

**SOUTHERN LUZON STATE UNIVERSITY
PBB 2015 RANKING PROCEDURES**

I. RANKING OF COLLEGES/CAMPUSES AND OFFICES/STO/GASS

Ranking of colleges/campuses shall be based on their contribution to the Major Final Output (MFO) targets. The SLSU-identified performance indicators under MFO1 to MFO4 are the criteria to be used.

Ranking of the Offices/STO/GASS shall be based on the ratings of their Office Performance Commitment and Reviews (OPCRs), which were rated using the SLSU Strategic Performance Management System (SPMS) approved by the Civil Service Commission (CSC) in 2015.

A. Colleges/Campuses

1. The ranking of the colleges/campuses shall be based on their respective performance results on the different indicators per Major Final Output (MFO). The SLSU-identified performance indicators shall serve as the criteria per MFO.
2. The colleges/campuses shall be ranked by MFO based on their contribution to total score of MFO targets, such as follows:

Rank	Score
1-2	5
3-4	4
5-7	3
8-10	2
Below 10 and no contribution	1

3. The MFOs shall have the following weights: MFO 1 = 50%; MFO 2 = 20%; MFO 3 = 20%; MFO 4 = 10%, hence:

$$\text{Weighted Points (WP)} = \text{MFO1} \times 0.5 + \text{MFO2} \times 0.2 + \text{MFO3} \times 0.2 + \text{MFO4} \times 0.10$$

B. Offices/STO/GASS

1. The Offices or Support to Operations (STO) and General Administration Support Services (GASS) shall be ranked based on the Weighted Mean (WM) or Average of Performance in their Office Performance Commitment and Review (OPCR). The Office with the highest WM shall be ranked no. 1, the next highest shall be ranked no. 2, and so forth and so on...
2. The OPCR ratings shall be based on the SLSU SPMS approved by the CSC in 2015.

C. GOOD, BETTER, AND BEST RATINGS

1. The College/Campus shall only qualify for PBB if it accomplished at least 90% or above of the targets in each of the four MFOs.
2. The Offices or the STO and GASS shall qualify only if they have met all their targets with the rating of at least 3 (satisfactory) or higher.
3. The Colleges/Campuses and the Offices/STO/GASS shall be ranked separately.
4. The GOOD, BETTER, or BEST college/campus shall be selected based on their WPs, while the Offices or STO and GASS on their WM.
5. The BEST delivery units shall comprise 15% of the colleges/campuses and offices that have the highest WP/WM.
6. The BETTER delivery units shall comprise 25% of the colleges/campuses and offices that have the highest WP/WM, after the 15% BEST has been selected.
7. The GOOD delivery units shall comprise 65% of the colleges/campuses and offices that have the highest WP/WM, after the 25% BETTER delivery units have been selected.

II. RANKING OF INDIVIDUAL EMPLOYEE

Ratings of individual faculty member shall be based on the SLSU SPMS 2015. The teaching and non-teaching staff shall be ranked separately.

A. TEACHING STAFF

- General rating scale ranges from 1 (lowest) and 5 (highest)
- Includes 2nd Semester AY 2014-2015 and 1st Semester AY 2014-2015 rating periods
- Average rating = $(1st\ Sem\ Total + 2nd\ Sem\ Total) / 2$

1. Core Functions

- a. Quality = $\frac{\text{No. Of Students who obtained 2.5 or higher GWA grades}}{\text{Students enrolled}}$

Description	Numerical Rating	Adjectival Rating
46% or more of students obtained a GWA grade of 2.5 or better	5	Outstanding
41.00-45.99% of students obtained a GWA grade of 2.5 or better	4	Very Satisfactory
36.00-40.99% of students obtained a GWA grade of 2.5 or better	3	Satisfactory
31.00-35.99% of students obtained a GWA grade of 2.5 or better	2	Unsatisfactory
30.99% and below of students obtained a GWA grade of 2.5 or better	1	Poor

- b. Efficiency = $\frac{\text{Students passed}}{\text{Total number of students enrolled}}$

Description	Numerical Rating	Adjectival Rating
90.00% or more of students passed over the total number of students enrolled	5	Outstanding
80.00-89.99% of students passed over the total number of students enrolled	4	Very Satisfactory
70.00-79.99% of students passed over the total number of students enrolled	3	Satisfactory
60.00-69.99% of students passed over the total number of students enrolled	2	Unsatisfactory
59.99% and below of students passed over the total number of students enrolled	1	Poor

- c. Timeliness

Description	Numerical Rating	Adjectival Rating
Task completed 30.00% or more earlier than the target period	5	Outstanding
Task completed 15.00 – 29.99% earlier than the target	4	Very Satisfactory
Task completed on the target period	3	Satisfactory
Task completed 15.99 – 30.99% later than the target period	2	Unsatisfactory
Task completed 31% or more later the target period	1	Poor

2. Strategic Functions – comprises the ratings on Research and Extension services.
3. Support Functions – includes ratings from accreditations, committee works, etc.

A. FACULTY (FULL-TIME)

1. Instructor to Associate Professor

Core Functions (Instruction)	70%
Strategic Priorities (Research/ Extension)	15%
Support Functions (Committee works/ Consultation/ Accreditation)	15%

2. Professor

Core Functions (Instruction)	45%
Strategic Priorities (Research/ Extension)	45%
Support Functions (Extension/ Committee works)	10%

B. FACULTY WITH DESIGNATION

Director/Dean

Chairman

Core Functions (Instruction)	30% (12ETL)*-	55% (6ETL)
Strategic Priorities (Research/ Extension)	15%	15%
Support Functions (As Designees)	55%	30%

*Extra Teaching Load

C. NON-TEACHING STAFF

- General rating scale ranges from 1 (lowest) and 5 (Highest)
- Includes January to December 31, 2015 rating periods
- Individually rated by the supervisor or head of the office based on the SPMS 2015 rating scales of the Individual Performance Commitment and Review (IPCR)

Core Functions	85%
Strategic or Support Functions	15%

Prepared by:



MOSES T. MACALINAO
Director, Planning & Development

Approved by:



MILO O. PLACINO, PhD
University President