



## SYSTEM OF RANKING DELIVERY UNITS AND INDIVIDUALS FOR THE GRANT OF PERFORMANCE BASED BONUS- FY 2020 REVISION

### I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to Administrative Order No. 25, series 2011 as affirmed by Executive Order No. 80, otherwise known as the **Performance-Based Bonus (PBB)**, which aims to reward, by way of granting additional cash incentive (bonus) to individuals in line with their performance. The granting of said cash incentive (bonus) follows specific guidelines and procedures. The guidelines involve the proportionate distribution of performances to delivering units (DUs), such as *best, better, and good performing bureaus*.

This Ranking System is based on the criteria stipulated in the CSC-approved Strategic Performance Management System (SPMS) Manual, the PBB IATF Memorandum Circular Nos. 2020-1, dated June 2, 2020. Whereas delivery units are identified, determined, and clustered per IATF Memorandum Circular No. 2020-1-Section 7.0 Sub-section 7.2(a), KSU organizational structure, DUs' functional charts, and similarities of tasks and responsibilities.

In Kalinga State University (KSU), the DUs are composed of the President's Office, including the Deputy Heads and immediate support staff, various Services, Campuses, and Colleges. Last FY 2019 PBB grant, the Kalinga State University registered thirty (30) DUs as an offshoot of conversion into Kalinga State University for this FY 2020 PBB cycle. This entitles KSU three (3) DUs according to the ten percent (10%) to be forced rank as best performing DUs. Two (2) of these best performing DUs are divided equally between the teaching unit (faculty) and the support unit (administration) because they have different natures of works to perform. While designated offices and services shall contest upon the remaining one (1) best performing DU.

Moreover, last FY 2019 PBB cycle, the student services were replaced by four (4) services such as Health Services, Guidance and Scholarship Services, Registrar Services, and Library Services making the total number of Delivering Units into twenty-one (21).

Below are the groupings:

Groupings	No.	Delivery Units
<b>A. COLLEGES</b> under the Teaching Delivery Units	1.	College of Criminal Justice Education (CCJE)
	2.	College of Agriculture (CoA)
	3.	College of Forestry (CoF)
	4.	College of Business, Entrepreneurship and Accountancy
	5.	College of Engineering and Information Technology (CEIT)
	6.	College of Law (Claw)
	7.	College of Liberal Arts (CLA)
	8.	College of Education CoEd)
	9.	College of Agroforestry and Environmental Science (CAES) in Rizal Campus
	10.	College of Health and Natural Sciences (CHNS)
	11.	College of Public Administration and Indigenous Governance (CPAIG)
<b>B. SERVICES</b> under the Research, Extension and Training, and Support to Operations	1.	Research and Development Services (RDS)
	2.	Extension and Training Services (ETS)
	3.	Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Student Development (VPASD)
	4.	Open Distance Education, Transnational Education, and International Linkages (OPETEIL)
	5.	Library Services Lib)
	6.	Laboratory Services (Lab)
	7.	Center of Training and Professional Development (CTPD)
	8.	Student Services and Placement Services (SSPS)
	9.	Sports and Socio-Cultural Affairs (SSCA)
	10.	University Registrar's Services (URS)





<b>C. OFFICES</b> under the Support Delivering Units occupied by Non-Teaching Personnel	1.	Office of the President (OP)
	2.	Office of the Vice President for Administration and Finance (VPAF)
	3.	General Services Office (GSO)
	4.	Finance Management Services (FMS)
	5.	Income Generating Projects (IGP)
	6.	Administrative Services (AS)
	7.	Information, Communication and Technology (ICT) Center
	8.	Planning and Strategy (PS)
	9.	Quality Assurance (QA)
<b>Total No.</b>	<b>31</b>	

## II. DESCRIPTION OF THE CRITERIA AND PROCESS USED IN RATING THE PERFORMANCE AND RANKING OF THE DELIVERY UNITS AND EMPLOYEES

### Office Performance Assessment:

1. The University President assesses and evaluates the performance of departments/offices.
2. The key officials initially assess the office's performance using the Department and Sectoral Performance Commitment and Review as a rating instrument for the semi-annual period – January to June and July to December.
3. As the implementing arm of the University's Strategic Performance Management System (SPMS), the Performance Management Team (PMT) to be assisted by the Human Resource Management Office, the Kalinga State University Employees Association President, and the PBB Committee, shall validate, consolidate and rank the accomplishments reported by offices as necessary.
4. Various rating scales are used for a specific set of measures, as follows:
  - ✓ **Core Functions** - these are functions that implement and deliver the mandates of the State University as identified in the University Code and Strategic Plan.
  - ✓ **Strategic Functions** - Special programs/projects supported by the national government and other institutions.
  - ✓ **Support Functions** - these are functions that provide necessary resources to enable the State University to perform its mandate effectively.

### Performance Assessment and Evaluation for Individual Employees:

1. Each employee and faculty member submits his/her targets at the beginning of each semester (rating period) in the prescribed Individual Performance Commitment Review (IPCR) form. There are two (2) rating periods per year: from January to June and July to December.
2. The immediate supervisor assesses individual employee performance based on the commitments or targets made at the beginning of the rating period. Each supervisor indicates qualitative comments, observations, and recommendations in the IPCR to include behavior and critical incidents that are considered for other human resource development purposes such as promotion and other interventions. Said assessment is discussed with the concerned individual before the submission of the IPCR to the department head.
3. The department head makes the final assessment of the individual employee's performance level in his/her office. The final assessment corresponds to the adjectival description of Outstanding, Very Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory, and Poor. The department head has adopted an appropriate mechanism to help him/her distinguish an individual's performance, such as, but not limited to, peer ranking and client satisfaction.
4. The average of all individual performance assessments shall not go higher than the office's collective performance assessment.
5. The department head shall ensure that the employees' performance assessments are submitted to the HRMO within the prescribed time.
6. The PMT shall serve as the appeals body and final arbiter on performance concerns. An employee who disagrees with the performance assessment may appeal to the PMT through the HRMO within ten (10) days from receipt of the final approved IPCR from the department head. The PMT shall decide on the appeals within one month from receipt of such formal appeal.





### Levels of Performance:

Each employee is rated based on the levels of performance set below (Based on the SPMS).

Numerical Description	Adjectival Rating	Numerical Rating
Performance exceeding targets by 30% and above of the planned targets	<i>Outstanding (O)</i>	130 and above
Performance exceeding targets by 15% to 29% of the planned targets	<i>Very Satisfactory (VS)</i>	115-129
Performance exceeding 9% to 14% of the planned targets	<i>Satisfactory (S)</i>	90-114
Performance of 5% to 8% below the planned targets	<i>Unsatisfactory (US)</i>	51-89
Performance of 4% and below and failing to meet any of the planned targets	<i>Poor (P)</i>	1-50

### III. SYSTEM OF RANKING DELIVERING UNITS FOR THE TEACHING FORCE (FACULTY)

The System of Ranking DUs for the Teaching Force (Faculty) is based on the criteria or parameters defined in the Major Final Outputs (MFOs) which are on (a) Instruction, (b) Research, and (c) Extension and which are specified in their respective S/DPCR based on the assigned quota or targets. The S/DPCR targets are the consolidation of the IPCR of Faculty in the respective Colleges.

The parameters identified in Instruction, Research, and Extension with the distribution of their corresponding points are shown in Table 1, Table 2, and Table 3, respectively. The target in instruction on the total number of graduates is based on the colleges' accomplishments in the previous year. The targets for Research and Extension are based on the number of Professors, Associate Professors, Assistant Professors, and Instructors in the college.

**Table 1. Parameters and points distribution for MFOs in Instruction**

#### a) Instruction (40 points)

Parameter	Bracket or Range	Points
Total number of graduates		12.0 pts
	<100	3.0 pts
	101-200	6.0 pts
	201-300	9.0 pts
	301-400	12.0 pts
Percentage of accredited programs		10.0 pts
Level 1	1	2.0 pts
	2	4.0 pts
Level 2	1	3.0 pts
	2	6.0 pts
Level 3	1	4.0 pts
	2	8.0 pts
Level 4	1	5.0 pts
	2	10.0 pts
COD/COE	1	6pts
Percentage of graduates employed within 2 years after graduation		6pts
10%-20%		2 pts
21%-30%		4 pts
31% and above		6 pts
Percentage change in the number of students enrolled in CHED and RDC identified Priority Programs/ courses		6pts
<15%		3 pts
>15%		6 pts

**Notes:** Instruction carries a total of 40 points because it is generally the main work of Faculty members.





**Table 2: Parameters and Points Distribution for MFO in Research**

The entry or qualifying number of Researches completed is at least the minimum in the target stipulated in the Respective S/DPCR/SPCR (table 4, 5, and 6). Failure to meet the target or quota number of Researches conducted, the Delivery unit is automatically in the Good Category or isolated if recommended by higher offices.

**b) Research (40 points)**

Number of Researches completed based on the target in the S/DPCR.		13.0 pts
International level researches	1	3.0 pts
	2	6.0 pts
	3 and above	9.0 pts
National level researches	1	1.0 pt
	2	2.0 pts
	3 and above	3.0 pts
Institutional level researches	1	0.5 pt
	2	1.0 pt
	3 and above	1.5 pts

Number of Researches Presented in recognized Legitimate Fora.		9.0 pts
International	1	1.5 pts
	2	3.0 pts
	3 and above	4.5 pts
National	1	1.0 pt
	2	2.0 pts
	3 and above	3.0 pts
Institutional	1	0.5 pt
	2	1.0 pt
	3 and above	1.5 pts

Number of researches published in reputable refereed publication recognized by CHED	10 pts
Local 0.5 each maximum of 1 pt.	1 pt
Regional 1.0 each maximum of 2 pts.	2 pts
National 1.5 each maximum of 3 pts.	3 pts
International 2 pts. each maximum of 4 pts.	4 pts

Number of Research outputs or Technologies Commercialized/ Patented/ Copyrighted which are disseminated and adopted by the industry or other beneficiaries	4.00 pts
1 patent/copyright/ um	2.0 pts
2 patents/copyright/ um's	4.0 pts

Percentage of researches conducted and completed on schedule	4.0
76%-80%	1 pt
81%-85%	2 pts
86%-90%	3 pts
91% and above	4 pts

**Research carries 40 points because it is the trademark of a University like that of Kalinga State University.**

**NOTES:**

- Classification of recognized legitimate fora and publications shall be based according to the organizing agency/company/organizations, participants, lecturers, and venue.
- A research work can be repeatedly counted, i.e., externally-funded research was presented in an organized International Forum, consequently published in an international publication, and consequently patented. In this case, the research can earn points for having been presented in an international forum, another points in the publication, and for having been patented.





- c) Legitimate government agencies must recognize domestic publication like the CHED, DOST, DOH, DOE, DOLE, DTI, DSWD, etc. The publication can be in a research journal or technical papers as a result of proceedings in conventions of professional organizations like PSAE, PSME, PICPA, PICE, etc.
- d) Domestic fora organized shall be CHED-endorsed and other legitimate national government agencies.
- e) A Research presented in different organized Fora shall be counted once and shall carry only the highest point. Example: A research presented in the AIHR, then at the ASCU-SN, in UNESCO-organized Forum, shall carry the maximum points of 1.5 points only (international).
- f) Patented work shall have passed through the Research and Development (R&D) of KSU.
- \* All claims of points shall be supported with appropriate and legitimate documents.
- \* Research work involving two or more colleges, the points shall be divided proportionately.
- g) Researches to be counted or considered shall have passed through the R and D of KSU.

**Table 3. Parameters and Points Distribution for MFO in Extension**

The entry or qualifying number of Extension conducted is at least the target stipulated in the Respective S/DPCR (tables 4, 5, and 6). Failure to meet the target number of Extension conducted, the Delivery unit is automatically in the Good Category or isolated if recommended by higher offices.

**c) Extension (20 points)**

Number of training days	3.0 pts
Less than or equal to 4 days	1.0 pt
5-8 days	2.0 pts
9 And above	3.0 pts
Number of training, extension activities conducted/Technical Advisories undertaken	3.0 pts

1-2	1.0 pt
3-4	2.0 pts
5 and above	3.0 pts

Number of persons trained weighted by length of training	3.0 pts
≤ 150	1.0 pt
151-300	2.0 pts
301 and above	3.0 pts
Percentage of Request for Training responded to within 3 days of the request.	3.0 pts
Below 100%	1.5 pts
100%	3.0 pts

Percentage of trainees who rated the training courses as good or better	3.0 pts
71-80%	1 pt
81-90%	2 pts
91-100%	3 pts

Number of poor beneficiaries of Technology Transfer/Extension Programs and activities leading to livelihood improvement.	3 pts
Less than 50	1.5 pts
More than 50	3.0 pts

Number of partnerships with LGU's, Industry, Small and Medium enterprise, and local entrepreneurs and other National Agency developing, implementing, or using new Technologies relevant o Agro-industrial development.	2.0 pts
1-2	1 pt
3-4	2 pts

**NOTE:** All claims of performances shall be supported with appropriate documents before they are considered.





#### IV. TARGET OF ACADEMIC UNITS SET IN THEIR S/DPCR ARE SHOWN IN TABLES 4, 5 AND 6

**Table 4. Quota or Target of Colleges in Instruction (FY 2020)**

MFO 1. INSTRUCTION	KSU Target	CCJE	CoA	CBA	CEIT	CLaw	CLASS	CoEd	CAES	CoF	CHNS	CPAIG	CETHM	Total
1. Percentage of first-time licensure exam-takers that pass the licensure exams	55%													
2. Percentage of graduates (2 years prior) that are employed	41%													
3. Percentage of undergraduate student population enrolled in CHED-identified and RDC-identified priority programs	85%													
4. Percentage of undergraduate programs with accreditation	88%													
a) Percentage of programs accredited level I				2	1	N/A					1			
b) Percentage of programs accredited level II		1	3		1	N/A			1				1	
c) Percentage of programs accredited level III			1	2	2	N/A	3	4		1		2	1	
5. Total number of graduates	777													

#### NOTES:

- There are thirty-six (36) KSU degree programs. Out of these programs, eight (8) are newly opened and eligible for accreditation upon graduation of the first batch of enrollees.
- Juris Doctor is recognized, inspected, and monitored by the Legal Education Board.
- There are twenty-seven (27) programs that are accreditable.

**Table 5. Quota or Target of Delivery Units in Research (FY 2020)**

MFO2. RESEARCH	KSU Target	CCJE	CoA	CBA	CEIT	CLaw	CLASS	CoEd	CAES	CoF	CHNS	CPAIG	CETHM	Total
1. Number of research outputs in the last three years utilized by the industry or by other beneficiaries	10													
2. Number of research outputs completed within the year	74													
3. Percentage of researches conducted and completed on schedule	100%													
4. Percentage of research outputs presented in local, regional, national and international fora	32.43%													
5. Percentage of research outputs published in internationally-refereed or CHED recognized journal within the year	32.43%													

**Table 6. Quota or Target of Delivery Units in Extension (FY 2020)**

#### A. GAA Target:

MFO3. EXTENSION	KSU Target	CCJE	CoA	CBA	CEIT	CLaw	CLASS	CoEd	CAES	CoF	CHNS	CPAIG	CETHM	Total
1. Number of active partnerships with LGUs, industries, NGOs, NGAs, SMEs, and other stakeholders as a result of extension activities	10													
2. Number of trainees weighted by the length of training	2700													
3. Number of extension programs organized and supported consistent with the SUC's mandated and priority programs	38													
4. Percentage of beneficiaries who rate the training course/s and advisory services as satisfactory or higher in terms of quality and relevance	85%													





**B. Details as submitted by Extension Services:**

MFO 4. EXTENSION SERVICES	KSU Target	CCJE	CoA	CBA	CEIT	CLaw	CLASS	CoEd	CAES	CoF	CHNS	CPAIG	CETHM	LHS
1. Number of training days	96													
2. Number of technical advisories undertaken														
3. Number of people trained weighted by length of training	3052													
4. Percentage request for training responded to within 3 days after request														
5. Percentage of trainees who rated training courses as good or better	96%													
6. Number of poor beneficiaries of Technology transfer/ Extension programs and activities leading to livelihood improvement	35													
7. Number of Partnership with LGU's, Industrial, Small and Medium Enterprise and local entrepreneurs and other National Agency in developing, implementing or using new Technologies relevant to Agro-industrial development	20													

**Note:** The College of Education and Laboratory High School have separate targets since they have a different budget.

**V. SYSTEM OF RANKING THE SUPPORT DELIVERING UNITS**

The System of Ranking the Support Delivery Units manned by Non-teaching personnel is based on the MFO's on Support to Operation (STO) and the General Administration and Support Services (GASS) defined in the PBB guidelines and policies.

The Performances of the Support Delivery Units are purely based on their respective S/DPCR's.

The Performances of the Support Delivering Units manned by Faculty members are based on both the MFO3 (Research) and their respective S/DPCR's. The MFO in research is included considering that the faculty members occupying the designations have faculty ranks of Associate Professors and Professors. They are required by NBC 461 guidelines to conduct research.

**VI. DISTRIBUTION OF THE PERFORMANCE AS TO BEST, BETTER AND GOOD FOR THE TEACHING DELIVERY UNITS AND THE SUPPORT UNITS**

**a) Best Performing Units (10% of 30 Delivery Units = 3.0≈3 units).**

- 1 for the Colleges under the Teaching Delivery Units.
- 1 for the Services under the Research, Extension and Support to Operations.
- 1 for the Offices under the Support Delivering Units occupied by Non-Teaching Personnel

**b) Better Performing Units (25% of 31 = 8.00≈8 units).**

- 3 for the Colleges
- 3 for the Services
- 2 for the Offices

**c) Good Performing Units (65% of 30 = 19.50≈19 units).**

- 7 for the Colleges
- 6 for the Services
- 6 for the Offices

The Delivering Units are forced ranked among themselves.





## VII. ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR THE GRANT OF PBB

1. The IPCR of the individual employees shall be evaluated. The detailed criteria and target of individuals identified by the units shall be considered/ "factored-in" in the IPCRs as agreed upon by the heads of offices and delivery units. Any applicable instrument shall be prepared to objectively assess the individual's compliance in the submission of required documents and support to the University policies and activities, and which shall form part of the IPCRs. Non-compliance to the IPCR submitted by each employee may isolate the employee from the PBB grant even if the delivery unit where he/she belongs complies with its S/DPCR targets.

The submission of identified required documents shall be monitored by the office where said reports are submitted. The Administration Office shall monitor the attendance to University Programs, and the respective Heads of Offices shall monitor the wearing of IDs and uniforms.

Non-submission or unjustifiable delay in submitting the S/DPCR/IPCR shall disqualify the Unit and the staff or faculty for awards and incentives.

2. A personnel of an eligible delivery unit must meet the following conditions to qualify for the grant of PBB:
  - a. must be holding a regular plantilla position or temporary position with plantilla item
  - b. he/she may be contractual or casual but must have an employer-employee relationship
  - c. his/her salaries are charged to the lump sum appropriation under PS
  - d. must have a satisfactory rating based on the CSC-approved SPMS
  - e. must satisfy his/her targets is his IPCR and contribute to the S/DPCR of the unit.
3. For personnel on detail to another government agency for six (6) months or more who is included in the recipient agency's ranking that rated his/her performance, the payment of PBB shall come from the mother agency.
4. Personnel transferred from one government agency to another agency shall be rated and ranked by the agency where he/she served the longest. If equal months were served for each agency, he/she would be included in the recipient agency.
5. Officials and employees who transferred from government agencies that are non-participating in the implementation of the PBB shall be rated by the agency where he/she served the longest; the official/ employee shall be eligible for the grant of PBB on a pro-rata basis corresponding to the actual length of service to the participating implementing agency, as stated in succeeding Section 7 below.
6. An official or employee who has rendered a minimum of nine (9) months of service during FY 2020 and with at least a Satisfactory rating may be eligible for the full grant of the PBB.
7. An official or employee who rendered less than nine (9) months but a minimum of three (3) months of service and with at least a Satisfactory rating shall be eligible for the grant of the PBB on a pro-rata basis corresponding to the actual length of service rendered as indicated in the table below:

Length of Service	% of PBB
8 months but less than 9 months	90%
7 months but less than 8 months	80%
6 months but less than 7 months	70%
5 months but less than 6 months	60%
4 months but less than 5 months	50%
3 months but less than 4 months	40%

The following are the valid reasons for an employee who may not meet the 9-month actual service requirement to be considered for PBB on a pro-rata basis:

- a. Being a newly-hired employee
  - b. Retirement
  - c. Resignation
  - d. Rehabilitation Leave
  - e. Maternity and/or Paternity Leave
  - f. Vacation or Sick Leave with or without pay
  - g. Scholarship/Study Leave
  - h. Sabbatical Leave
8. The following are not entitled to the grant of PBB:
    - a. An employee who is on vacation or sick leave, with or without pay, for the entire year.





- b. Personnel found guilty of administrative and/or criminal cases by final and executory judgment in FY 2020. If the penalty meted out is only a reprimand, such penalty shall not cause disqualification.
- c. Officials and employees who failed to submit the 2019 SALN as prescribed in the rules provided under CSC Memorandum Circular No. 3 s. 2015.
- d. Individual employee/s directly responsible for the isolation of a delivery unit due to controllable factors.
- e. Officials and employees who failed to liquidate all Cash Advances received in FY 2020 within the reglementary period, as prescribed in COA Circular 97-002 dated February 10, 1997, and reiterated in COA Circular 2009-002 dated May 18, 2009.
- f. Delivery units/Officials and employees failed to submit their complete SPMS Forms (S/DPCR and IPCR, respectively) without valid cause.
- g. Any employee or unit that is responsible in the misrepresentation of submitted reports required for the PBB and commission of fraud in the payment of the PBB.
- h. Officials and employees responsible for the implementation of the prior years' audit recommendations, QMS certification, or posting and dissemination of the department/agency system of ranking performance of delivery units, shall not be entitled to the FY 2020 PBB if the Department/Agency fails to comply with any of these requirements.

**ADDITIONAL ELIGIBILITY OF INDIVIDUALS (BASED ON IATF ADMIN. ORDER NO. 25.S. 2011 AND MC # 2020-1)**

1. Officials and employees responsible for submitting COA Annual Financial Reports and Statements to include Financial Statements (FSs), Annual Reports and Annual Audit Reports (AARs), shall not be entitled to the FY 2020 PBB if the Department/Agency fails to comply with the said reporting requirements as prescribed in COA Resolution 2014-003 dated January 14, 2014, and COA Circular 2015-002 dated March 9, 2015.
2. The Head of Procuring Entity (HOPE), Chairman and Secretariat of the Bids and Awards Committee (BAC), including the Procurement Management Office, shall not be entitled to the FY 2020 PBB if the Department/Agency fails to submit the following:
  - a. FY 2020 Annual Procurement Plan (CSE and non-CSE) to DBM including the FY 2021 indicative APP as prescribed by relevant circulars.
  - b. Results of FY 2019 Agency Procurement Compliance and Performance Indicators (APCPI) System, per GPPB Resolution No. 10-2012, complete with required attachments.
3. Officials and employees responsible for the non-compliance of prior years' audit recommendations shall not be entitled to the FY 2020 PBB.
4. Officials and employees responsible for QMS certification/recertification shall not be entitled to the FY 2020 PBB if the Department/Agency fails to comply with the said requirement.
5. The Head of Agency, the web administrators, or their equivalent, including the officials and employees responsible for non-compliance with the submission, posting, or updating of the various documents under the Transparency Seal website of KSU shall not be entitled to the FY 2020 PBB. Please refer to Annex 2-Guideline on Transparency Seal of IATF Memo No. 2020-1, and Section 94 of RA 11465 (GAA 2020) for the list of required documents to be uploaded.
6. Officials and employees, including the committee or offices responsible for non-submission of Certificate of Compliance (CoC), the submission of reports, and maintenance or updating of Citizen's or Service Charter according to RA No 11032, shall not be entitled to PBB FY 2020.
7. Officials and employees or those who are responsible for non-compliance with the establishment and conduct of the SALN Review and Compliance Committee resulting to failure of reviewing and complying with SALN requirements, i.e. submission on time, completeness and proper form.

Likewise, those Officials and employees or responsible units who cause the delay or non-submission of SALN to repository agencies (Malacanang Records for President's SALN; Ombudsman for SALN of Officials and Employees), including non-compliance with the requirement of SALN validating agency, shall be disqualified for the grant of PBB.

Further, employees, officials, and responsible KSU SALN Review and Compliance Committee failed to disseminate or cascade the University's Agency Review and Compliance Procedure of SALN, including its non-uploading in the TS webpage, shall not be entitled to the FY 2020 PBB.





8. Officials and employees or responsible units who failed to submit on schedule or update the documents to comply with the Freedom of Information (FOI) Program, under Executive Order No. 2, s. 2016, shall not be ineligible for PBB grant. Please refer to IATF Memo No. 2020-1, Sub-section 5.7(b), and PCOO website at [www.foi.gov.ph](http://www.foi.gov.ph) for information and guidance.
9. Officials and employees responsible for posting and dissemination of the Department/Agency System of Ranking Performance of Delivery Units shall not be entitled to the FY 2020 PBB if the Department/Agency fails to comply.
10. The list of PBB eligible delivery units across the Campuses is ranked by the following performance categories:

Ranking	Performance Category
Top 10%	Best Delivery
Top 25%	Better Delivery Unit
Top 65%	Good delivery

11. PBB rates of individuals shall depend on the performance ranking of the delivery unit where they belong and shall be calculated based on the individual's monthly salary as of December 31, 2020, as follows:

Performance Category	PBB as % of Monthly Basic Salary
Best	65%
Better	57.5%
Good	50%
Or P5,000 if PBB % of basic monthly salary is lower than P5,000	

12. The eligibility of SUC Presidents is based on CHED Memo Order No. 4 s. 2015. Their FY 2020 PBB shall also depend on the eligibility performance of the respective SUC based on the basic monthly salary as of December 31, 2020:

Performance Category of Head of Agency			
Eligibility Requirements	Best	Better	Good
	*SUC has met all good governance conditions		
	SUC has achieved at least 90% of each of its physical targets in <b>all</b> MFOs, STO, and GASS indicators	SUC has deficiency/ies in <b>some</b> of its physical targets, but these were due to <b>uncontrollable</b> reasons	SUC has a deficiency in <b>one</b> physical target due to <b>controllable</b> reasons
Salary Percentage	65%	57.5%	50%

13. The offices responsible for performance management shall set up a Help Desk to respond to queries and comments on their departments/sections/employees' targets and accomplishments. The ICT Center is tasked to establish a Help Desk facility at the KSU website.
14. The Grievance Committee may assist the PMT in setting up a Complaints Mechanism to respond to PBB related issues and concerns formally raised by officials and employees.
15. This Guidelines/Mechanics in Ranking Delivery Units and Individuals shall be based in the PBB Form 1.0 for the Grant of Performance-Based Bonus (PBB) FY 2020 cycle. This was patterned from the approved PBB FY 2015 Ranking System with BOT Resolution No. 1219, Series of 2015, and incorporating A025 Memorandum Circular 2020-1 and enhancement on the number of Performance Indicators on the three MFO's.

Prepared and Recommended for Approval:

**LOPE T. BUEN, PhD**  
PBB Focal Person

**ENGR. RHONJON R. GARMING**  
Alternate PBB Focal Person

**JOY GRACE P. DOCTOR, PhD**  
PBB Spokesperson/ TWG for Academic Concerns

**EDNA P. YUMOL, CPA, PhD**  
TWG for Admin and Financial Concerns

**JOVITA E. SAGUIBO, PhD**  
TWG for Research & Extension Concerns

**ROMUALDO O. WACAS, MBA**  
TWG for FOI Concerns

Date concurred: July 10, 2020

Approved by:

**EDUARDO T. BAGTANG, CPA, DBM**  
University President/ PBB Champion

Date of Approval: July 13, 2020