Guidelines in Forced Ranking the Delivery Units (Campuses) for the Grant of 2015 Performance-Based Bonus (PBB)†

1. The forced ranking of delivery units (i.e., campuses) for the grant of 2015 Performance-Based Bonus (PBB) shall be guided by the Memorandum Circular (MC) 2015-1 titled “Guidelines on the Grant of Performance-Based Bonus for Fiscal Year 2015 Under Executive Order No. 80” issued by the Inter-Agency Task Force (IATF) on the Harmonization of National Government Performance Monitoring, Information and Reporting Systems (Administrative Order No. 25, S. 2011).

2. Campuses shall be rated and ranked based on their accomplishments in the performance targets in all 2015 GAA-based performance indicators along the Major Final Outputs (MFOs - Higher Education, Advanced Education, Research and Extension and Technical Advisory Services), Support to Operations (STO), and General Administrative and Support Services (GASS), which appeared in their approved Campus Performance Targets for 2015.

3. Plat, La-Ho, Carig and Gonzaga campuses shall not be evaluated in MFO 2 as this is not applicable to delivery units without graduate program offerings.

4. Campuses which have not compiled fully well in the Good Governance Conditions shall be disqualified from the grant of PBB 2015.

5. All claims must be supported by credible, clear and convincing documentary evidence which shall be reviewed by the University PBB Team:

5.1. MFO 1 and 2 – Academic/Instruction Affairs Office with Dr. Leticia Dumiao as lead evaluator
5.2. MFO 3 – Research and Development Office with Dr. Ramelo Ramirez Jr. as lead evaluator
5.3. MFO 4 – Extension and Training Office with Prof. Eladia Salabacan as lead evaluator
5.4. STO and Good Governance– Performance Management Team with Atty. Honorato Carag as lead evaluator
5.5 GASS – Financial Management Office with Ms. Vila Bassig as lead evaluator

6. The University has 8 delivery units (or 8 campuses). The total performance of each of these campuses shall be the average of percentage scores each obtained from the enumerated criteria, which are given equal weights. The average points of the campuses along the four criteria (MFO, STO, GASS and Good Governance Conditions) shall be ranked to determine the Best, Better, and Good Campuses. The ranking and distribution to be followed is the one provided for by IATF MC 2015-01:
Applying this system, 10% of eight (8) campuses is 0.8 or 1 best campus, 25% of eight is 2 better campuses, and 65% shall cover the rest of the campuses classified as good delivery units.

7. The Summary of Accomplishments, Rating and Ranking of Campuses shall be presented in the Form A-1 Report of the University required by the Task Force for submission and assessment. The summary shall also be uploaded in the university website and disseminated using other possible channels or platforms of communication.

8. All concerns and clarifications in regard to the rating and ranking shall be submitted in writing to the University Performance Management Committee (UPMC), the group tasked to serve as the Grievance Group for PBB, who shall review the issues and complaints and make proper recommendation/s within 15 calendar days upon receipt of the said complaint. The decision of the UPMC shall be final and executory.
Eligibility of Employees

1. Officials, faculty members, and administrative staff of eligible campuses holding regular plantilla positions and who are casual personnel whose salaries are charged to the lump sum appropriation under PS or contractual employees occupying positions in the DBM-approved contractual staffing pattern, are qualified for the full grant of 2015 PBB if they have:

1.1. Achieved at least 90% of their targets for the year;
1.2. Received a rating of at least “Satisfactory” under the Strategic Performance Management System (SPMS);
1.3. No outstanding cash advance/s as of November 30, 2015;
1.4. Complied with the submission of SALN per RA 6713 and CSC MC No. 3 s. 2015;
1.5. Not been on vacation or sick leave with or without pay for the entire year;
1.6. Not been found guilty of administrative and/or criminal cases filed against them and meted out a penalty in FY 2015 (If penalty meted out is only a reprimand, such penalty shall not cause the disqualification to receive PBB.); and,
1.7. Rendered at least nine (9) months of service during the fiscal year and with a performance rating in accordance with Item 1.2.

2. Permanent faculty members and administrative staff (with the required performance rating) who have rendered a minimum of three (3) months but less than nine (9) months of service due to the following reasons are entitled to receive PBB 2015 on pro-rata basis as presented below.

2.1. being newly hired employee
2.2. retirement
2.3. resignation
2.4. rehabilitation leave
2.5. maternity leave
2.6. vacation or sick leave with or without pay
2.7. scholarship/study leave
2.8. sabbatical leave
Evaluation and Rating of Employees


5. Faculty members and administrative staff of CSU shall be evaluated based on their performance in the two rating periods (Second Semester 2014-2015 and First Semester 2015-2016 for faculty members; January to June 2015 and July to December 2015 for administrative personnel) as reflected on the Individual Performance Commitment Rating (IPCR) and Office Performance Commitment Rating (OPCR) of the CSC-approved Strategic Performance Management System (SPMS) of the University.

6. Faculty members and administrative staff designated as heads of offices such as Vice Presidents, Campus Executive Officers, Deans and Directors shall be evaluated and forced ranked according to the office they supervise and based on the OPCR.

7. Faculty members and administrative staff designated as heads of offices without a staff shall be evaluated and forced ranked based on the IPCR filed.

8. VPs, University Directors/Coordinators and Campus Executive Officers shall be evaluated by the University President using the OPCR.

9. The University President shall be evaluated based on CHED Memorandum No. 4 s. 2015.

10. Faculty members who are designated to multiple administrative positions shall be evaluated and forced ranked based on the OPCR or IPCRs they filed for each position. Their ratings in each position shall be assigned a corresponding proportional percentage to be determined by the college evaluation committee. The sum of all ratings shall be the final mark of the designee.
11. Faculty members handling courses in different colleges during the assessment period shall be evaluated and forced ranked in their main colleges.

12. Faculty members and administrative staff assigned to other campuses (or office) shall be ranked in the campus (or office) where majority of their services were rendered. In case of multiple assignments, the employee shall be ranked in the campus (office) where he or she served the longest during the evaluation period.

13. Faculty members and administrative staff on detail to another government agency for 6 (six) months or more shall be included in the ranking of employees in the recipient agency that rated their performance. Payment of the PBB shall come from the main agency.

14. Faculty members and administrative personnel who transferred from a government agency to CSU shall be rated and forced ranked by the agency where they served the longest. If equal months were served, they will be included in CSU.

15. Each campus shall create a College Evaluation Committee (CED) in each college whose role is to evaluate faculty members based on IPCR/OPCR and shall prepare the individual score sheet for information and signature of individual faculty member. CEC shall discuss with the ratee the result of the rating in a post-conference style in the interest of transparency. It shall prepare the ranking list (indicating the best, better and good faculty members) of the college certified by the dean for submission to the Campus Review Committee (CRC).

16. Evaluation and ratings shall be based on documentary evidence which will be secured by the committee from concerned offices.

17. Since not all campuses have the same situation, here is how campuses proceed with the organization of their CECs:

17.1. CSU Gonzaga, CSU Piat, CSU Lal-lo, CSU Sanchez Mira and CSU Aparri shall cluster its colleges to form CECs. Using this system, Gonzaga shall create two committees. Piat, 4, Lal-lo, 2, Sanchez Mira, 3 and Aparri 3. The said committee shall include the dean, who has the most number of staff, as chair, department chairs and extension and research coordinators, as members.

17.2. CSU Lasam shall not anymore create a college evaluation committee, considering its present number of personnel. It shall only organize a campus evaluation and review committee for the faculty members and administrative personnel. This is to be chaired by the CEO with members: college deans, PBB campus contact persons, administrative personnel association president, and faculty association president. Campus research and extension coordinators shall sit in the committee when the personnel being rated is a faculty member.
17.3. CSU Carig shall have a CEC in each college except veterinary medicine, medicine and public administration and human kinetics which shall be clustered to form one committee, whose membership includes those enumerated in 17.1.

17.4. Deans and those named to sit in the college evaluation committee, who are designated as campus PBB contact persons, shall no longer participate in the college evaluation process to avoid multiple assignments.

18. Campuses shall also create an Administrative Personnel Evaluation Committee (APEC) that will solely assess and rank administrative staff including those working in colleges. The composition: CEO (Chair) and heads of offices including deans with administrative staff, as members. This committee shall exercise the same duties mentioned in items 15 and 16 for CECs.

19. The campus shall also create a Campus Review Committee (CRC) that will verify the forced ranking list submitted by the CEC and that will, in full deliberations, finalize the list of forced ranked employees of the campuses. It shall also entertain and decide on queries and complaints of employees in regard to the result of the forced ranking in the college level. The decision of the campus review committee shall be final.

20. CRC shall be composed of the Campus Executive Officer as chair, and the campus administrative personnel association president, campus faculty association president, campus PBB contact persons, one senior faculty member handpicked by the Campus Faculty Association, as members.

21. However, in the case of Andrews Campus, since its set up is different from the other campuses, it shall create its own campus review committee and determine its membership.

22. To facilitate the completion of the forced ranking list, CECs, APECs and CRCs shall devise a proportional allocation formula, which is scientifically and statistically acceptable, to determine who and how many will be best, better and good among the faculty and administrative employees to be fair to all. The list should also be guided by the result of the ranking and distribution for PBB 2015 described in full in item 28.

23. Full deliberations in the college and campus level shall be conducted to address cases of ties in ranking. CECs, APECs and CRCs shall put up a logical and reasonable system of breaking ties based on the most scientific conventions of statistics and on available documents.

24. The forced ranking list of the campus shall be forwarded by the Campus Executive Officers to the University Performance Management Committee (UPMC) for verification. UPMC is chaired by Atty. Honorato M. Carag, with members: Dr. Mariden Ventura, Dr. Leticia Dumiao, Dr. Perfecto Vivit, Ms. Rachel Miguel, Mrs. Viva M. Bassig and Ms. Noamah Lasam.

25. Result of the verified ranking shall be posted on the bulletin boards or websites of the campuses for information-dissemination for at least two weeks, within which all inquiries or concerns regarding the result should have been formally elevated to the UPMC, for action.
26. The UPMC approved ranking shall be used to identify who among the employees will be best, better and good in the forced ranked campus following the category provided for in Section 7 of IATF-MC 2015-1 and EO 80 S. 2012:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivery Unit/Campus Category</th>
<th>Individual Category/Proportion of Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Best Performer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Delivery Unit</td>
<td>Php35,000 (20% of eligible employees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Delivery Unit</td>
<td>Php25,000 (15% of eligible employees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Delivery Unit</td>
<td>Php15,000 (10% of eligible employees)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. The verified and confirmed Forced Ranking List of each campus shall be forwarded to the PBB Focal Person for the completion of CSU Form 1 to be submitted to the Department of Budget and Management Regional Office 02. The form, which shall bear the signatures of the PBB Focal Person, UPMC Chair, Financial Management Officer, and the University President, shall be used as basis for the payout of the PBB 2015.

*Approved on January 19, 2016 during the meeting of the University President with the University officials, campus executive officers, university deans, associate deans, PBB Contact Persons, and members of the University Performance Management Committee held at CSU Lao-Is Campus.
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