



14 February 2022

MEMORANDUM CIRCULAR NO. 18

Series of 2022

**T O: All Faculty Concerned
Department Personnel Committee
College Personnel Committee
VSU NBC 461 Evaluation Committee**

R E: Qualitative Contribution Evaluation (QCE) for the NBC 461 8th Cycle

This pertains to the implementation of the NBC 461 8th cycle using the NBC 461 7th cycle guidelines.

Since the Qualitative Contribution Evaluation (QCE) is part of the 7th cycle of NBC 461 and still no final modification of guidelines for the 8th cycle by the TWG, faculty concerned shall comply and submit the supporting documents in addition to the CCE. QCE is the process of determining the eligibility of faculty for the particular rank or sub-rank indicated by the CCE.

The QCE documents shall be accomplished and submitted in another folder per faculty with the following schedule of submission.

- Individual Faculty to Department Personnel Committee (DPC) - February 18, 2022
- DPC to College Personnel Committee - February 25, 2022
- College Personnel Committee to Institution NBC 461 Committee - March 4, 2022

Please find attached relevant QCE guideline and forms for your reference and compliance.


EDGARDO E. TULIN
President

QUALITATIVE CONTRIBUTION EVALUATION (QCE) OF THE NATIONAL BUDGET CIRCULAR (NBC) No. 461

Introduction

The Qualitative Contribution Evaluation (QCE) of the National Budget Circular No. 461 practices of the State Universities and Colleges (SUC's) is an integral and effective component of total quality assurance in public tertiary education. It is designed to make an effective motivator for the development of a culture of excellence in: Instruction, Research, Extension, and Production. That QCE would make as an effective reliable measure for faculty ranking among the public tertiary institution.

Qualitative Contribution Evaluation is a validating factor of CCE with two levels: First is QCE for instructors, assistant Professors and associate Professors is focused on instructions/teaching effectiveness. This however shall not prevent a faculty from having other functions. Second is QCE for full-fledged Professor is focused to research, extension, and production on top of or in addition to instructional functions.

Full-fledged Professors be rated on Instruction (50%) and mandatory on Research (50%) without prejudice to having other functions.

This manual of operation will be helpful in the conduct of QCE to the school system in reference to the objectives of it, as it is done in order to attain and achieve its very objectives towards quality and excellence in education through the performance and competencies of the faculty in the public tertiary institution.

Definition of Terms

The definitions of the technical terms presented are quoted from the implementing guidelines of Quality Contribution Evaluation (Annex 1 and 2) of the NBC 461, signed by PASUC President Dr. Eldigario D. Gonzales and CHED Chairman Dr. Carlito S. Puno (2006).

Areas of Evaluation. It refers to the four areas of concern of QCE such as Instruction, Research, Extension, and Production; where the academic rank holder is evaluated.

- **Instruction.** It refers to the teaching effectiveness and its delivery that eventually results in academic excellence. Teaching effectiveness of faculty members is evaluated using the assessment areas which are the commitment, knowledge of subject matter, teaching for independent learning and management of learning.
- **Research.** It refers to the scientific investigation duly approved by the university/college authority and it is evaluated using the four (4) assessment areas such as; clientele satisfaction, leadership, partnership development, community responsibility.
- **Extension.** It refers to the activities/projects/programs conducted by a faculty include technology verification, packaging, managing/facilitating non-formal/non-degree trainings, consultancy and speakership in trainings/seminars/symposia/convocations, community development activities, people empowerment/capability building, radio programs and development/publication/dissemination of manuals, brochures, pamphlets, leaflets, technoguide and newsletters, and the assessment areas are clientele satisfaction, leadership, partnership development, community responsibility.

- **Production.** Refers to all activities related to the production of goods and services supportive to the programs of the College/University/Institution, and the assessment areas are clientele satisfaction, leadership, partnership development, community responsibility.

Clientele Satisfaction. This is a strategic concept for the overall institutional image as the SUC seeks continuous improvement toward excellence. It is based on the belief that the quality of education will improve as the clientele (i.e. students, parents, community) assume more responsibility for the value of education they draw from the institution. This demands constant sensitivity to clientele requirements and measurements of the factors that drive clientele satisfaction. Equally, this demands awareness of the latest developments in education and rapid response to the clientele requirements thereby improving both the quality of education and the relationships with students, parents, and community.

Commitment. This refers to a faculty member's deep sense of responsibility to render service for the development of the student's well-being and for the advancement of his/her discipline.

Common Criteria for Evaluation. The CCE is a set of factors of services and achievements which establish the relative performance of a faculty in the state university or college for the period of evaluation. This refers to a faculty member's deep sense of responsibility to render service for the development of the student's well-being and for the advancement of his/her discipline.

Community Responsibility. Education quality objectives should reflect areas of community citizenship and responsibility. These include ethics in education, support for public safety, environmental safety, and sharing of quality-related information with business, industry and government agencies within the community needs and process to develop and maintain public trust.

Knowledge of Subject. This includes the faculty member's scholarship and expertise in his/her chosen field or discipline.

Leadership. Professors (including board members and administrators) must create clear and visible quality values within the educational system. Reinforcement of these values and expectations requires personal commitment and involvement. Professors in collaboration with administrators and instructors or board members, must create strategies, system and methods for achieving educational excellence. These systems and methods guide activities and decisions of the college or university and encourage participation and creativity by all.

Management of Learning. This refers to the faculty member's ability to create and manage a conducive learning environment and at the same time guide, monitor, and evaluate student learning.

National Budget Circular (NBC 461). It sets the latest guidelines in the promotion and standardization of salary of faculty and administrators at the SUCs and CHED – Supervised institutions including TESDA (PADA 1998).

Partnership Development. The college or university should seek to build internal and external partnerships that promote cooperation/collaboration serving mutual in larger community interests. These should consider longer-term objectives as well as short-term needs, thereby creating a basis for mutual investments. The building of partnerships should address means of regular communication, approaches to evaluating progress, means of modifying objectives, and methods to accommodate changing conditions.

Qualitative Contribution. This is the distinctive contribution by a faculty member seeking promotion to a higher rank or sub-rank and which generally accrues the enhancement and sustenance of the overall image of the state universities and colleges in their constant endeavor towards excellence.

Qualitative Contribution Evaluation. Is the process of determining the eligibility of a faculty candidate for the particular rank and sub-rank indicated by result of the application of the common criteria for evaluation.

Teaching for Independent Learning. This pertains to the faculty member's ability to organize teaching-learning processes to enable students to maximize their learning potentials.

The **Revised Implementing Guidelines for Annex 1 of QCE of the NBC No. 461 (Instructors, Assistant Professors and Associate Professors)**, Signed by PASUC President Dr. Eldigario D. Gonzales and CHED Chairman Dr. Carlito S. Puno (2006) are as follows:

I. General Guidelines

In addition to the common criteria for evaluation (CCE), promotion to a higher rank and sub-rank of Instructor, Assistant Professor and Associate Professor shall be subject to Qualitative Contribution Evaluation (QCE).

Continuous improvement toward excellence shall include well-defined and well-executed approach(es) aimed to enhancing the value of collegiate/university education to the clientele the SU/C pledges to serve. The improvements must be in all four (4) functional areas of the SU/C, namely: instruction, research, extension, and production.

For those seeking promotion to the higher sub-ranks of the Instructor, Assistant Professor and Associate Professor positions, the QCE shall be in the Teaching Effectiveness.

II. Specific Guidelines

- A. The Teaching Effectiveness of instructors, assistant professors and associate professors is evaluated using the following assessment areas with corresponding weighted points:

1.	Commitment	0.25
2.	Knowledge of Subject	0.25
3.	Teaching for Independent Learning	0.25
4.	Management of Learning	0.25
- B. A common evaluation instrument is prepared by a joint committee of CHED, PASUC, and TESDA. The Evaluation is done by the faculty concerned, his peers, his supervisor, and his student beneficiaries.
- C. Each area of assessment has a number of criteria and allotted a total of 25 points. The total raw point for the assessment area is 100. The raw points garnered in each of the four assessment areas are multiplied by the corresponding weight.
- D. In rating using the criteria, the scale of 1 to 5 is used, with 5 as the highest.
- E. The faculty shall be evaluated regularly and the average rating is obtained for the particular CCE implementation.
- F. The following are the minimum points required under the QCE so that a faculty with the appropriate CCE credits can be promoted.
- G. In case a faculty opts to perform multiple functions, 70% is mandated in Instruction

SUB RANK		MINIMUM POINTS
Instructor	II	80
	III	82
Assistant Professor	I	84
	II	86
	III	88
	IV	90
Associate Professor	I	91
	II	92
	III	93
	IV	94
	V	95

The **Revised Implementing Guidelines for Annex 2 of QCE of the NBC No. 461 (Professors)**, Signed by PASUC President Dr. Eldigario D. Gonzales and CHED Chairman Dr. Carlito S. Puno (2006) are as follows:

I. General Guidelines

- A.** In addition to the common criteria for evaluation (CCE), promotion to higher rank and sub-rank of Professor shall be subject to the QCE of Professor.
- B.** Continuous improvement toward excellence shall include well-defined and well-executed approach(es) aimed at enhancing the value of college/university education to the clientele the SU/C pledges to serve. The improvement must be in all four (4) functional areas of the SU/C, namely: instruction, research, extension, and production.
- C.** For those seeking promotion to the Professor rank, the QCE shall be in two (2) functional areas chosen by the candidate prior to any assessment year. (Instruction plus research as mandatory function).

II. Specific Guidelines

- A. In each of the self-selected functional areas, the candidates' qualitative contribution shall be assessed based on clientele satisfaction, leadership, partnership development, and community responsibility. The weight applicable to the different ranks are as follows:

Rank	Instruction	Research	Extension	Production
Professor	0.50	0.50		

- B. A common evaluation instrument is prepared by a joint committee of CHED and PASUC. The evaluation is done by the ratee's client, by the direct supervisor, by the stakeholders in the completed projects, and by his internal and external communities.
- C. Each area of assessment has a number of criteria and allotted a total of 25 points. The total raw point for the assessment area is 100, the raw points garnered in each of the four assessment areas is multiplied by the corresponding weight.
- D. In rating using the criteria, the scale of 1 to 5 is used, with 5 as the highest.
- E. The faculty should be evaluated regularly at the end of every academic school year and the average rating is obtained for the particular CCE implementation.
- F. The total weighted points (maximum being 100) shall have the equivalent points corresponding to the sub-ranks under Full Professor ranks as follows:

RANK		QCE Weighted Points	
		Minimum	Maximum
Full Professor	1	61	65
	2	66	70
	3	71	75
	4	76	80
	5	81	85
	6	86	90
	College Professor	91	95
	University Professor	96	100

AREA 1: INSTRUCTION/TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

1.0 DEFINITION

Teaching effectiveness 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.

2.0 SPECIFIC GUIDELINES

2.1 Areas of Evaluation

The **teaching effectiveness** of faculty members is evaluated using the following assessment areas with the corresponding weighted points.

AREAS	WEIGHTED POINTS
a. Commitment	25
b. Knowledge of Subject Matter	25
c. Teaching for Independent Learning	25
d. Management of Learning	25
Total	<hr/> 100

2.2 Mode of Evaluation

- The evaluation is done every semester or twice a year.
- The QCE point is the average of ratings for six semesters (three years).

2.3 Evaluation Period

A faculty shall be evaluated in instruction covered within the cycle and the QCE point is obtained during the particular NBC 461 cycle.

3.0 PROCESS OF EVALUATION

3.1 Areas of Evaluation

3.1.1 Commitment: This refers to a faculty member's deep sense of responsibility to render service for the development of the students' well-being and for advancement of his/her discipline.

3.1.2 Knowledge of Subject Matter: This includes the faculty member's scholarship and expertise in his/her chosen field of discipline.

3.1.3 Teaching for Independent Learning: This pertains to the faculty member's ability to organize teaching-learning processes to enable students to maximize their learning potentials.

3.1.4 Management of Learning: This refers to the faculty member's ability to create and manage conducive learning environment and at the same time guide, monitor and evaluate student learning.

3.2 Evaluators

3.2.1 Students

- A faculty member with three or more classes the students' evaluator will be chosen through institutional sampling strategies or by cluster random sampling with a minimum of thirty (30) students to be done by the Department Chairperson.
- For a faculty member with less than or equal to thirty (30) students in all classes are the evaluators.

3.2.2 Peers

- All the faculty members within the department are evaluators.
- In case of less than five peers are available, faculty members from related disciplines that are familiar with the academic activities of the faculty member can be chosen by random sampling (to be done by the Department Chairperson) to complete the minimum number of five peer evaluators.

3.2.3 Supervisor

- He is the immediate superior or the Department Chairperson of the faculty member.
- The Department Chairperson is to be rated by the Dean.
- The Dean is to be rated by the VPAA.
- The VPAA as well as the Dean should be rated by the Department Chairperson and President.

3.2.4 Self

- The faculty concerned.

3.3 Instrument

- The QCE of the NBC No. 461 for Instruction/Teaching Effectiveness

3.4 Computation

3.4.1 The total QCE point of the faculty is the sum of the weighted point (product of QCE point per evaluator and the given percentage) of all four categories of evaluators: supervisor (30%), students (30%), peers (20%), and self (20%).

Evaluators	QCE Point per Evaluator	Percentage	Weighted Points
A. Self		.20	
B. Peers		.20	
C. Students		.30	
D. Supervisor		.30	
Total QCE Point			

AREA 2: RESEARCH

1.0 DEFINITION

Research would include scientific investigation duly approved by the university/college authority.

2.0 SPECIFIC GUIDELINES

2.1 Areas of Evaluation

Research activities/projects of faculty members under the QCE shall be evaluated using the four (4) assessment areas below with their corresponding weighted points.

AREAS	WEIGHTED POINTS
a. Clientele Satisfaction	25
b. Leadership	25
c. Partnership Development	25
d. Community Responsibility	25
Total	<hr/> 100

2.2 Mode of Evaluation

- A faculty who wishes to be evaluated in the area of research shall submit himself/herself for evaluation by specified evaluators of the four areas of evaluation.
- Faculty members qualified for evaluation in the area of research must be any of the following: research program leaders, project leaders, study leaders, co-study leaders, research collaborators, research assistants, and other who are directly involved in the research activities. However, statisticians, computer encoders, editors and the like are not included in this category.
- Research includes only scientific investigation (completed research, papers/posters presented in the conferences on going researches, approved research proposal, and etc.).
- Feasibility Studies shall be evaluated in the same way as research output, however, only Feasibility Studies with Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) or Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) will be considered.

2.3 Evaluation Period

- Evaluation should be done right after the activity/project and/or every end of the school year.
- Each faculty shall be evaluated in all research activities conducted within the cycle and the average rating is obtained for the particular NBC 461 cycle.

3.0 PROCESS OF EVALUATION

3.1 Areas of Evaluation and Evaluators

3.1.1 Clientele Satisfaction

In this area the faculty member should be evaluated as to the extent that their research activities/projects provide significant contribution, help/facilitate and/or in of assistance to the overall institutional image as the college/university seek continuous improvement toward excellence, through constant awareness and sensitivity to clientele requirements and/or needs thereby improving both the quality of education and relationships with students, parents and the community.

- **Evaluators:** Any from the research clientele; i.e. students, teachers, parents, community (LGU/NGO and etc.), industries, and etc. There shall be at least three (3) evaluators.

3.1.2 Leadership

The faculty member should be evaluated as to the extent that their research activities/projects reflect their quality values and it must be clear and visible within the educational system. This requires personal commitment and involvement, and creates strategies, system and methods for achieving educational excellence. These strategies, systems and methods influence activities and decisions of the college or university and encourage participation and creativity by all.

- **Evaluators:** Researcher's immediate supervisor (i.e. program leader for project leaders, project leader for study leaders, and the Director for the Research Coordinator).

3.1.3 Partnership Development

In this area the faculty member should be evaluated as to the extent that their research activities/projects provide significant contribution/instrumental, and/or in of assistance to the processes were the college or university build internal and external partnerships that promote cooperation/collaboration serving mutual and larger community interest. These also consider longer-term objective as well as short-term needs, thereby creating a basis for mutual investments.

The building of partnerships address means of regular communication, approaches to evaluating progress, means of modifying objectives, and methods to accommodate changing conditions.

- **Evaluators:** Anyone from research stakeholders or immediate beneficiaries of research projects/activities. There shall be at least three (3) evaluators.

3.1.4 Community Responsibility

This area of evaluation the faculty member should be evaluated as to the extent that their research activities/projects provide significant contribution/instrumental and/or in of assistance to the means were the college or university responses to community requirements and/or needs, and processes to develop and maintain public trust. These include ethical issues on the said activity(s)/project(s) with reference in education process, support for public safety, environmental safety, and sharing of quality-related information with business, industry and government agencies within the community and the country.

- **Evaluators:** Anyone from the external and internal communities [i.e. student community, local community (e.g. households, Government and private employees, etc.), industries, NGO/GO, etc.]. There shall be at least three (3) evaluators.

3.2 Documents Needed

The following documents must be submitted by the candidates who wish to be evaluated under research area to the local QCE Committee for Research through the representative of their respective colleges:

- 3.2.1 For locally approved researches/research proposals, a letter of approval.
- 3.2.2 For externally funded researches/feasibility studies, a MOA/MOU entered into by the faculty and the head of the sponsoring/funding institution.
- 3.2.3 For published researches, published audio-visual materials which are products of research, terminal research report and published research reports in journals, duly certified by the Chairperson of the College Research Committee.
- 3.2.4 Designation/Appointments signed by the College/University President, VP for Research, Research Director/Coordinator, and/or Dean.
- 3.2.5 QCE Forms for research duly certified by appropriate offices.
- 3.2.6 Approved progress reports for ongoing projects.

3.3 Procedure

The following constitute the procedure for evaluation:

- Step 1. The faculty shall secure the QCE forms for Research from the College/University QCE Team/Committee
- Step 2. The Unit Research Coordinator administers them to his/her clients whom he/she served the research program/project/activity.
- Step 3. A witness should sign the QCE forms, preferably the head of the organization/LGU or the Unit Research Coordinator, affirming the authenticity of the answers of the respondents and the validity of the research program/project/ activity.
- Step 4. The duly answered QCE Forms, together with supporting documents should be submitted to the College/University QCE Team/Committee.
- Step 5. The College/University QCE Team/Committee shall evaluate and review the documents submitted, their authenticity, especially the signatures of evaluators and the witnesses. Specimen of their signatures should be found in order and authentic.
- Step 6. The faculty shall be evaluated in all research activities conducted within the cycle and the average rating is obtained for the particular NBC 461 cycle.

3.4 Instruments

The following are the QCE Instrument for Research corresponding to the four areas of evaluation:

- The QCE for Research Instrument
- The QCE for Research Instrument
- The QCE for Research Instrument
- The QCE for Research Instrument

AREA 3: EXTENSION

1.0 DEFINITION

Extension activities/project/programs conducted by a faculty include technology verification, packaging, managing/facilitating non-formal/non-degree trainings, consultancy and speakership in trainings/seminars/symposia/ convocations, community development activities, people empowerment/capability building, radio programs and development/publication/dissemination of manuals, brochures, pamphlets, leaflets, techno-guide and newsletters.

Includes extension activities which are community based, service oriented, (without remunerations) voluntary, not part of the faculty's teaching (i.e. subject/course) load, and/or activities in line with faculty expertise.

2.0. SPECIFIC GUIDELINES

2.1 Areas of Evaluation

The extension activities/projects of the faculty members under QCE shall be evaluated using the four (4) assessments areas below with their corresponding weighted points.

AREAS	WEIGHTED POINTS
a. Clientele Satisfaction	25
b. Leadership	25
c. Partnership Development	25
d. Community Responsibility	25
Total	<hr/> 100

2.2 Mode of Evaluation

- A faculty who wishes to be evaluated in the area of extension shall submit himself/herself for evaluation by specified evaluators of the four areas of evaluation.
- Faculty members qualified for evaluation in the area of extension are those directly involved and responsible in any extension activities/project/programs, include technology verification, packaging, managing/facilitating non-formal/non-degree trainings, consultancy and speakership in trainings/seminars/symposia/ convocations, community development activities, people empowerment/capability building, radio programs and development/publication/dissemination of manuals, brochures, pamphlets, leaflets, techno-guide and newsletters. Includes extension activities which are community based, service oriented, (without remunerations) voluntary, not part of the faculty's teaching (i.e. subject/course) load, and/or activities in line with faculty expertise.

2.3 Evaluation Period

- Evaluation should be done right after the activity/project and/or every end of the school year.

- Each faculty shall be evaluated in all extension activities conducted within the cycle and the average rating is obtained for the particular NBC 461 cycle.

3.0 PROCESS OF EVALUATION

3.1 Areas of Evaluation and Evaluators

3.1.1 Clientele Satisfaction

In this area the faculty member should be evaluated as to the quality of their extension activities/projects/programs and to what extent it provide significant contribution, help/facilitate and/or in of assistance to the overall institutional image as the college/university seek continuous improvement toward excellence, through constant awareness and sensitivity to clientele requirements and/or needs thereby improving both the quality of education and relationships with students, parents and the community.

- **Evaluators:** Clientele of the extension programs/projects/activities such as the president/chairperson of the people's organizations, barangay chairperson, students, parents and other beneficiaries.

3.1.2 Leadership

The faculty member should be evaluated as to the extent that their extension activities/projects/programs reflect their quality values and it must be clear and visible within the educational system. This requires personal commitment and involvement, and creates strategies, system and methods for achieving educational excellence. These strategies, systems and methods influence activities and decisions of the college or university and encourage participation and creativity by all.

- **Evaluators:** Immediate supervisor of the faculty which may include team/project leaders, college extension coordinators, and etc.

3.1.3 Partnership Development

In this area the faculty member should be evaluated as to the extent that their extension activities/projects/programs provide significant contribution/instrumental, and/or in of assistance to the processes were the college or university build internal and external partnerships that promote cooperation/collaboration serving mutual and larger community interest. These also consider longer-term objective as well as short-term needs, thereby creating a basis for mutual investments. The building of partnerships address means of regular communication, approaches to evaluating progress, means of modifying objectives, and methods to accommodate changing conditions.

- **Evaluators:** Stakeholders of the extension programs/projects/activities such as barangay chairperson, municipal mayor, presidents of POs/GOs/NGOs, etc.

3.1.4 Community Responsibility

This area of evaluation the faculty member should be evaluated as to the extent that their extension activities/projects/programs provide significant contribution/instrumental and/or in of assistance to the means were the college or university responses to community requirements and/or needs, and processes to develop and maintain public trust. These include ethical issues on the said activity(s)/project(s) with reference in education process, support for public safety, environmental safety, and sharing of quality-related information with business, industry and government agencies within the community and the country.

- **Evaluators:** Parties from the external and internal Community, namely; heads of agencies/organizations (PO, NGO, LGU,GO,etc.)
- **3.2 Documents Needed**

The following documents must be submitted by a faculty who wishes to be evaluated under extension area to the College/University QCE Team/Committee through the representative of their respective college:

- 3.2.1 For those extension programs/projects covered by the college/university, an extension plan/program certified by the SUCs Vice President or Director of Extension should be submitted.
- 3.2.2 For those extension programs entered into by other agencies outside the university/college, a MOA or MOU should be submitted.
- 3.2.3 Reports (i.e. terminal/ongoing) of the extension activities conducted should also be submitted.
- 3.2.4 Designation/appointments duly signed by the agency heads; and invitation letter from clientele, certification/certificate of appearance, narrative report, etc.
- 3.2.5 Duly accomplished QCE Extension Forms.
- 3.2.6 Other documents to support claims for extension services rendered.

3.3 Procedure

The following constitute the procedure for evaluation:

- Step 1. The faculty shall secure the QCE forms for Extension from the Chairman of the College/University QCE Team/Committee
- Step 2. The faculty shall be responsible for the distribution of the forms to the clients.
- Step 3. A witness should sign the QCE forms, preferably the head of the organization/agencies affirming the authenticity of the answers of the respondents and the validity of the extension program project/activities.
- Step 4. The duly accomplished QCE Forms, together with the authenticated supporting documents, should be submitted to the College/University QCE Team/Committee.
- Step 5. The College/University QCE Team/Committee shall evaluate and review

the documents submitted, specially the signatures of the clients and the witnesses. Specimens of their signatures should be found in order and authentic.

- Step 6. Each faculty shall be evaluated in all extension activities conducted within the cycle and the average rating is obtained for the particular NBC 461 cycle.

3.4 Instruments

The following are the QCE Instrument for Extension corresponding to the four areas of evaluation

- The QCE for Extension Instrument
- The QCE for Extension Instrument
- The QCE for Extension Instrument
- The QCE for Extension Instrument

AREA 4: PRODUCTION

I.0 DEFINITION

Production refers to all activities related to the production of goods and services supportive to the programs of the College/University/Institution through the personal initiative of the faculty. Examples of the production activities where the faculty can be evaluated include: Scientific/professional book writing, food processing, tissue culture and other agribusiness-related projects; socio-cultural/entertainment project: statistical data processing pool, thesis editing pool, and other production-related activities duly sanctioned and approved by the college/university/institution.

For University-owned/sponsored IGPs, production activities could be considered if there could be a marked increase of at least three percent (3%) in Return of Investment (ROI) over the historical financial data for the last three (3) years.

2.0. SPECIFIC GUIDELINES

2.1 Areas of Evaluation

The production activities/projects of faculty members under the QCE shall be evaluated using the four (4) assessment areas below with their corresponding weighted points.

AREAS	WEIGHTED POINTS
a. Clientele Satisfaction	25
b. Leadership	25
c. Partnership Development	25
d. Community Responsibility	25
Total	<hr/> 100

2.2 Mode of Evaluation

- A faculty who wishes to be evaluated in the area of production shall submit himself/herself for evaluation by specified evaluators to the four areas of evaluation.
- Faculty members qualified for evaluation in the area of production are those directly involved and responsible in any activities related to the production of goods and services supportive to the programs of the College/University/Institution through the personal initiative of the faculty (consider the definition of production).

2.3 Evaluation Period

- Evaluation should be done right after the activity/project and/or every end of the school year.
- Each faculty shall be evaluated in all production activities conducted within the cycle and the average rating is obtained for the particular NBC 461 cycle.

3.0 PROCESS OF EVALUATION

3.1 Areas of Evaluation and Evaluators

3.1.1 Clientele Satisfaction

In this area the faculty member should be evaluated as to the quality of their production activities/projects and to what extent it provide significant contribution, help/facilitate and/or in of assistance to the overall institutional image as the college/university seek continuous improvement toward excellence, through constant awareness and sensitivity to clientele requirements and/or needs thereby improving both the quality of education and relationships with students, parents and the community.

- **Evaluators:** Clientele (i.e. students, faculty, members, school administrators, agency head, community residents)

3.1.2 Leadership

The faculty member should be evaluated as to the extent that their production activities/projects reflect their quality values and it must be clear and visible within the educational system. This requires personal commitment and involvement, and creates strategies, system and methods for achieving educational excellence. These strategies, systems and methods influence activities and decisions of the college or university and encourage participation and creativity by all.

- **Evaluators:** Clientele (i.e. school administrators, agency head, immediate supervisor)

3.1.3 Partnership Development

In this area the faculty member should be evaluated as to the extent that their production activities/projects provide significant contribution/instrumental, and/or in of assistance to the processes were the college or university build internal and external partnerships that promote cooperation/collaboration serving mutual and larger community interest. These also consider longer-term objective as well as short-term needs, thereby creating a basis for mutual investments. The building of partnerships address means of regular communication, approaches to evaluating progress, means of modifying objectives, and methods to accommodate changing conditions.

- **Evaluators:** Clientele (i.e. school administrator, agency head, business entities)

3.1.4 Community Responsibility

This area of evaluation the faculty member should be evaluated as to the extent that their production activities/projects provide significant contribution/instrumental and/or in of assistance to the means were the college or university responses to community requirements and/or needs, and processes to develop and maintain public trust. These include ethical issues on the said activity(s)/project(s) with reference in education process, support for public safety, environmental safety, and sharing of quality-related information with business, industry and government agencies within the community and the country.

- **Evaluators:** Clientele (i.e. students, faculty Members, school administrator, agency head, business entities, community residents)

3.2 Documents Needed

The Following documents must be submitted by the candidates who wish to be evaluated under the production area to the college/university QCE Team/Committee through the representative of their respective colleges:

Whenever necessary/applicable, any of the following shall be submitted:

- 3.2.1 Memorandum of Agreement/Understanding or any written contract entered into by the faculty and the head of the college/university.
- 3.2.2 Letter of request duly approved by the authorities concerned/target beneficiaries

- 3.2.3 Production plan/feasibility study approved by the school administrator.
- 3.2.4 Business permits legally operate the production activity which is secured from the office of the municipal mayor. In case of book writing, ISBN is required.
- 3.2.5 Time table of monitoring/evaluation of production activities
- 3.2.6 Minutes of consultative meeting with the target clientele
- 3.2.7 Result of the assessment conducted
- 3.2.8 Duly accomplished QCE forms under production.
- 3.2.9 Audited financial report/income statement during the cycle.
- 3.2.10 Other documents deemed necessary for production evaluation under QCE.

3.3 Procedure

The following constitute the procedure for evaluation:

- Step 1. The faculty shall secure QCE forms for production from the College/University QCE Team/Committee
- Step 2. He/she then administers it to his/her immediate beneficiaries/clients.
- Step 3. A witness should sign the QCE form, preferably the head of the organization or any person in authority, affirming the authenticity of the information provided and the validity of the production activity
- Step 4. The duly accomplished QCE forms, together with other supporting documents, shall be submitted to the College/University QCE Team/Committee.
- Step 5. The College/University QCE Team/Committee shall evaluate and review the documents submitted their authenticity, especially the signatures of the clients and the witness. Specimen of their signatures should be found in order and authentic.
- Step 6. Each faculty shall be evaluated in all production activities conducted within the cycle and the average rating is obtained for the particular NBC 461 cycle.

3.4 Instruments

The following are the QCE Instrument for Production corresponding to the four areas of evaluation

- The QCE for Production Instrument
- The QCE for Production Instrument

- The QCE for Production Instrument
- The QCE for Production Instrument 4: Community Responsibility (See Appendix M)

APPENDIX A
The QCE of the NBC No. 461
Instrument for Instruction/Teaching Effectiveness

Rating Period: _____ to _____
Name of Faculty: _____ Academic Rank: _____

Evaluators:

- ☐ Self ☐ Peer
☐ Student ☐ Supervisor

Instruction: Please evaluate the faculty using the scale below. Encircle your rating.

Scale	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Description
5	Outstanding	The performance almost always exceeds the job requirements. The Faculty is an exceptional role model
4	Very Satisfactory	The performance meets and often exceeds the job requirements
3	Satisfactory	The performance meets job requirements
2	Fair	The performance needs some development to meet job requirements.
1	Poor	The faculty fails to meet job requirements

A. Commitment		Scale				
1.	Demonstrates sensitivity to students' ability to attend and absorb content information.	5	4	3	2	1
2.	Integrates sensitively his/her learning objectives with those of the students in a collaborative process.	5	4	3	2	1
3.	Makes self available to students beyond official time	5	4	3	2	1
4.	Regularly comes to class on time, well-groomed and well-prepared to complete assigned responsibilities.	5	4	3	2	1
5.	Keeps accurate records of students' performance and prompt submission of the same.	5	4	3	2	1
Total Score						
B. Knowledge of Subject		Scale				
1..	Demonstrates mastery of the subject matter (explain the subject matter without relying solely on the prescribed textbook).	5	4	3	2	1
2..	Draws and share information on the state on the art of theory and practice in his/her discipline.	5	4	3	2	1
3..	Integrates subject to practical circumstances and learning intents/purposes of students.	5	4	3	2	1
4..	Explains the relevance of present topics to the previous lessons, and relates the subject matter to relevant current issues and/or daily life activities.	5	4	3	2	1
5..	Demonstrates up-to-date knowledge and/or awareness on current trends and issues of the subject.	5	4	3	2	1
Total Score						

C. Teaching for Independent Learning	Scale				
1.. Creates teaching strategies that allow students to practice using concepts they need to understand (interactive discussion).	5	4	3	2	1
2.. Enhances student self-esteem and/or gives due recognition to students' performance/potentials.	5	4	3	2	1
3.. Allows students to create their own course with objectives and realistically defined student-professor rules and make them accountable for their performance	5	4	3	2	1
4.. Allows students to think independently and make their own decisions and holding them accountable for their performance based largely on their success in executing decisions.	5	4	3	2	1
5.. Encourages students to learn beyond what is required and help/guide the students how to apply the concepts learned	5	4	3	2	1
Total Score					
D. Management of Learning	Scale				
1. Creates opportunities for intensive and/or extensive contribution of students in the class activities (e.g. breaks class into dyads, triads or buzz/task groups).	5	4	3	2	1
2. Assumes roles as facilitator, resource person, coach, inquisitor, integrator, referee in drawing students to contribute to knowledge and understanding of the concepts at hands.	5	4	3	2	1
3. Designs and implements learning conditions and experience that promotes healthy exchange and/or confrontations.	5	4	3	2	1
4. Structures/re-structures learning and teaching-learning context to enhance attainment of collective learning objectives.	5	4	3	2	1
5. Use of Instructional Materials ((audio/video materials: fieldtrips, film showing, computer aided instruction and etc.) to reinforces learning processes.	5	4	3	2	1
Total Score					

Legend for the Formula/Equation:

ts = Total Score
 hps = Highest Possible Score
 $\%$ = Percentage

Signature of Evaluator : _____
 Name of Evaluator : _____
 Position of Evaluator : _____
 Date : _____

APPENDIX B

The QCE of the NBC No. 461 for Research

Instrument 1: CLIENTELE SATISFACTION

Rating Period: _____ to _____

Name of Faculty: _____ Academic Rank: _____

Evaluators: Anyone from the research clientele

- ☐ Student ☐ Parent
☐ Teacher ☐ Community
☐ Others (Please Indicate) _____

Title of Project: _____

Instruction: Please evaluate the faculty using the scale below. Encircle your rating.

Scale	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Description
5	Outstanding	The performance almost always exceeds the job requirements. The Faculty is an exceptional role model
4	Very Satisfactory	The performance meets and often exceeds the job requirements
3	Satisfactory	The performance meets job requirements
2	Fair	The performance needs some development to meet job requirements.
1	Poor	The faculty fails to meet job requirements

Faculty Performance/Output	Scale				
1. The research proposal/feasibility study submitted is base on the needs/problems of the clients (there is a consultation with the client during the conceptualization of the research proposal).	5	4	3	2	1
2. Meet and discusses with the clientele the know how of the research results for its usability and/or clients benefits.	5	4	3	2	1
3. Disseminates and/or present research results in a forum or symposium for proper information of the clientele.	5	4	3	2	1
4. Utilizes appropriate research procedures, and/or methodologies in meeting clients' needs and problems.	5	4	3	2	1
5. Research results would really helps and/or address the clients needs or problems	5	4	3	2	1

Total Score: _____

Signature of Evaluator _____

Signature of Witness _____

Name of Evaluator _____

Name of Witness _____

Position of Evaluator _____

Agency and Position _____

Date : _____

Date : _____

APPENDIX C

The QCE of the NBC No. 461 for Research Instrument 2: LEADERSHIP

Rating Period: _____ to _____

Name of Faculty: _____ Academic Rank: _____
Evaluators: The immediate supervisor

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="radio"/> Program Project Leaders
<input type="radio"/> Project Leader for Study Leaders
<input type="radio"/> Others (Please Indicate) _____ | <input type="radio"/> College Research Coordinator
<input type="radio"/> College Research Director |
|---|---|

Title of Project: _____

Instruction: Please evaluate the faculty using the scale below. Encircle your rating.

Scale	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Description
5	Outstanding	The performance almost always exceeds the job requirements. The Faculty is an exceptional role model
4	Very Satisfactory	The performance meets and often exceeds the job requirements
3	Satisfactory	The performance meets job requirements
2	Fair	The performance needs some development to meet job requirements.
1	Poor	The faculty fails to meet job requirements

Faculty Performance/Output	Scale				
1. Regularly communicates quality output of the research proceeding to colleagues/staff/clientele/ subordinates.	5	4	3	2	1
2. Manages priorities to get the job done and able to looks for better ways to confronts conflict situations in an honest and direct manner	5	4	3	2	1
3. Encourage/motivates participation/cooperation of the people evolved in the research proceedings.	5	4	3	2	1
4. Suggest/introduces strategies that enhanced colleagues/staff/clientele/subordinates' skills and abilities to perform the research activity in a more efficient manner.	5	4	3	2	1
5. Communicates directly, openly, honestly and shares information with the concerned individual or people involved in their research proceeding	5	4	3	2	1

Total Score: _____

Signature of Evaluator

Signature of Witness

Name of Evaluator

Name of Witness

Position of Evaluator

Agency and Position

Date : _____

Date : _____

APPENDIX D
The QCE of the NBC No. 461 for Research
Instrument 3: PARTNERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

Rating Period: _____ to _____

Name of Faculty: _____ Academic Rank: _____

Evaluators: Anyone from the research stakeholders or immediate beneficiaries of research projects/activities

- ☐ Research Stakeholder
- ☐ Immediate Beneficiaries of Research Projects/Activities
- ☐ Others (Please Indicate) _____

Title of Project: _____

Instruction: Please evaluate the faculty using the scale below. Encircle your rating.

Scale	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Description
5	Outstanding	The performance almost always exceeds the job requirements. The Faculty is an exceptional role model
4	Very Satisfactory	The performance meets and often exceeds the job requirements
3	Satisfactory	The performance meets job requirements
2	Fair	The performance needs some development to meet job requirements.
1	Poor	The faculty fails to meet job requirements

Faculty Performance/Output	Scale				
1. Coordinates with local residents, businesses and other government functionaries for possible research collaboration.	5	4	3	2	1
2. Promotes networking activities with local communities and various research agencies to gain support/cooperation on research activities.	5	4	3	2	1
3. Conducts consultative meetings and/or dialogues with stakeholders on priority research agenda supporting their needs.	5	4	3	2	1
4. Regularly meet concerned sector to discuss ways in which the research undertaking can create better learning and working environment.	5	4	3	2	1
5. Communicates directly, openly, honestly and shares information with the concerned sectors, and considering comments, and suggestions for improvement if necessary.	5	4	3	2	1

Total Score: _____

Signature of Evaluator

Signature of Witness

Name of Evaluator

Name of Witness

Position of Evaluator

Agency and Position

Date : _____

Date : _____

APPENDIX E
The QCE of the NBC No. 461 for Research
Instrument 4: COMMUNITY RESPONSIBILITY

Rating Period: _____ to _____

Name of Faculty: _____ Academic Rank: _____

Evaluators: Anyone from the external and internal communities

- ☐ Students, Community (Representative)
- ☐ Local Community (Representative)
- ☐ Others (Please Indicate) _____

Title of Project: _____

Instruction: Please evaluate the faculty using the scale below. Encircle your rating.

Scale	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Description
5	Outstanding	The performance almost always exceeds the job requirements. The Faculty is an exceptional role model
4	Very Satisfactory	The performance meets and often exceeds the job requirements
3	Satisfactory	The performance meets job requirements
2	Fair	The performance needs some development to meet job requirements.
1	Poor	The faculty fails to meet job requirements

Faculty Performance/Output	Scale				
1. Creates safe research environment where activities conducted consider the ethical and moral predicament of the community and/or the sector involved	5	4	3	2	1
2. Conducts researches/feasibility studies where implications on the responsibility of the concerned sectors to the community are addressed.	5	4	3	2	1
3. Initiates and develops interventions that increase awareness of the responsibility of policy-makers, etc. based on the research findings.	5	4	3	2	1
4. The researches/feasibility studies conducted with significant contribution to the community and increase awareness on community issues and concerns.	5	4	3	2	1
5. The researcher assumes impartial responsibility and accountability on the research proceeding and its effect or impact to the community and/or other sectors involved.	5	4	3	2	1

Total Score: _____

Signature of Evaluator

Signature of Witness

Name of Evaluator

Name of Witness

Position of Evaluator

Agency and Position

Date : _____

Date : _____

APPENDIX F
The QCE of the NBC No. 461 for Extension
Instrument 1: CLIENTELE SATISFACTION

Rating Period: _____ to _____

Name of Faculty: _____ Academic Rank: _____

Evaluators: Clientele of the Extension Programs/Projects/Activities

- ☐ President/Chairman of Organization Involved
- ☐ Barangay Chairperson
- ☐ Student
- ☐ Parent
- ☐ Others (Please Indicate) _____

Title of Project: _____

Instruction: Please evaluate the faculty using the scale below. Encircle your rating.

Scale	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Description
5	Outstanding	The performance almost always exceeds the job requirements. The Faculty is an exceptional role model
4	Very Satisfactory	The performance meets and often exceeds the job requirements
3	Satisfactory	The performance meets job requirements
2	Fair	The performance needs some development to meet job requirements.
1	Poor	The faculty fails to meet job requirements

Faculty Performance/Output	Scale				
1. The extension proposal/plan is base on the needs/problems of the clients (there is a consultation with the client during the conceptualization of the extension plan).	5	4	3	2	1
2. Meet and discusses with the clientele the know how of the extension activity(s) for its usability and/or clients benefits.	5	4	3	2	1
3. There is an information campaign for proper information of the clientele about the extension activity(s).	5	4	3	2	1
4. Monitors and evaluates the quantity and quality of services provided to clientele.	5	4	3	2	1
5. Extension activity(s) really helps and/or address the clients needs or problems	5	4	3	2	1

Total Score: _____

Signature of Evaluator

Signature of Witness

Name of Evaluator

Name of Witness

Position of Evaluator

Agency and Position

Date : _____

Date : _____

APPENDIX G
The QCE of the NBC No. 461 for Extension
Instrument 2: LEADERSHIP

Rating Period: _____ to _____

Name of Faculty: _____ Academic Rank: _____

Evaluators: Immediate Supervisor

- ☐ Director for Extension
- ☐ Team/Project leader
- ☐ College Extension Coordinators
- ☐ Others (Please Indicate) _____

Title of Project: _____

Instruction: Please evaluate the faculty using the scale below. Encircle your rating.

Scale	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Description
5	Outstanding	The performance almost always exceeds the job requirements. The Faculty is an exceptional role model
4	Very Satisfactory	The performance meets and often exceeds the job requirements
3	Satisfactory	The performance meets job requirements
2	Fair	The performance needs some development to meet job requirements.
1	Poor	The faculty fails to meet job requirements

Faculty Performance/Output	Scale				
1. Regularly communicates quality output of the extension proceeding to colleagues/staff/clientele/ subordinates.	5	4	3	2	1
2. Manages priorities to get the job done and able to looks for better ways to confronts conflict situations in an honest and direct manner	5	4	3	2	1
3. Encourage/motivates participation/cooperation of the people evolved in the extension activity(s).	5	4	3	2	1
4. Suggest/introduces strategies that enhanced colleagues/staff/clientele/subordinates' skills and abilities to perform the extension activity(s) in a more efficient manner.	5	4	3	2	1
5. Communicates directly, openly, honestly and shares information with the concerned individual or people involved in their extension activity(s)	5	4	3	2	1

Total Score: _____

Signature of Evaluator

Signature of Witness

Name of Evaluator

Name of Witness

Position of Evaluator

Agency and Position

Date : _____

Date : _____

APPENDIX H
The QCE of the NBC No. 461 for Extension
Instrument 3: PARTNERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

Rating Period: _____ to _____

Name of Faculty: _____ Academic Rank: _____

Evaluators: Stakeholders of the Extension Programs/Projects/Activities

☐ Barangay Chairperson☐ President of PO☐ Municipal Mayor☐ President of NGO☐ Others (Please Indicate) _____

Title of Project: _____

Instruction: Please evaluate the faculty using the scale below. Encircle your rating.

Scale	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Description
5	Outstanding	The performance almost always exceeds the job requirements. The Faculty is an exceptional role model
4	Very Satisfactory	The performance meets and often exceeds the job requirements
3	Satisfactory	The performance meets job requirements
2	Fair	The performance needs some development to meet job requirements.
1	Poor	The faculty fails to meet job requirements

Faculty Performance/Output	Scale				
1. Coordinates with local residents, businesses and other government functionaries for possible extension collaboration.	5	4	3	2	1
2. Conducts consultative meetings and/or dialogues with stakeholders on priority extension plan supporting their needs.	5	4	3	2	1
3. Regularly meet concerned sector to discuss ways in which the extension undertaking can create better working environment, and full cooperation and participation.	5	4	3	2	1
4. Establishes linkages with local/national agencies for possible funding of extension undertakings (sourcing of funds).	5	4	3	2	1
5. Communicates directly, openly, honestly and shares information with the concerned sectors, and considering comments, and suggestions for improvement if necessary.	5	4	3	2	1

Total Score: _____

Signature of Evaluator _____

Signature of Witness _____

Name of Evaluator _____

Name of Witness _____

Position of Evaluator _____

Agency and Position _____

Date : _____

Date : _____

APPENDIX I
The QCE of the NBC No. 461 for Extension
Instrument 4: COMMUNITY RESPONSIBILITY

Rating Period: _____ to _____

Name of Faculty: _____ Academic Rank: _____

Evaluators: Parties from the external and internal community (e.g. external: Head of an NGO, PO, Local Chief Executive of the LGU, GO; Internal: Directors, Dept. Chairman, Deans, etc.)

☐ Head, NGO

☐ Head, GO

☐ Head, PO

☐ Head, LGU

☐ Others (Please Indicate) _____

Title of Project: _____

Instruction: Please evaluate the faculty using the scale below. Encircle your rating.

Scale	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Description
5	Outstanding	The performance almost always exceeds the job requirements. The Faculty is an exceptional role model
4	Very Satisfactory	The performance meets and often exceeds the job requirements
3	Satisfactory	The performance meets job requirements
2	Fair	The performance needs some development to meet job requirements.
1	Poor	The faculty fails to meet job requirements

Faculty Performance/Output	Scale				
1. Creates safe working environment where activities conducted consider the ethical and moral predicament of the community and/or the sector involved	5	4	3	2	1
2. Conducts extension activity(s) where the responsibilities of the concerned sectors to the community are addressed.	5	4	3	2	1
3. The extension activity(s) conducted with significant contribution to the community and increase awareness on community issues and concerns.	5	4	3	2	1
4. The extension activity(s) is instrumental and/or in of consideration of public safety, environmental safety, and sharing of quality-related information with the sector involved.	5	4	3	2	1
5. Assumes impartial responsibility and accountability on the extension proceeding and its effect or impact to the community and/or other sectors involved.	5	4	3	2	1

Total Score: _____

Signature of Evaluator _____

Signature of Witness _____

Name of Evaluator _____

Name of Witness _____

Position of Evaluator _____

Agency and Position _____

Date : _____

Date : _____

APPENDIX J
The QCE of the NBC No. 461 for Production
Instrument 1: CLIENTELE SATISFACTION

Rating Period: _____ to _____

Name of Faculty: _____ Academic Rank: _____

Evaluators: Clientele (i.e. Students, Faculty Members, School Administrators, Agency Head, Community Residents).

☐ Student

☐ School Administrator

☐ Faculty Member

☐ Agency Head

☐ Community Resident (Representative)

☐ Others (Please Indicate) _____

Title of Project: _____

Instruction: Please evaluate the faculty using the scale below. Encircle your rating.

Scale	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Description
5	Outstanding	The performance almost always exceeds the job requirements. The Faculty is an exceptional role model
4	Very Satisfactory	The performance meets and often exceeds the job requirements
3	Satisfactory	The performance meets job requirements
2	Fair	The performance needs some development to meet job requirements.
1	Poor	The faculty fails to meet job requirements

Faculty Performance/Output	Scale				
1. Involves clientele in the planning process of the intended production activity.(there is a consultation with the client during the conceptualization of the said activity).	5	4	3	2	1
2. Meet and discusses with the clientele the know how of the production activity(s) for its usability and/or clients benefits, and/or to asses the quality of production services provided	5	4	3	2	1
3. There is an information campaign for proper information of the clientele about the production activity(s).	5	4	3	2	1
4. Monitors and evaluates the quantity and quality of services provided to clientele.	5	4	3	2	1
5. Adopts and implements a system that is supportive of realizing clientele's needs/problems.	5	4	3	2	1

Total Score: _____

Signature of Evaluator _____

Signature of Witness _____

Name of Evaluator _____

Name of Witness _____

Position of Evaluator _____

Agency and Position _____

Date : _____

Date : _____

APPENDIX K
The QCE of the NBC No. 461 for Production
Instrument 2: LEADERSHIP

Rating Period: _____ to _____

Name of Faculty: _____ Academic Rank: _____

Evaluators: Clientele (i.e. school administrator, agency head, immediate Supervisor)

☐ Immediate Supervisor

☐ School Administrator

☐ Agency Head

☐ Others (Please Indicate) _____

Title of Project: _____

Instruction: Please evaluate the faculty using the scale below. Encircle your rating.

Scale	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Description
5	Outstanding	The performance almost always exceeds the job requirements. The Faculty is an exceptional role model
4	Very Satisfactory	The performance meets and often exceeds the job requirements
3	Satisfactory	The performance meets job requirements
2	Fair	The performance needs some development to meet job requirements.
1	Poor	The faculty fails to meet job requirements

Faculty Performance/Output	Scale				
1. Regularly communicates quality output of the production proceeding to colleagues/staff/clientele/ subordinates.	5	4	3	2	1
2. Manages priorities to get the job done and able to looks for better ways to confronts conflict situations in an honest and direct manner	5	4	3	2	1
3. Encourage/motivates participation/cooperation of the people evolved in the production activity(s)	5	4	3	2	1
4. Suggest/introduces strategies that enhanced colleagues/staff/clientele/subordinates' skills and abilities to perform the production activity in a more efficient manner.	5	4	3	2	1
5. Communicates directly, openly, honestly and shares information with the concerned individual or people involved in their production activity(s)	5	4	3	2	1

Total Score: _____

Signature of Evaluator _____

Signature of Witness _____

Name of Evaluator _____

Name of Witness _____

Position of Evaluator _____

Agency and Position _____

Date : _____

Date : _____

APPENDIX L
The QCE of the NBC No. 461 for Production
Instrument 3: PARTNERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

Rating Period: _____ to _____

Name of Faculty: _____ Academic Rank: _____

Evaluators: Clientele (e.g. students, administrator, agency head, business entities)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="radio"/> Student | <input type="radio"/> Agency Head |
| <input type="radio"/> School Administrator | <input type="radio"/> Business Entities |
| <input type="radio"/> Others (Please Indicate) | _____ |

Title of Project: _____

Instruction: Please evaluate the faculty using the scale below. Encircle your rating.

Scale	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Description
5	Outstanding	The performance almost always exceeds the job requirements. The Faculty is an exceptional role model
4	Very Satisfactory	The performance meets and often exceeds the job requirements
3	Satisfactory	The performance meets job requirements
2	Fair	The performance needs some development to meet job requirements.
1	Poor	The faculty fails to meet job requirements

Faculty Performance/Output	Scale				
1. Coordinates with local residents, businesses and other government functionaries for possible production activity(s) collaboration.	5	4	3	2	1
2. Conducts consultative meetings and/or dialogues with stakeholders on priority production plan supporting their needs.	5	4	3	2	1
3. Regularly meet concerned sector to discuss ways in which the production undertaking can create better working environment, and full cooperation and participation.	5	4	3	2	1
4. Establishes linkages with local/national agencies for possible funding of production undertakings (sourcing of funds).	5	4	3	2	1
5. Communicates directly, openly, honestly and shares information with the concerned sectors, and considering comments, and suggestions for improvement if necessary.	5	4	3	2	1

Total Score: _____

Signature of Evaluator _____

Signature of Witness _____

Name of Evaluator

Name of Witness

Position of Evaluator

Agency and Position

Date : _____

Date : _____

APPENDIX M

The QCE of the NBC No. 461 for Production Instrument 4: COMMUNITY RESPONSIBILITY

Rating Period: _____ to _____

Name of Faculty: _____ Academic Rank: _____

Evaluators: Clientele (e.g. students, faculty members, school administrators, Agency head, business entities, community residents).

☐ Student

☐ Agency Head

☐ Faculty Member

☐ Business Entities

☐ School Administrator

☐ Community Resident

☐ Others (Please Indicate) _____

Title of Project: _____

Instruction: Please evaluate the faculty using the scale below. Encircle your rating.

Scale	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Description
5	Outstanding	The performance almost always exceeds the job requirements. The Faculty is an exceptional role model
4	Very Satisfactory	The performance meets and often exceeds the job requirements
3	Satisfactory	The performance meets job requirements
2	Fair	The performance needs some development to meet job requirements.
1	Poor	The faculty fails to meet job requirements

Faculty Performance/Output	Scale				
1. Creates safe working environment where activities conducted consider the ethical and moral predicament of the community and/or the sector involved	5	4	3	2	1
2. Conducts production activity(s) where the responsibilities of the concerned sectors to the community are addressed.	5	4	3	2	1
3. The production program extends technical assistance which supports community activities.	5	4	3	2	1
4. Utilizes appropriate production procedures that conserve and prevent damage to the environment	5	4	3	2	1
5. Assumes impartial responsibility and accountability on the production activity(s) and its effect or impact to the community and/or other sectors involved.	5	4	3	2	1

Signature of Evaluator

Total Score: _____

Signature of Witness

Name of Evaluator

Name of Witness

Position of Evaluator _____

Agency and Position _____

Date : _____

Date : _____

APPENDIX N
The QCE of the NBC No. 461
(Commitment Form for RESEARCH/EXTENSION/PRODUCTION)

Rating Period: _____ **to** _____

Name of Faculty: _____

Academic Rank: _____

Subject Matter (Title of Study/Activities): _____

Rationale (Significance and/or Relevance of the Study/Activities) :

Objectives (Consider the four areas of assessment): _____

Methodology/Program of Activities: _____

Signature of Faculty Concern

Recommending Approval

Approved

Dean

Director (Research/Extension/Production)

APPENDIX O
The QCE of the NBC No. 461
(Computation for Instruction Area per Rating Period)

Rating Period: _____ **to** _____

Name of Faculty: _____

Academic Rank: _____

COMPUTATION PER EVALUATOR				
Areas of Evaluation	Total Score	% (Percentage)	Formula/Equation	QCE Point
			$\frac{ts}{hps} \times \%$	
A. Commitment		20		
B. Knowledge of Subject		20		
C. Teaching for Independent Learning		30		
D. Management of Learning		30		
Total QCE Point				

Legend for the Formula/Equation:

Ts = Total Score

Hp = Highest Possible Score:

s

% = Percentage

Signature of Evaluator : _____

Name of Evaluator : _____

Position of Evaluator : _____

Date : _____

APPENDIX P
The QCE of the NBC No. 461
(Sample Computation for Instruction Area per Rating Period)

Rating Period: _____ **to** _____

Name of Faculty: _____

Academic Rank: _____

SUMMARY OF COMPUTATION OF FOUR EVALUATORS				
Evaluators	Ave. Rating	% (Percentage)	Formula/Equation	QCE Point
			<i>ar</i> × %	
A. Students	100	.30	$100 \times .30$	30
B. Peers	100	.20	$100 \times .20$	20
C. Self	100	.20	$100 \times .20$	20
D. Immediate Supervisor(s)	100	.30	$100 \times .30$	30
Total QCE Point				100

Legend for the Formula/Equation:

ar = Average Rating

% = Percentage

Recorded and Computed by:

Reviewed by:

Signature over Printed Name

Position/Designation

Date

Signature over Printed Name

Position/Designation

Date

Conforme: _____
Signature of the Ratee

Date

APPENDIX Q
The QCE of the NBC No. 461
Sample Computation per Rating Period
(RESEARCH/EXTENSION/PRODUCTION)

Rating Period: _____ **to** _____

Name of Faculty: _____

Academic Rank: _____

SUMMARY OF COMPUTATION OF EVALUATORS' RATING TO THEIR RESPECTIVE AREA OF EVALUATION			
Areas of Evaluation	Average Score	% (Percentage)	QCE Point
A. Clientele Satisfaction	25	25	25
B. Leadership	25	25	25
C. Partnership Development	25	25	25
D. Community Responsibility	25	25	25
Total QCE Point			100

Recorded and Computed by:

Reviewed by:

Signature over Printed Name

Signature over Printed Name

Position/Designation

Position/Designation

Date

Date

Conforme: _____
Signature of the Ratee

Date

APPENDIX R
The QCE of the NBC No. 461
Sample Computation per Rating Period
(RESEARCH/EXTENSION/PRODUCTION)

Rating Period: _____ **to** _____

Name of Faculty: _____

Academic Rank: _____

SUMMARY OF COMPUTATION OF FOUR AREAS OF EVALUATION				
Evaluators	QCE Points	%(Percentage)	Formula/Equation	QCE Point
			$qp \times \%$	
A. Instruction	100	35	$100 \times .35$	35
B. Research	100	50	$100 \times .50$	50
C. Extension	100	10	$100 \times .10$	10
D. Production	100	5	$100 \times .05$	5
Total QCE Point				100

Legend for the Formula/Equation:

qp = QCE Points per Area of Evaluation

$\%$ = Percentage

Recorded and Computed by:

Reviewed by:

Signature over Printed Name

Signature over Printed Name

Position/Designation

Position/Designation

Date

Date

Conforme: _____

Signature of the Ratee

Date

VISAYAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Institution/Agency

Name of Faculty: _____ College: _____

Present Rank: _____ Department: _____

QUALITATIVE CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION (QCE) OF FACULTY
NBC 461 8TH CYCLE (July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2019)

SUMMARY OF EVALUATION FROM FOUR RATERS

RATERS	2016-17		2017-18		2018-19		TOTAL	AVE	FAC- TOR	QCE POINTS
	Semester		Semester		Semester					
	1st	2nd	1st	2nd	1st	2nd				
STUDENT									0.30	
PEERS									0.20	
SUPERVISOR									0.30	
SELF									0.20	
TOTAL										
AVERAGE										

Prepared by: _____

REVIEWED BY:

College Evaluation Committee

University QCE Committee

Chairman:

Chairman:

Members:

Members:

VISAYAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Institution/Agency

Name of Faculty: _____ College: _____
Present Rank: _____ Department: _____

QUALITATIVE CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION (QCE) OF FACULTY
NBC 461 8TH CYCLE (July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2019)

LIST OF THE RATERS AND THEIR RATINGS

RATERS	2016-17		2017-18		2018-19		TOTAL	AVE
	Semester		Semester		Semester			
	1st	2nd	1st	2nd	1st	2nd		
A. STUDENT								
B. PEERS								
1)								
2)								
3)								
4)								
5)								
6)								
Total								
Average								
C. SUPERVISOR								
D. SELF								

VISAYAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Institution/Agency

Name of Faculty: _____ College: _____

Present Rank: _____ Department: _____

**QUALITATIVE CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION (QCE) OF FACULTY
(FOR PROFESSOR RANK)**
NBC 461 8TH CYCLE (July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2019)

SUMMARY OF EVALUATION FROM AREAS OF EVALUATION

Evaluation Areas	AVERAGE RATING, AR	FACTOR, F	Formula: AR x F	QCE POINTS
INSTRUCTION		0.50		
RESEARCH		0.50		
EXTENSION				
PRODUCTION				
TOTAL QCE POINTS				

Prepared by: _____

REVIEWED BY:

College NBC 461 Committee

University QCE Committee

Chairman:

Chairman:

Members:

Members:

VISAYAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Institution/Agency

Name of Faculty: _____ College: _____

Present Rank: _____ Department: _____

**QUALITATIVE CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION (QCE) OF FACULTY
(FOR PROFESSOR RANK)**

NBC 461 8TH CYCLE (July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2019)

SUMMARY OF EVALUATION FROM INSTRUCTION

Evaluation Areas	AVERAGE RATING, AR	FACTOR, F	Formula: AR x F	QCE POINTS
A. STUDENTS		0.30		
B. PEERS		0.20		
C. SUPERVISORS		0.30		
D. SELF		0.20		
TOTAL QCE POINTS				

SUMMARY OF RATING

I. INSTRUCTION: TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

A. STUDENT

(Please insert the TPES from the VP of Instruction)

I. INSTRUCTION: TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

B) PEERS

PEERS	RATING				TOTAL
	Commitment	Knowledge of Subject	Teaching for Independent Learning	Mgt of Learning	
1st Sem SY 2016-17					
1.					
2.					
3					
4					
5					
6					
2nd Sem SY 2016-17					
1.					
2.					
3					
4					
5					
6					
1st Sem SY 2017-18					
1.					
2.					
3					
4					
5					
6					
2nd Sem SY 2017-18					
1.					
2.					
3					
4					
5					
6					
1st Sem SY 2018-19					
1.					
2.					
3					
4					
5					
6					
2nd Sem SY 2018-19					
1.					
2.					
3					
4					
5					
6					
Average					
Weight					
Weighted Score					

I. INSTRUCTION: TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

C) SUPERVISOR

SUPERVISOR	RATING				
	Commitment	Knowledge of Subject	Teaching for Independent Learning	Mgt of Learning	TOTAL
1st Sem SY 2016-17					
2nd Sem SY 2016-17					
1st Sem SY 2017-18					
2nd Sem SY 2017-18					
1st Sem SY 2018-19					
2nd Sem SY 2018-19					
Average					
Weight					
Weighted Score					

D) SELF

SUPERVISOR	RATING				
	Commitment	Knowledge of Subject	Teaching for Independent Learning	Mgt of Learning	TOTAL
1st Sem SY 2016-17					
2nd Sem SY 2016-17					
1st Sem SY 2017-18					
2nd Sem SY 2017-18					
1st Sem SY 2018-19					
2nd Sem SY 2018-19					
Average					
Weight					
Weighted Score					

VISAYAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Institution/Agency

Name of Faculty: _____ College: _____

Present Rank: _____ Department: _____

**QUALITATIVE CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION (QCE) OF FACULTY
(FOR PROFESSOR RANK)**

NNBC 461 8TH CYCLE (July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2019)

SUMMARY OF RATING

II. RESEARCH

AREAS EVALUATED	Evaluation Period			AVE SCORE	QCE POINTS
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19		
Clientele satisfaction					
Leadership					
Partnership Development					
Community Responsibility					
Total QCE					

List of Raters and Their Ratings

a) SY 2016-17

RATER, Position/ Address	Clientele Satisfaction	Leadership	Partnership Development	Community Responsibility	Average
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
Average					

List of Raters and Their Ratings

b) SY 2017-18

RATER, Position/ Address	Clientele Satisfaction	Leadership	Partnership Development	Community Responsibility	Average
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					

16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
Average					

List of Raters and Their Ratings
c) SY 2018-19

RATER, Position/ Address	Clientele Satisfaction	Leadership	Partnership Development	Community Responsibility	Average
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
Average					

VISAYAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Institution/Agency

Name of Faculty: _____ College: _____

Present Rank: _____ Department: _____

**QUALITATIVE CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION (QCE) OF FACULTY
(FOR PROFESSOR RANK)**

NBC 461 8TH CYCLE (July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2019)

SUMMARY OF RATING

III. EXTENSION

AREAS EVALUATED	Evaluation Period			AVE SCORE	QCE POINTS
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19		
Clientele satisfaction					
Leadership					
Partnership Development					
Community Responsibility					
Total QCE					

List of Raters and Their Ratings

a) SY 2016-17

RATER, Position/ Address	Clientele Satisfaction	Leadership	Partnership Development	Community Responsibility	Average
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
Average					

List of Raters and Their Ratings

b) SY 2017-18

RATER, Position/ Address	Clientele Satisfaction	Leadership	Partnership Development	Community Responsibility	Average
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					

15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
Average					

List of Raters and Their Ratings

c) SY 2018-19

RATER, Position/ Address	Clientele Satisfaction	Leadership	Partnership Development	Community Responsibility	Average
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
Average					