accomplished as expected.
- 4 - Only 60% - 95% of target or quota accomplished.
- 2 - Less than 60% of quota or target accomplished.



POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY OF THE PHILIPPINES
COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
COMPUTER ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

HOW TO COMPUTE THE RATING

PART I. PERFORMANCE (70%)

1. Add all the total ratings obtained under Quantity, Quality, Timeliness.
2. Divide the sum by the number of ratings to get the Average Point Score.
3. Multiply the Average Point Score by 0.7 to get the Equivalent Point Score.

PART II. BEHAVIORAL DIMENSIONS (30%)

1. Add all the total ratings obtained for each behavioral factor.
2. Divide the sum by the number of behavioral factors to get the Average Point Score.
3. Multiply the Average Point Score by 0.3 to get the Equivalent Point Score.

To get the Overall Point Score, add the Equivalent Point Score of Part I and Part II. Convert the Overall Point Score into its Equivalent Numerical Rating and Equivalent Adjectival Rating by referring to the table below:

OVERALL POINT SCORE	EQUIVALENT NUMERICAL RATING	EQUIVALENT ADJECTIVAL RATING
9.4 - 10.0	10	Outstanding
7.6 - 9.3	8	Very Satisfactory
4.6 - 7.5	6	Satisfactory
2.8 - 4.5	4	Unsatisfactory
2.0 - 2.7	2	Poor

Reference: CSC-MC No. 12, s. 1993
c:pereval/cpr/022599

VII. MECHANISM OF APPEAL

An employee who expresses dissatisfaction with the rating given him may appeal to the Grievance Committee established under CSC MC No. 45, s. 1989 within fifteen (15) days after receipt of his copy of Performance Appraisal Report.

Only those employees who receive an overall rating equivalent to Poor, Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory, and Very Satisfactory shall have the right of appeal to the Grievance Committee.

Who may Appeal a Performance Rating. Within fifteen (15) days after receiving an official copy of his rating, an employee may file an appeal in writing specifying what his



POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY OF THE PHILIPPINES
COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
COMPUTER ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

performance rating should be, the reasons therefore, and supporting documents to support his appeal.

VIII. SANCTION

Administrative action shall be filed against an employee using the performance evaluation system to give undue advantage or disadvantage to the employees they rate.

Procedure of filing complaints and imposing sanctions shall be in accordance with CSC MC No. 30 and No. 32, s. 1989, and the Omnibus Rules Implementing Book V of EO 292.



POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY OF THE PHILIPPINES
COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
COMPUTER ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

PF S.2

S.1. The institution has a system of evaluating the faculty on the following:

S.1.2. scholarly works

Documents attached:

- IMPLEMENTING GUIDELINES ON MERIT PROMOTION ON THE BASIS OF RESEARCH PUBLICATION
AND CITATION



POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY OF THE PHILIPPINES
COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
COMPUTER ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT



Republic of the Philippines
POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY OF THE PHILIPPINES
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

MEMORANDUM ORDER
No. 012, Series of 2017

PUP - Central Records Section	
Received by: <i>Roberto S. Palilio</i>	
<i>02/17/17</i>	<i>J:20</i>
Date:	Time:

TO : ALL CONCERNED

SUBJECT: IMPLEMENTING GUIDELINES ON MERIT PROMOTION ON THE BASIS OF RESEARCH PUBLICATION AND CITATION

DATE : February 9, 2017

In accordance with the decision made by the PUP Board of Regents in its 155th Regular Meeting, the following implementing guidelines on merit promotion on the basis of research publication and citation is hereby promulgated.

Section 1.0 Rationale

The University, as approved by the Board of Regents during its 142nd Regular Meeting held on October 18, 2013 per Board Resolution No. 985, provides an opportunity for faculty members to avail of merit promotion scheme on the basis of research publication and citation.

In this promotion scheme, a faculty member who has published a paper or is cited in national or international refereed or peer-reviewed journals (ISI/Scopus-indexed) shall be entitled to either one rank or sub-rank promotion.

The objectives of the scheme are (1) *to encourage and reinforce research productivity of faculty members*; (2) *to provide due reward to faculty members who actively involve themselves in research undertakings*; and (3) *to motivate faculty members to be more vigorous in their responsibility as academic researchers*.

Section 2.0 Definitions

2.1 *National Journal Publication* refers to journal publication accredited/recognized by the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) through its Journal Accreditation Service (JAS). To gain points from this scheme, accreditation of CHED-JAS would suffice for national journal publication regardless of whether or not the journal is indexed by ISI/Scopus.

2.2 *International Journal Publication* refers to those that include papers authored by researchers/contributors from across geographic locations and with international editorial board composition. To gain points from this scheme, international journal publication must necessarily be indexed by ISI/Scopus.

2nd floor South Wing PUP A, Mabini Campus Anonas Street, Sta. Mesa, Manila Phone: (Direct Line) 716-1143; Telefax: 7162644
(Trunk Line) 3351-777/787 local 201/202/658/659; website: www.pup.edu.ph e-mail: president@pup.edu.ph

“THE COUNTRY’S 1ST POLYTECHNICU”



POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY OF THE PHILIPPINES
COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
COMPUTER ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

2

2.3 *International Scientific Information (ISI)* offers a bibliographic database services and citation indexing and analysis. Its databases cover thousands of academic journals in the fields of science, engineering, arts, humanities, business, etc. The indexing also provides information as to the impact factor of each journal listed in its databases. ISI is internationally recognized as the most reliable and reputable index of scholarly journals in the world.

2.4 *Scopus* offers bibliographic databases, citation indexing and analysis. It covers thousands of peer-reviewed literatures and journals from educational institutions and professional organizations.

Section 3.0 Eligibility

Only permanent, regular faculty members with at least master's degree can avail of this scheme.

Section 4.0 Evaluation

4.1 An Ad Hoc Committee will be constituted by the Office of the Vice President for Research, Extension, Planning and Development to evaluate the documents submitted by the applicants. The Committee shall be composed of a Chair (Vice President for Research, Extension, Planning, and Development), a Co-chair (Faculty Regent), and three members.

4.2 The results of the evaluation of the Ad Hoc Committee will be submitted to the Research Management Office (RMO) which shall serve as Secretariat.

4.3 The decision of the Ad Hoc Committee will be forwarded to the Executive Committee for endorsement to and confirmation by the Board of Regents.

Section 5.0 Documentary Requirements

The following documentary requirements must be submitted to the Research Management Office:

5.1 Letter of Application to the University President through the Vice President for Research, Extension, Planning and Development which states among others his/her intention to avail the merit promotion scheme on the basis of his/her research publication and citation;

5.2 Tabular list of researches completed and published within the last three years or tabular list of publications where the applicant's work was cited within the last five years;

5.3 Copies of published journal articles or journal articles where the applicant's research work/article was cited;

2nd floor South Wing PUP A, Mabini Campus Anonas Street, Sta. Mesa, Manila Phone: (Direct Line) 716-1143; Telefax: 7162644
(Trunk Line) 3351-777/787 local 201/202/658/659; website: www.pup.edu.ph e-mail: president@pup.edu.ph

"THE COUNTRY'S 1ST POLYTECHNICU"



POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY OF THE PHILIPPINES
COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
COMPUTER ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

3

5.4 Proof/s of the ISI/Scopus Indexing/CHED accreditation/recognition of the journals on which the articles appeared (e.g certification, CHED Memorandum, etc.); and

5.5 Other incidental requirements as may be deemed necessary.

Section 6.0 Point and Credit System

6.1 Only full papers/research outputs published in peer-reviewed or refereed journals indexed by ISI/Scopus (for international journals) and recognized by the Commission on Higher Education (for national journals) shall be granted credits or points.

6.2 Point-system shall be employed in assigning the required points/scores for promotion which is based on the faculty member's current rank, and the level at which the work appeared for publication.

6.3 An applicant for the Instructor sub-ranks must earn at least 15 points to be considered for a one (1) sub-rank promotion.

6.4 An applicant for the Assistant Professor rank and sub-ranks must earn at least 20 points to be considered for a one (1) rank, in case the applicant is Instructor III at the time of application, and sub-rank promotion.

6.5 An applicant for the Associate Professor rank and sub-ranks must earn at least 30 points to be considered for a one (1) rank, in case the applicant is Assistant Professor IV at the time of application, and sub-rank promotion.

6.6 An applicant with rank of Associate Professor V is not allowed to apply for a Professor rank as per the limitations of the power of the University President in merit promotion provided by the Civil Service Commission. However, an applicant who earned at least 40 points may avail the maximum allowable increment step/s.

6.7 An applicant for the Professor sub-ranks must earn at least 40 points to be considered for a one (1) sub-rank promotion.

The table below illustrates the matrix for assigning credits for promotion based on research publication and citation.

2nd floor South Wing PUP A. Mabini Campus Anonas Street, Sta. Mesa, Manila Phone: (Direct Line) 716-1143; Telefax: 7162644
(Trunk Line) 3351-777/787 local 201/202/658/659; website: www.pup.edu.ph e-mail: president@pup.edu.ph

"THE COUNTRY'S 1ST POLYTECHNICU"



Table 1: Matrix for Assigning Credits for Promotion of Faculty Members based on CHED-Accredited/Recognized Journals and ISI/Scopus-indexed Publications

Peer-Reviewed/Refereed Journal				Total points to be earned to get a sub-rank or rank promotion
Authorship	Nature	National (CHED Accredited)	International ISI/Scopus-indexed	
Sole	Publication	10 points	20 points	Instructor 15 Points
Multiple		The points shall be divided among the number of authors of the journal article.	The points shall be divided among the number of authors of the journal article.	Assistant Professor 20 Points Associate Professor ¹ 30 Points Professor 40 Points

Table 2: Matrix for Assigning Credits for Promotion of Faculty Members based on Citation in CHED Accredited/Recognized Journals and ISI/Scopus Publications

Peer-Reviewed/Refereed Journal				Total points to be earned to get a sub-rank or rank promotion
Authorship	Nature	National (CHED Accredited)	International ISI/Scopus Indexed	
Sole	Citation	5 points	10 points	Instructor 15 Points
Multiple		The points shall be divided among the number of authors of the journal article.	The points shall be divided among the number of authors of the journal article.	Assistant Professor 20 Points Associate Professor ² 30 Points Professor 40 Points

Illustration: A faculty member must accumulate the number of points corresponding to his/her target rank or sub rank. For instance, an Instructor I to be promoted to next higher sub-rank (Instructor II) must earn a total of at least 15 points or an Instructor III to be promoted to Assistant Professor I (one rank) must earn a total of at least 20 points.

Section 7.0 Limitation of Promotion

- 7.1 This promotion scheme shall only be limited to a one-step leap notwithstanding the number of accumulated points or credits.
- 7.2 In case that there is unavailability of job items (plantilla items), the applicant will avail the promotion upon its availability or may avail the maximum permissible increment step/s while waiting for the availability of job items (plantilla items).
- 7.3 This promotion is limited only to the change of rank or sub-rank from Instructor to Associate Professor V levels and within the sub-ranks of Professor level. However, in case of an applicant with Associate Professor V rank, he/she is not covered by this set of guidelines.

¹ Please refer to Section 6.6 and Section 7.3.

² Please refer to Section 6.6 and Section 7.3.

2nd floor South Wing PUP A. Mabini Campus Anonas Street, Sta. Mesa, Manila Phone: (Direct Line) 716-1143; Telefax: 7162644 (Trunk Line) 3351-777/787 local 201/202/658/659 ; website: www.pup.edu.ph e-mail: president@pup.edu.ph

“THE COUNTRY’S 1ST POLYTECHNICU”



POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY OF THE PHILIPPINES
COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
COMPUTER ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

5

- 7.4 This set of guidelines is subject to the existing rules and regulations of the Civil Service Commission on the power of the University President in implementing merit promotion.

Section 8.0 Repealing Clause

This set of guidelines repeals all circulars and memoranda that are not consistent herewith.

Section 9.0 Effectivity

Effective immediately upon approval by the Board of Regents on December 17, 2016.


EMANUEL C. DE GUZMAN, PhD
President

2nd floor South Wing PUP A, Mabini Campus Anonas Street, Sta. Mesa, Manila Phone: (Direct Line) 716-1143; Telefax: 7162644
(Trunk Line) 3351-777/787 local 201/202/658/659 ; website: www.pup.edu.ph e-mail: president@pup.edu.ph

“THE COUNTRY’S 1ST POLYTECHNICU”