Republic of the Philippines
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

CHED MEMORANDUM ORDER
No. 60
Series of 2006

SUBJECT : **IMPLEMENTING GUIDELINES FOR THE CHED CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE AND CENTERS OF DEVELOPMENT FOR ENGINEERING EDUCATION**

In accordance with the pertinent provisions of Republic Act No. 7722, otherwise known as the Higher Education Act of 1994, and by virtue of Resolution No. 782-2006 dated November 13, 2006, the attached Implementing Guidelines and evaluation workbook for the CHED Centers of Excellence and Centers of Development for Engineering are hereby adopted and promulgated by the Commission on Higher Education for information, guidance and compliance of all concerned thus:

The Attached Implementing Guidelines and Evaluation Workbook for the CHED Centers of Excellence and Centers of Development contains detailed information on the process of application, selection, evaluation, grants, responsibilities of the Centers, and other concerns in the identification and implementation of the COE/COD .

This order shall take effect upon approval and after publication in the official gazette or in a newspaper of general circulation.

Pasig City Philippines December 29, 2006

V

FOR THE COMMISSION:

CARLITO S. PUNO, DPA
Chairman

5/F Upper DAP Bldg., San Miguel Avenue, Ortigas Center, Pasig City 1605 Philippines
Website: www.ched.gov.ph Tel. Nos. 633-27-13, 910-08-23, 638-58-35, 636-16-94 Fax No. 635-58-29

IMPLEMENTING GUIDELINES FOR THE CHED CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE / DEVELOPMENT FOR ENGINEERING PROJECT 2007-2010

Version 1.03 (03/07)

Table of Contents

Page

IMPLEMENTING GUIDELINES FOR THE CHED CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE / DEVELOPMENT FOR ENGINEERING PROJECT 2007-2010

In accordance with the pertinent provisions of Republic Act No. 7722, otherwise known as the Higher Education Act of 1994, and to expedite the attainment of relevant, responsive, and quality higher education in the country, the following guidelines for the support and development of Centers of Excellence and Centers of Development for Engineering are hereby adopted and promulgated by the Commission of Higher Education, thus:

1. BASIC CONCEPTS

1.1 Statement of Policy

Section 8 (f) of the Higher Education Act of 1994 provides that the Commission develop Centers that can spearhead the nation's thrust towards development. It is, therefore, the policy of the Commission to promote quality and excellence in higher education by identifying, supporting, and developing Centers of Excellence and Centers of Development in higher education institutions (HEIs). These implementing guidelines for Centers of Excellence/Development for Engineering are designed to support the original priorities set forth by the Commission yet be flexible enough to maximize the impact for the assistance and upgrading of programs and to consider the unique needs and priorities of the selected institutions in trying to best address their developmental requirements.

1.2 The First Centers of Excellence / Development Project (1997-2004)

The original basis for the identification of Centers of Excellence/ Development was CHED Memo No. 14, Series of 1997. For this project, a set of guidelines was issued by the CHED dated 19 March 1997 and was disseminated to all institutions through the CHED Regional Offices (CHEDROs). Interested institutions submitted applications for their programs to the CHEDROs, where they were initially evaluated. Complete applications were forwarded to the CHED main office and the TPETA. Evaluation visits of programs were conducted from November 1997 to April 1998 by a team of program specialists trained by the TPETA. Based on the evaluation, the TPETA submitted a recommendation on Potential Centers of Excellence to the Commission in June 1998. After an additional recommendation by the TPETA, the final decision by the Commission was to award the following status to programs based on the evaluation ratings:

- Center of Excellence: 90% or better
- Center of Development Category 1: 80% to 89%
- Center of Development Category 2: 70% to 79%

The Commission issued Resolution R457-98 dated 16 November 1998 identifying specific programs of institutions as COEs, COD-1s, and COD-2s. As benefits, COEs were to receive three million pesos a year for three academic years, COD-1s will receive one million a year for three years, and COD-2s will receive 500,000 pesos a year for three years, provided that the institution will provide counterpart funding of the same amount. Specific guidelines were given for the proper expenditure and liquidation of the grants. Due to unavoidable delays, the project extended to 2004.

1.3 Reconceptualization of the Project

Limited funding constraints have forced the rethinking of the Centers of Excellence/Development Project. In April of 2004, the Commission released a new CMO on the revised policies and standards for the Centers of Excellence Project. The specific guidelines contained in this document follow the revised policies as stated in CMO No. 20, series of 2004.

1.4 Definitions

1.4.1 Center of Excellence for Engineering (COEFE)
A Center of Excellence for Engineering is an engineering department or unit of a higher education institution with a strong undergraduate program, research and extension capability, and preferably a good graduate program. Beginning Academic Year 2008-2009, the evaluation process and criteria will be specified for the selection of programs for COEFE status.

1.4.2 Center of Development for Engineering (CODFE)
A Center of Development for Engineering is an engineering unit of a higher education institution with a good undergraduate program, extension capability, and potential for research. For the 2007-2008-period, the following evaluation criteria must be met:

a. An overall evaluation rating of 75% or better;
b. All ratings in all four evaluation areas are better than 50%; and
c. No critical deficiency. A critical deficiency arises when a critical item incurs a failed rating.

Henceforth, COEFEs and CODFEs will be collectively referred to as Centers.

1.5 Procedure for the Application, Evaluation, and Selection of Centers

1.5.1 Schedule for the Transition Period 2007-2009

For the transition from the previous Centers of Excellence/Development Project to the new project, the reevaluation and selection of Centers will be done in two phases: Centers of Development will be evaluated in time for designation by the start of Academic Year 2008-2009, Centers of Excellence will be evaluated and selected in time for designation by the start of Academic Year 2009-2010. Thereafter, if the CHED COE/COD Project will be continued, reevaluations and selections for all Centers for Engineering will be done every three years. Centers of Development designated starting Academic Year 2008-2009 can apply for reevaluation for Center of Excellence status for 2009-2010. The process for selecting the Centers of Excellence including their benefits will be issued in a separate set of additional guidelines.

1.5.2 Application for CODFE Status

a. Any HEI offering an undergraduate program in the following engineering fields can apply for a Center of Development for Engineering status for 2007-2008:
   - Aeronautical Engineering
   - Ceramics Engineering
   - Chemical Engineering
   - Civil Engineering
   - Computer Engineering
   - Electrical Engineering
   - Electronics and Communications Engineering
   - Geodetic Engineering
   - Industrial Engineering
   - Mechanical Engineering
   - Metallurgical Engineering
   - Mining Engineering
   - Sanitary Engineering

b. The instrument to be used for evaluation is the COEDFE Evaluation Workbook, Version 1.03. The evaluation workbook can be requested from the CHED TPETA Secretariat or can be downloaded from the CHED website: *www.ched.gov.ph*.

c. A complete application will consist of:
   - A letter of application for a Center of Development status from the Department Chair offering the program, properly endorsed by the College Dean and the University President/Chancellor;
   - Two copies of the properly accomplished Microsoft Excel COEDFE Evaluation Workbook in electronic form, each stored in a separate CD-Recordable (CD-R) disc; and
   - A printed and signed copy of the contents of the evaluation workbook.

1.5.3 Evaluation of CODFE Applicants

a. Applications will be received by the CHEDROs and will be forwarded to the CHED main office and the TPETA. Applications can also be submitted directly to and received by the TPETA Secretariat at the CHED main office.

b. The complete application set (application letter, one copy of the accomplished evaluation workbook in CD-R, signed printout) will be kept on file by the TPETA Secretariat. The responses in the second copy of the accomplished evaluation workbook will be converted from Microsoft Excel formulas or references into values (“frozen”) by the TPETA Secretariat prior to the evaluation workbook being assigned to a CHED-appointed evaluator.

c. Based on the electronic workbook submitted and the results of an ocular visit to the institution, if necessary, the evaluator will validate the responses made by the program respondent and will come up with a rating for the academic program.

d. In instances where there is disagreement between the program respondent and the evaluator regarding certain items in the evaluation, the program respondent may supply additional supporting documentation to the TPETA Secretariat in support of

the appeal. The TPETA will make the final decision on such matters.

1.5.4 Selection of CODFEs

a. After all applicants have been fully evaluated, the TPETA will submit a recommendation on the Centers of Development to the Commission for action.
b. The CHED Commissioners meeting en banc will deliberate on the recommendation by the TPETA and will come up with the list of programs that will be granted Centers of Development status for 2008-2009.

1.6 Grants and Benefits for Centers

For the initial phase, the selected Centers of Development will be entitled to the following grants and benefits:

a. CODs that would like to avail for grants on a per project basis will be subject to the recommendation of the TPETA and will be subjected to the approval of the Commission.
b. Priority in the selection of CHED institutional partners with regard to other CHED developmental projects.
c. Entitlement to other non-monetary subsidies and awards such as graduate scholarships for faculty members (CHED Faculty Development Programs) and priority for CHED research grants.

A separate set of additional guidelines will be issued for the grants and benefits for the Centers of Excellence for 2009-2010.

1.7 Roles and Responsibilities

The units and institutions cooperating in this program shall adopt the following roles and responsibilities:

1.7.1 Centers of Development and Higher Education Institutions

a. Act as role models/leaders in the local, regional and national community;
b. Sustain and enhance research capabilities and upgrade professional or research graduate programs in engineering;
c. Provide assistance to agencies / institutions within its geographical area of coverage;
d. Undertake other activities/projects necessary in developing quality education in engineering;
e. Accelerate the development of the engineering discipline through strategic developmental programs and projects;
f. Develop instructional program quality through faculty development activities and upgrading of facilities and library resources;
g. Undertake basic and applied research activities on emerging trends and advancement in the field and offer graduate programs;
h. Undertake extension and linkage projects through regional or national consortia agreements, internationalization activities and industry-academe collaboration;

i. Provide assistance to other HEIs within its area of coverage in terms of faculty and curricular development and other quality improvement activities; and
j. Establish linkages with COEs in the same discipline to further improve their capability to undertake research in engineering

1.7.2 CHED Technical Panel for Engineering, Technology and Architecture (TPETA)

The Commission on Higher Education's Technical Panel for Engineering, Technology and Architecture shall:

a. Recommend the criteria and the procedures for the identification of Centers of Excellence/Development for Engineering;
b. Recommend the possible CODFEs to the Commission;
c. Review the project proposals with assistance from the Technical Committees and recommend the award of grants and other forms of benefits to the Centers;
d. Assist the Centers in preparing their work and financial plans in accordance with CHED priorities and financial regulations;
e. Monitor and evaluate the progress of the grant projects with assistance from the CHED-OPS TPETA Secretariat and CHEDROs; and
f. Recommend a program of action to the Commission after the duration of the project.

1.7.3 CHED Regional Offices (CHEDRO)

The CHEDROs shall:

a. Assist the TPETA, through the CHED's Office of Programs and Standards (OPS), in receiving applications from the HEIs;
b. Assist the Centers in the implementation of the different components in their approved project grants;
c. Assist the TPETA in monitoring the development and progress of the Centers being supported;
d. Submit progress assessment reports to the CHED OPS on the Centers' status of implementation of approved projects;
e. Facilitate the processing of the financial liquidation reports to the CHED-COA Regional Auditors; and
f. Submit the liquidation reports of the Centers to the TPETA Secretariat of the CHED-OPS.

1.7.4 CHED Higher Education Development Fund (CHED-HEDF)

The CHED-HEDF shall:

a. Release the financial requirements of the Center as reflected in its approved grant project proposal;
b. Verify the correctness of the liquidation reports submitted by the Centers; and
c. Coordinate with the TPETA Secretariat of CHED-OPS regarding the financial and operational status and requirements of the Centers for orderly and expeditious action.

2. OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES FOR GRANTS AND BENEFITS OF CENTERS

2.1 Centers of Development can apply for grants on a per project basis. Larger projects can be broken up into activities or modules that can be applied for grants. The proposal will be evaluated and recommended by the TPETA. In no case will a Center have more than two grants at any one time.

2.2 Project duration for the grants should preferably not exceed one calendar year. Longer projects should be broken up into modules not exceeding one year.

2.3 The grants for the Centers of Development can be used for the following:

- 2.3.1 Instructional Quality
  - a. Faculty Development for Academic Staff (degree and non-degree)
  - b. Upgrading of Library Resources
  - c. Upgrading of Facilities
  - d. Program and Instructional Materials Development
- 2.3.2 Research and Publication
  - a. Research Grants
  - b. Publication Fee Awards
  - c. Innovation and Commercialization Projects
- 2.3.3 Extension and Linkages
  - a. Industry-Academe Projects
  - b. Faculty Development for Other Institutions
  - c. Consortia Agreements
  - d. Internationalization Activities

2.4 Funds provided by the CHED for a grant must be fully liquidated by the Center before a new grant proposal for the Center can be approved and awarded.

2.5 Other benefits of the Centers of Development like CHED scholarships and CHED research grants will be subject to the specific guidelines previously released by the CHED.

2.6 The TPETA shall monitor the implementation of the grants and benefits and may decide not to award additional grants or benefits to a Center due to non-performance.

3. PERIOD OF VALIDITY

The designation of Centers of Development for Engineering shall be starting Academic Year 2008-2009, subject to regular monitoring by the CHED. If, at any point, the CHED assesses the Center as being incapable of fulfilling its functions and responsibilities, the designation shall be revoked.

4. REPEAL

All other CHED issuances that are inconsistent with these implementing guidelines are hereby repealed or modified.

5. EFFECTIVITY

These guidelines shall take effect upon the approval by the Commissioners of the Commission on Higher Education through a resolution and after publication in an official gazette or in a newspaper of general circulation.

ANNEX A: SELECTION CRITERIA

Potential CODs shall be identified using the following criteria

CRITERIA **(Specific Area)**	***WEIGHT***	
1. INSTRUCTIONAL QUALITY		**45%**
1.1 Administration	2.25%	
1.2 Faculty	13.50%	
1.3 Curriculum	4.50%	
1.4 Laboratories	3.15%	
1.5 Engineering Library	3.15%	
1.6 Instructional Facilities	2.70%	
1.7 Instructional Materials, Methods, and Support	2.25%	
1.8 Students	2.25%	
1.9 Licensure Examination (If required for the program)	11.25%	
2. RESEARCH AND PUBLICATION		**30%**
2.1 Personnel	9.00%	
2.2 Organization and Funding	4.50%	
2.3 Facilities and Equipment	4.50%	
2.4 Output	12.00%	
3. EXTENSION AND LINKAGES		**20%**
3.1 Personnel	6.00%	
3.2 Organization and Budget	3.00%	
3.3 Facilities and Equipment	3.00%	
3.4 Output	8.00%	
4. INSTITUTIONAL QUALIFICATIONS		**5%**
4.1 Vision/Mission/Objectives	1.00%	
4.2 Institutional Planning and Development	1.00%	
4.3 Governance	1.25%	
4.4 Linkages	0.75%	
4.5 Site and Buildings	1.00%	

BREAKDOWN OF THE EVALUATION CRITERIA:

1.	Instructional Quality	45	
	1.1 Administration	5	
	1.1.1 Program administration <critical>		10
	1.1.2 Program accreditation		10
	1.1.3 Qualifications of the College Dean		30
	1.1.4 Qualifications of the Department Chair		50
	1.2 Faculty	30	
	1.2.1 Performance		40
	1.2.2 Qualifications <critical>		55
	1.2.3 Faculty awards, achievements, and recognition		5
	1.3 Curriculum	10	
	1.3.1 Curriculum standards <critical>		70
	1.3.2 Last curriculum review		15
	1.3.3 Last curriculum revision		15
	1.4 Laboratories	7	
	1.4.1 Required teaching laboratories <critical>		5
	1.4.2 Teaching laboratories rating (weighted average of all laboratories)		35
	1.4.3 Required computer laboratories <critical>		5
	1.4.4 Computer laboratories rating (average of all laboratories)		35
	1.4.5 Modernization and sustainability		10
	1.4.6 Student-faculty ratio		10
	1.5 Engineering Library	7	
	1.5.1 Book collection and journals/periodicals		50
	1.5.2 Library requirements		24
	1.5.3 Library personnel		21
	1.5.4 Interlibrary cooperative relations		5
	1.6 Instructional Facilities	6	
	1.6.1 Classrooms		50
	1.6.2 Audiovisual facilities and equipment		20
	1.6.3 Faculty office		15
	1.6.4 Faculty computer access		15
	1.7 Instructional Materials, Methods, and Support	5	
	1.7.1 Instructional materials		60
	1.7.2 Innovative teaching methods		20
	1.7.3 Teaching and learning programs and support		20
	1.8 Students	5	
	1.8.1 Admission requirements		30
	1.8.2 Retention and readmission		25
	1.8.3 Student disciplinary process		10
	1.8.4 Financial scholarships		10
	1.8.5 Student services		15
	1.8.6 Student awards, achievements, and recognition		10
	1.9 Licensure Examination (If required for the program)	25	
	1.9.1 Percentage of graduates taking PRC examination		15
	1.9.2 Average performance in PRC examination <critical>		75
	1.9.3 PRC licensure examination performance awards		10

2. Research and Publication	30		
2.1 Personnel		30	
2.1.1 Full-time faculty members performing research			40
2.1.2 Students performing research			35
2.1.3 Full-time research support staff and personnel			15
2.1.4 Director or coordinator for research			10
2.2 Organization and Funding		15	
2.2.1 Formal research organization in college or university			40
2.2.2 Annual research budget of the university			15
2.2.3 Annual research funding of the college			30
2.2.4 Utilization of the college research funding			15
2.3 Facilities and Equipment		15	
2.3.1 Research office			10
2.3.2 Research laboratory/laboratories			50
2.3.3 Research equipment and facilities rating			30
2.3.4 Utilization of research equipment and facilities			10
2.4 Output		40	
2.4.1 Research performance			30
2.4.2 Research projects			35
2.4.3 Publications			35
3. Extension and Linkages	20		
3.1 Personnel		30	
3.1.1 Full-time faculty members involved in extension			40
3.1.2 Students involved in community extension services			35
3.1.3 Full-time extension support staff and personnel			15
3.1.4 Coordinator or supervisor for extension			10
3.2 Organization and Budget		15	
3.2.1 Extension organizations			50
3.2.2 Extension budgets			50
3.3 Facilities and Equipment		15	
3.3.1 Office for community outreach			50
3.3.2 Equipment for community outreach			50
3.4 Output		40	
3.4.1 Community extension services undertaken			30
3.4.2 Faculty engaged in consultancy or professional work			20
3.4.3 Formal linkages with industry			15
3.4.4 Formal linkages with other educational institutions			15
3.4.5 Hosting/training of faculty members of other institutions			10
3.4.6 Faculty service in organizations and foundations			10

4. Institutional Qualifications	5		
4.1 Vision/Mission/Objectives		20	
4.1.1 Vision/mission of the university			15
4.1.2 Vision/mission of the college			15
4.1.3 Vision/mission of the department			20
4.1.4 Priority objectives of the department			25
4.1.5 Implementation			25
4.2 Institutional Planning and Development		20	
4.2.1 Office for planning and development			20
4.2.2 Long-term institutional development plan			20
4.2.3 Medium-term institutional development plan			20
4.2.4 Implementation of institutional plans			20
4.2.5 Mechanism to review and update development plans			20
4.3 Governance		25	
4.3.1 Direction and support from higher administration			25
4.3.2 Faculty councils/assemblies			25
4.3.3 Manuals and standard operating procedures			30
4.3.4 Fund generation			20
4.4 Linkages		15	
4.4.1 Participation of university in international organizations			25
4.4.2 Participation of university in national organizations			15
4.4.3 Participation of college or department in international organizations			35
4.4.4 Participation of college or department in national organizations			25
4.5 Site and Buildings		20	
4.5.1 Land and buildings ownership			25
4.5.2 University and college rating			50
4.5.3 Health and safety provisions			25

QUALITATIVE SELECTION CRITERIA FOR CHED CENTERS OF DEVELOPMENT FOR ENGINEERING

Version 1.03 (03/07)

QUALITATIVE SELECTION CRITERIA

The selection criteria are based on CMO 25, s. 2005 (Revised Policies, Standards and Guidelines for Engineering Education) and CMO 20, s. 2004.

I. INSTRUCTIONAL QUALITY (45%)

1.1 Administration (5%)

1.1.1 Program Administration (10%)
The program must be offered under a college/faculty/school of engineering and must have a proper authority to operate.

1.1.2 Program Accreditation (10%)
The program preferably should be accredited by a recognized accrediting body.

The school/college of engineering shall have (a) a full-time dean, (b) a full-time department head in each curricular program area on reduced teaching loads (no more than 80% of full-time teacher's teaching load), and (c) at least a full-time assistant dean, whenever needed, to adequately support the administrative functions of the dean.

1.1.3 Qualifications of the College Dean (30%)
The dean of the school/college of engineering must:

a. be a holder of baccalaureate and master's degree in engineering, preferably in the fields/programs being offered by the school;
b. be preferably a holder of a doctorate degree in engineering or related fields;
c. have a minimum teaching experience of not less than five (5) years, at least five (5) years administrative experience, and at least five (5) years field experience; and
d. be a registered engineer, if applicable.

1.1.4 Qualifications of the Department Chair (50%)
The department chair/head of each program must:

a. be a holder of baccalaureate and master's degrees in engineering in the field of specialization; and
b. be a registered engineer, if applicable.

1.2 Faculty (30%)

1.2.1 Performance (40%)
The evaluation result should show that majority of the faculty has, as a whole, good or better performance. The evaluation should be based on evaluation system with clear and documented guidelines, participated by the administration, dean, department chair, peers,

and students. The loading profile should also be a consideration in the evaluation of faculty performance. Other considerations shall be in compliance with CMO 25, s. 2005.

1.2.2 Qualification (55%)
Both full-time and part-time faculty members handling professional courses should be holders of master's degrees in the field of specialization, registered engineers, if applicable, and with substantial number of years of experience both in teaching and industry. Hiring policies should also be a consideration in this component.

1.2.3 Faculty Awards, Achievements, and Recognition (5%)
The faculty should strive to garner individual awards and gain achievements and recognition in their chosen fields.

1.3 Curriculum (10%)
The curriculum of each engineering program that a school/college of engineering offers shall meet the minimum requirements set by the Commission on Higher Education.

1.4 Laboratories (7%)
The teaching and computer laboratories shall comply with the minimum requirements specified in CMO 25, s. 2005.

1.5 Engineering Library (7%)
The school/college of engineering should have a separate library and should comply with the minimum requirements specified in CMO 25, s. 2005.

1.6 Instructional Facilities (6%)
Classrooms and instructional facilities should be adequate and should conform to CMO 25, s. 2005 and other laws.

1.7 Instructional Materials, Methods, and Support (5%)
There should be adequate and updated instructional materials, which can be used to undertake innovative teaching. The materials can be in the form of books, CD-ROMs, papers presented in conferences, articles found in magazines, or published experiences rendered by outstanding faculty members in the past. New teaching innovations to improve the methods of teaching and learning shall be developed by the school administration and shall be evaluated by the faculty for their effectiveness. The institution should show support for improving teaching and learning methods.

1.8 Students (5%)
The institution/college shall have a clear admission requirements, selection and retention policy, and adequate student services.

1.9 Licensure Examination (25%)
The performance of graduates of the department in the professional licensure examinations should be equal or higher than the national passing percentage for the past five (5) years.

II. RESEARCH AND PUBLICATION (30%)

The college/department should have a well-developed culture for research. Faculty members actively engaged in relevant and significant research work in engineering shall be afforded special privileges and benefits such as reduced teaching load and/or its equivalent without diminution of pay or additional compensation on top of the regular load.

2.1 Personnel (30%)
For the development of research, the institution shall designate a competent research director, research assistants, and other personnel for the research office.

2.2 Organization and Funding (15%)
There shall be a formal organization in order for the research function to be carried out effectively. Research funds shall be allocated. As much as possible, there shall be external agency support for research.

2.3 Facilities and Equipment (15%)
There shall be adequate facilities and equipment to accommodate the research efforts of students and faculty members.

2.4 Output (40%)
There shall be documented research output, preferably papers published in refereed journals.

III. EXTENSION AND LINKAGES (25%)

3.1 Personnel (30%)
There shall be an appointed supervisor to coordinate community extension projects.

3.2 Organization and Budget (15%)
There shall be an organization for the effective implementation of community extension projects. Funds for community extension projects shall be allocated.

3.3 Facilities and Equipment (15%)
There shall be adequate facilities and equipment for community extension projects.

3.4 Output (40%)

3.4.1. Community Extension Services (30%)
The administration of each school/college of engineering shall maintain close relations with local industries, professional societies, and the general public for recruitment and placement of graduates as well as providing educational services to these groups.

3.4.2. Consultancy or Professional Work (20%)
The administration of each school/college of engineering may allow their faculty members to engage in consultancy services for as long

as these services do not adversely affect the faculty members' performance.

3.4.3 Industry-Academe Linkage (15%)
The school/college shall establish and maintain satisfactory relationship with industry for the on-the-job training of their students. The institution shall allot and provide financial assistance to the projects.

3.4.4 Linkages with Other Educational Institutions (15%)
The school/college is encouraged to maintain formal linkages with other educational institutions.

3.4.5 Faculty Exchange (10%)
The school/college is encouraged to have a faculty exchange program with other educational institutions.

3.4.6 Faculty Service in Organizations and Foundations (10%)
The faculty is encouraged to devote individual service to worthy organizations and foundations.

IV. INSTITUTIONAL QUALIFICATIONS (5%)

4.1 Vision/Mission/Objectives (20%)
A good academic program stems from a clear and achievable vision/mission of the institution, the college, and the department for excellence and quality. The institution's development plan, organization, and governance must all be geared towards this vision.

4.1.1 Vision/Mission of the Institution (15%)
4.1.2 Vision/ Mission of the College (15%)
4.1.3 Vision/ Mission of the Department (20%)
4.1.4 Priority Objectives of the Department (25%)
4.1.5 Implementation (25%)

4.2 Institutional Planning and Development (20%)
The institution/university should have an office for planning and development. The institution/university must have development plans, which should be implemented, assessed, and updated.

4.3 Governance (25%)
Matters relating to governance such as administrator/faculty involvement, student services, administrative publications, and records should conform to CMO 25, s.2005.

4.4 Linkages (15%)
There should be active and formal participation by the institution/university and the college/department in international and national organizations.

4.5 Site and Buildings (20%)
The site and buildings should conform to the appropriate government laws and CMO 25, s. 2005.