POLICIES AND GUIDELINES

for Internally-funded Research Projects
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Introduction

De La Salle University

Vision-Mission

A leading learner-centered research university, bridging faith and scholarship in the service of society, especially the poor.

The University Research Coordination Office (URCO) is a service unit under the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research and Innovation. It provides valuable support in fulfilling the University’s Vision-Mission through its programs and services. URCO promotes and nurtures a culture of genuine intellectual inquiry, advances inter-and multi-disciplinary studies, and serves as a clearinghouse for information related to faculty research activities on campus, among others, in support of this Vision-Mission.

Its Programs and Services

- administers the Faculty Research Program and Special Project Grants, interdisciplinary research;
- monitors externally-funded projects under taken by the different college research centers;
- serves as a clearinghouse of research related information and disseminates salient findings of completed researches;
- provides project development and implementation assistance;
- documents and assists in the formulation, review, and amendment of guidelines and policies governing research in the University;
- ensures uniform implementation of policies across colleges; and
- manages research data and handles the retrieval of information in response to the requirement of the research end-users.
Faculty Research Program (FRP)

The FRP provides funds for faculty research or materials development projects, deholoding from teaching or an honorarium. It also encourages the different colleges to identify their own research thrust areas. Research projects funded by FRP may be basic, applied, or materials development. Materials development projects may take the form of developing or evaluating textbooks and instructional materials that will meet the current needs of DLSU students.

Faculty Research Program

Basic Requirements/Conditions

Faculty Qualification

1. Research grants are awarded to academic teaching and academic service faculty (ASF) members. Priority is given to full-time faculty members.
2. Normally, the principal proponent for group projects should be a permanent full-time faculty member.
3. Upon the recommendation of their dean/chair, full-time probationary faculty members may qualify as co-proponents of research projects. In meritorious cases, they may be considered principal proponents.

   In these cases, the duration of the grant should not go beyond the term of their probation.
4. Part-time, half-time, full-time fixed term faculty members may qualify as co-proponents upon the recommendation of their Dean and Department Chair. In meritorious cases, they may be considered principal part-time proponents.

   However, part-time faculty proponents must have taught at De La Salle University for at least two (2) consecutive terms and must have a track record in research.
5. Visiting or exchange faculty members with research experience may qualify as proponents, but the duration of the grant should not go beyond the term of their appointment or hiring.
6. Retiring faculty members with research experience may qualify as proponents, but the duration of the grant should not go beyond the date of their retirement.
Types of Research Proposals

1. **Basic/Applied Research**
   Basic or fundamental research involves experimental or theoretical work undertaken to acquire new knowledge without particular or specific application in use (according to DOST guidelines).
   Applied research involves an original investigation undertaken to acquire new knowledge toward a specific practical aim or objective (according to DOST guidelines).
   Action research and test development are examples of applied research. All theses and dissertations submitted for funding fall under this type of research.
   If the proposed research is a thesis/dissertation, a copy of the approval sheet duly signed by the panel, adviser, chair, and dean and an abstract must be attached to the research proposal form.

2. **Materials Development Project**
   This type of project involves developing or evaluating manuals, textbooks, and instructional materials (e.g. software and audio-visual materials).

3. **Experimental Development Project**
   Experimental Development project refers to systematic work that draws from existing knowledge gained from research and/or practical experience that is directed to produce new materials, products and devices, install new processes, systems and services, and substantially improve those already produced or installed.
   (DOST Guidelines on Grants in Aid Funds)

Submission of Proposals

1. At the beginning of each term, the University Research Coordination Office issues a call for research proposals for the Faculty Research Program, New PhD Grant, Sabbatical Research, and Interdisciplinary Research. The deadline for submission is posted in the colleges, departments and other strategic areas on campus. The deadline for proposals is also announced through the electronic mail.

2. The deadline for the submission of project proposals to the University Research Coordination Office is strictly observed. Late project proposals are considered the following term.
General Guidelines & Policies

Evaluation Criteria of Project Proposals

1. Criteria for Approving Project Proposals
   A project may be approved if:
   
   1.1 The project will result in publishable/patentable research output.
   1.2 The project will make an impact on and contribution to education in the University as well as the quality of life of the Filipino people.
   1.3 New knowledge will be produced and contribute to different field/areas of specialization.
   1.4 The project is part of the research thrusts of the Department/College/University/State.

2. Priority is given to research projects (i.e. basic/applied). Materials Development Projects may be pursued subject to the following conditions:
   
   2.1 The material is urgently needed for the new course/program.
   2.2 No local materials are available for the particular course/program.
   2.3 The project is part of the indigenization efforts of the department.
   2.4 Actual laboratory/classroom experiments are done as part of the material.

3. Project proposals which are by nature part of the departmental or administrative function may be pursued subject to the following conditions:
   
   3.1 The project requires data gathering.
   3.2 The research requires primary or secondary data.
   3.3 It is an evaluation of a course or a program.

4. For proposals that require sensitive information or cooperation from other institutions/companies, the faculty proponent will be required to show proof of consent from the said institutions before the approval of the proposal.
5. The proponent should have the capability to undertake and complete a research project.
6. If a proponent has an ongoing (on schedule/delayed) or deferred project, and he/she proposes a new one, approval of the new project will be deferred until the time that the earlier project is completed.
7. A proponent is granted only one internally-funded project at one time. Exceptions are given to the St. Miguel Febres Cordero research grantees.

**Research Unit Equivalence**

The proponent is compensated in terms of a teaching de-loading or a research honorarium (in coordination with the Department Chair) equivalent to the number of units awarded to the project, upon approval of the proposal by the College Research Council.

1. **Criteria for Awarding Research Unit Equivalence**
   The total number of research units awarded to proponents is decided by the College Research Council.

   1.1 **Number of Hours**
   1.1.1 On the assumption that 25 hours per week of full-time service is rendered for 12 units of teaching, research units are computed as 56 hours of actual research work per term of 14 weeks for one research unit (meaning 4 hours/week equals 1 research unit). However, the decision on what constitutes a reasonable number of hours for work on the project rests upon the College Research Council.
   1.1.2 The input involvement (i.e. tasks and responsibilities) of each proponent in doing the research is considered in the awarding of the research units.

   1.2 **Number of Proponents**
   1.2.1 The distribution of the research units among the proponents depends upon the number of hours devoted by and the workload of each proponent.
1.3 Research Units
1.3.1 Teaching Deloading

1.3.1.1 For a single proponent, the maximum number of research units is nine (9) or 3 units per term for a whole academic year project (3 terms).
1.3.1.2 For collaborative/interdisciplinary research projects, the maximum number of research units is twenty-one (21). A maximum of 9-unit deloading may be granted to the project coordinator for a whole academic year, while the other members of the team may be given a maximum of 6 units for an academic year.
1.3.1.3 For professorial chairholders, the maximum number of research units is nine (9) or 3 units per term for a whole academic year project (3 terms), provided that the research proposal and research objectives of the University Research Coordination Office project are different from the professorial paper/lecture.
1.3.1.4 A maximum of 4 units is awarded to materials development projects. In meritorious cases, such as a single authorship book, more than 4 research units may be allowed.
1.3.1.5 An original research project (basic or applied) is awarded more/higher research units than other types of proposals.
1.3.1.6 Involvement of Research Assistants
Proponents who hire research assistants for their project are awarded fewer research units than those who have no research assistants.

2. The proponent is not awarded any research unit equivalence under any of the following conditions:
2.1 The project is a thesis or dissertation and a deloading has been applied for/granted through the Faculty Development Program of the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academics.
2.2 The project is a compilation.
2.3 The project is a simple revision of existing material.
2.4 The project is a sabbatical research.
3. As a general rule, research unit(s) should be part of the basic 12-unit load of proponents.

4. All units of deloading shall be used within the duration of the research project or within a CRC-approved extension period for the project.

5. In the event that a faculty member completes the University-supported research project without being able to avail of all units of deloading for the project, the faculty member can apply for a conversion of unused deloading to research honorarium. The faculty researcher shall submit a letter to the URCO detailing the justification for the conversion. The letter shall be endorsed by the Department Chair and the College Research and Advanced Studies Director. The request shall then be submitted to the URCO for CRC approval.

6. Faculty members may apply for a research honorarium for the conduct of their projects through URCO and approved by the CRC. Proponents should be able to align the proposed project with the research priority themes of the University. A faculty member may only have two (2) honorarium-based projects at any one time. Research honoraria are not to be applied for the completion of a thesis or dissertation. Research honoraria will be paid according to the guidelines set by the URCO.

(See Appendix 2 on p. 28 for the Research Honoraria Scale and Guidelines of Honoraria Payments through URCO)

7. In case the type of research units to be awarded needs to be changed, the dean of the college, in consultation with the department chair, decides whether the proponent is to be given a teaching deloading or a research honorarium.

8. Honorarium for deferred research projects is computed based on the rank at the time the project was supposed to have been implemented.

9. Academic Service Faculty (ASF) members are awarded research unit equivalence in the form of an honorarium.
10. Should disagreements pertaining to the number of units awarded for a project arise, the proponent may appeal to the College Research Council. Henceforth, the decision made by the College Research Council is final.

**Ethical Review of Research Proposals**

1. All research proposals shall undergo the ethical review process through the College Research Ethics Committee (CREC).
2. The proponent is required to accomplish the appropriate research ethics checklist for a particular category. The checklist is to ensure that the research conducted by the faculty proponent is carried out according to the guiding principles outlined in the Code of Research Ethics. The proponent is advised to refer to the De La Salle University Code of Research Ethics and Guide to Responsible Conduct of Research before completing the checklist.

*(See Appendix 3 on p. 30 for the De La Salle Code of Research Ethics and Guide to Responsible Conduct of Research)*

*(See Appendix 4 on p. 31 for the Flowchart for Ethical Review Process and Procedure for the College Research Ethics Committee (CREC) Expedited Ethical Review)*

**Application Procedures and Processing of Proposals**

*(See Appendix 5 on p. 34 for the Flowchart of Evaluation of Research Proposal for FRP, New Ph.D., Sabbatical Research, Interdisciplinary Research)*

**Monitoring of Research Budget**

1. At the beginning of each term, the University Research Coordination Office informs the College Research and Advanced Studies Director of the available research fund of the College.
2. Budgets are distributed equally across colleges.
3. For Academic Service Faculty who belong to a particular college, funding comes from the budget allocated for the College. For those who are not affiliated with any college, the University Research Coordination Office with the concurrence of the College Research Council, assigns the project to a College whose research thrust most closely related to the proposed research.
4. Fund Disbursement or Reimbursement
4.1 All requests for disbursement of/reimbursement from research project funds are channeled through the University Research Coordination Office.

4.2 The proponent is informed about the availability of funding by the University Research Coordination Office.

4.3 No disbursement of funds in excess of the approved budget is allowed. However, those with exceptional cases may file a request for additional funds to the University Research Coordination Office Director, through the Research and Advanced Studies Director. The University Research Coordination Office Director may approve requests up to 10% of the original budget.

4.4 Funds approved for one project may not be allocated for another project.

4.5 No checks may be prepared for research-related expenses unless the corresponding Payment Requisition Slip is signed by the University Research Coordination Office Director and the Vice Chancellor for Research and Innovation.

For Payment Requisition Slip in the amount of PhP5,001 but less than or equal to PhP250,000, the final approving officer is the Vice Chancellor for Research and Innovation; for amounts over PhP250,000, the final approving officer is the President and Chancellor.

Fund disbursement is subject to the prompt submission of progress reports, mid-term report, and/or liquidation of previous cash advances.

Liquidation should be supported by acceptable cash invoices/original official receipts (i.e. BIR registered receipts).

4.6 Payment of fees for research personnel (e.g. research assistant, typist, consultant, illustrator, fabricator) should becourse through the University Research Coordination Office and are not to be paid or shouldered by the proponent. Nor should the fees come from any unliquidated cash advance.

4.7 Checks for project equipment/supplies must be submitted with a corresponding Materials Requisition Form signed by the University Research Coordination Office Director and the Vice Chancellor for Research and Innovation before processing.

4.8 Cash advances for up to 20% of the approved budget may be requested for materials and supplies. Requests for cash advances or reimbursements for the direct purchase of equipment, materials and supplies, chemicals, and gadgets must be approved by the President and Chancellor before processing.
4.9 Generally, all cash advances should be liquidated within five (5) calendar days after each event or activity. Exceptions may be granted on a case-to-case basis, or when the nature of activity warrants it (in accordance with the Accounting Office Disbursement Procedures, July 29, 1991, DLSU-Manila).

4.10 Proponents who fail to liquidate cash advances within the prescribed period are sent a reminder for them to submit all supporting documents a week after receipt of notice. This requirement must be fulfilled before subsequent requests for cash advances (in accordance with the Accounting Office Disbursement Procedures, July 29, 1991, DLSU-Manila).

5. Project Personnel

5.1 Requests for research personnel may be made by filling out the personnel form duly endorsed by the University Research Coordination Office.

5.2 A contract duly accomplished with the University Research Coordination Office is a condition for the compensation for any research-related work. This contract should indicate the amount and mode of payment of compensation.

5.3 Compensation for research-related work is subject to standard salary deductions.

5.4 A proponent with sabbatical research can hire an MS/MA student as his/her research assistant(s). However, there should be a clear delineation of work between parties, and RAs should be properly acknowledged in any publication resulting from the project.

5.5 Research assistant(s) may be hired despite the full 9 units teaching deloading. The College Research Council may allow such, depending on the nature of the project.

5.6 A proponent may submit a certification attesting to the number of hours of work that were rendered by his/her research assistant(s). A time sheet is not necessary.

5.7 Academic Service Faculty are not entitled to hire research assistant(s).

5.8 The proponent’s honorarium is released based on the schedule indicated in the Research Grant Agreement Form. (see Appendix 2 on p. 28)

6. Internally-Sourced Budget Items

6.1 The proponent is expected to purchase or use supplies, facilities and services available on campus (i.e. from the
Library, Information Technology Service Office, Statistical Testing Assistance for Research-Deaf Assistance, or Bookstore).  

6.2 Requests for supplies, use of facilities and services may be made by filling out appropriate forms duly endorsed by the University Research Coordination Office.

6.3 Purchase of supplies and other items not available on campus should be approved beforehand by the University Research Coordination Office. All purchases should be channeled through the Procurement Office.

In cases where the Procurement Office cannot process the request within two weeks' time, the proponent has the option to request for a cash advance. The University Research Coordination Office then attaches the following to the Payment Requisition Slip.

6.3.1 Payment Requisition Slip (PRS) not covered by P.O. form.

6.3.2 Note or endorsement from the Procurement Office that they cannot process the proponent's request within the given time.

6.4 Books/On-line research materials not exceeding PhP5,000 may be included as a budget item. These books shall be turned over to the Library or department concerned upon completion of the project.

7. Taking Equipment/Non-Consumable Items Out of Campus  
A proponent must secure permission from the Associate Vice President for Campus Services before taking equipment/non-consumable items out of campus. A letter for such purposes should be endorsed by the College Research and Advanced Studies Director and Dean and coursed through the University Research Coordination Office.

Monitoring of Research Progress

1. As specified in the research grant agreement form, a progress report, mid-term report, final, and revised report is submitted to the University Research Coordination Office  
(See Appendix 6 on p. 37 for the Schedule of Progress/Mid-term/Final/Revised Final Report).

An audited report on the chemicals/reagents used is included in the
progress report, whenever applicable.

2. Faculty proponents are required, where applicable, to attach photos/pictures of research activities to the progress report.

3. Submission of a progress report and mid-term report are prerequisite to the subsequent release of funds.

4. In case of refusal of institutions/companies to release confidential data/information, the faculty proponent will be allowed to submit a correspondence from the company stating that they cannot provide such information. The faculty proponent will then be allowed to revise his/her project subject to approval of the College Research Council (CRC).

5. Research Outputs

5.1 Two (2) copies of the final report should be submitted to University Research Coordination Office.

5.2 Faculty proponents are required to submit research outputs in publishable form (i.e. following the format of a manuscript for journal article or book).

5.3 Faculty proponents are required to submit the abstract and at least six (6) keywords of the research report.

5.4 A proponent handling theses groups should submit a final report different from the student's thesis. The final report should be submitted together with the thesis for evaluation purposes.

5.5 The final outputs for materials development projects such as OHP acetates and electronic slides should be submitted to the University Research Coordination Office in the form of a print-out paper/photocopied masterslide/powerpoint version/CD.

5.6 In most materials development projects, the expected output is a manual, workbook, module, etc. which will be used for a particular course/subject.

   In cases where the course is deleted from the curriculum, the faculty proponent will be allowed to submit his/her output according to the originally submitted proposal.

5.7 Materials Development Projects such as instructional materials (textbooks/manuals/workbooks/study guides) should undergo a trial run and evaluation one term before submission to the University Research Coordination Office.

6. A research project submitted beyond the approved timetable will automatically be reviewed by the College Research Council.

7. Long overdue projects (i.e. projects that exceed the maximum of two years extension from the original deadline of project completion ) may be
terminated by the College Research Council. A formal letter terminating the project is given to the proponent; copies of which are sent to the Department Chair, Dean, University Research Coordination Office Director, and Vice Chancellor for Research and Innovation.

All projects approved from Academic Year 2011-2012 and beyond shall be given an extension period of at most two (2) academic years. The project shall be automatically terminated if uncompleted after this maximum extension period.

8. The research proponent is expected to complete the research project according to the terms approved by the College Research Council. The proponent may not transfer the project to another faculty member.

9. For projects with more than one proponent, the role and output of each proponent should be clearly identified in the proposal stage.

   In cases where the co-proponent has retired, has resigned, goes on study leave, or has his/her contract expired, the main proponent will take over the project and see to its completion.

   In cases where the co-proponent has substantially done his/her part for the research, he/she will be required to submit a clearly well-defined output which will be subjected to the evaluation process of URCO. This will enable him/her to qualify for another URCO project.

   However, this will not release him/her from any legal and financial obligations of the original project.

10. In cases where a proponent is no longer connected with De La Salle University, the College Research Council through its Research and Advanced Studies Director sends a formal letter to the University Research Coordination Office to terminate the project.

11. For Terminated Projects

   11.1 If the proponent fails to complete the research project within the allowable period or in case of resignation, he/she pays back all research deloading/honorarium received for the project, and the direct expenses incurred. An automatic deduction from the proponent's last payment to be received from De La Salle University is likewise made.

   11.1.1 Research deloading is paid back by teaching of load without pay equal to the number of unit granted to the project.

   11.1.2 Direct expenses incurred that must be paid back are:

   11.1.2.1 Personnel fees (research assistants, typist, fabricator, illustrator, laboratory technician, consultant, and others).
11.1.2.2 Materials and supplies, chemicals, reagents, and other consumable items which have been used by the proponent.

11.1.2.3 Cost of unconsumed materials which cannot be turned over to the laboratory/department or which the laboratory/department has no need of/use for.

11.1.2.4 Reproduction of materials.

11.1.2.5 Research-related travel and transportation.

11.1.2.6 Other fees (computerization, seminar fees and others); unused items should be properly turned over to the University Research Coordination Office/department/ laboratory concerned.

11.1.3 Payment for direct expenses is credited to the project’s account, while payment for the research honorarium is credited to the Br. Gabriel Connon Chair Research Fund or the University Research Fund account.

11.1.4 Repayment for research honorarium and direct expenses for a terminated project is made through salary deduction system.

11.1.5 Repayment for expense/s beyond PhP1,000 is paid on a staggered basis.

11.1.6 The University Research Coordination Office sends an authorization form to proponent for salary deduction. The authorization form is then forwarded to the Accounting Office.

11.1.7 The proponent is given a period of one year starting from the approved date of termination to return payment for the expenses incurred for the project.

11.2 Equipment (i.e. computer, laboratory equipment, audiovisual equipment) is to be turned over to the College Research Council/department/laboratory concerned.

A form for turning over the equipment is available at the University Research Coordination Office. The proponent fills out the form accordingly and obtains the signature of the person-in-charge of the College Research Council/department/laboratory concerned.
12. Faculty proponents are advised to defer projects or not to avail of the deloading units if necessary equipment has not been procured or delivered.

13. As a general rule, projects may be deferred for a maximum period of three terms, after which they must be implemented. If not they are considered officially cancelled by the University Research Coordination Office.

14. With regard to requests for additional funds/extension of deadlines/changes in the project proposals:
   14.1 Requests for extension of deadlines or additional funds are discouraged.
   14.2 Should the proponent need to request for additional funds or an extension of the project deadline, this should be done in writing and addressed to the University Research Coordination Office Director. Supporting documents should be attached.
   14.3 Requests for extension of deadlines should always be accompanied by a current status report.
   14.4 The College Research Council evaluates requests for changes in project proposals (i.e. project title/objectives/methodology), extensions, supplementary budgets, and similar developments.
   14.5 Delayed projects are given a maximum of two years extension from the original deadline of project completion. Failure to complete and submit the final report within the extension result in an automatic termination of the project.

15. Copies of all completed research outputs/projects are to be turned over to the De La Salle University Library Archives.

16. Turnover of project equipment to the Department/Research Center of the College is to be properly documented.

**Evaluation of Final Reports**

1. All final reports of research projects are evaluated by experts in the field.

2. University Research Coordination Office-funded research outputs (i.e. thesis/dissertation projects/sabbatical researches evaluated through the funding agency/ies and outputs that have been accepted in a refereed publication (journal, proceedings) need not undergo internal or external evaluation.

3. Evaluators are selected from a list of faculty and their specialization/area of expertise, which is provided by the Department Chair concerned. They may also be chosen from among the research council members who initially approved project proposal.
4. The identities of the proponent and the evaluator(s) are kept confidential. The proponent is discouraged from seeking the identity of the evaluator, and vice versa. Consultations between the proponent and the evaluator(s) are likewise discouraged.

5. Proponents are provided with a copy of the evaluation instrument upon signing the contract and/or actual implementation of the project.

6. Evaluation forms corresponding to the type of project are provided to the evaluator by the University Research Coordination Office.

7. The University Research Coordination Office forwards a copy of the evaluation report to the proponent. The revisions recommended by evaluators should be incorporated in the final output, where applicable, before the project is considered completed. However, the proponent is not required to comply with evaluator's comments that are not found to be valid, and is allowed to explain his/her stance.

8. In cases where clarification(s) pertaining to the evaluation outcome/results are needed, the proponent may write the evaluator through the University Research Coordination Office, which will then forward the queries to the evaluator concerned.

9. The research will be submitted to a second evaluator if:

   9.1 The evaluation outcome is poor/not recommended for publication.

   9.2 The evaluator has requested that evaluation outcome/assessment be withheld.

   9.3 There are differences in the opinion between the proponent and the evaluator.

10. If there is a conflict/disagreement between the first evaluator and the proponent, the second evaluator will decide on the point of conflict or the issue/s of disagreement.

11. If a conflict arises between the first and second evaluation, the matter will be brought to the College Research Council for the final resolution of evaluation.

12. In some cases, the University Research Coordination Office Director may decide on the differences in opinion between the proponent and the evaluator.

13. Reports for publication are edited in consultation with the proponent.
Completion of Research Project

A project is considered provisionally complete upon acceptance of the evaluator of the final report/research output (with or without revisions). A project is considered complete upon compliance with the above provision and submission of the following requirements:

- a one-page abstract, synopsis or description of final output for publication and at least six (6) keywords of the research report
- hard copy and electronic copy of the report/publication on CD/diskette or other physical media
- liquidation of cash advance (where applicable)
- book(s) purchased using the project’s funds (where applicable)
- turn-over form for computer and computer peripherals and other audio visual/laboratory equipment purchased using the project’s funds (where applicable)
- proof of disposal or administrative turnover of category 1 or 2 of wastes/excess materials (where applicable)

(If disposal or administrative turnover is not provided upon completion of the other project requirements, the project will be considered “provisionally complete” for a period of one year. During this period, the proponents will be allowed to embark on new projects. If proof of disposal or administrative turnover is provided during this period, the project will be considered “complete”. Beyond this one year period, the “provisionally complete” will revert to an “incomplete” status and no more new projects will be allowed. If a proponent has two provisionally complete projects, then no more new projects will be allowed.)

(See Appendix 7 on p.41 for the URCO Procedure for Projects with Wastes or Excess Materials and Declaration of Wastes and Excess Materials).

Dissemination of Research Output

Upon completion of the project, the proponent disseminates his/her research findings to his/her department, or he/she is invited to present his/her study through the University Research Coordination Office- sponsored Research Dissemination Program.

Publication of Internally-Funded Research Projects

1. A proponent who has completed his/her research project is encouraged to publish his/her work.
2. Proper acknowledgement of the grant should be made in any publication of the report.
3. All intellectual properties of URCO funded projects shall be governed by the Intellectual Property (IP) policy of the university;
4. The De la Salle Publishing House has the first option to publish books resulting from URCO-funded projects.

**Special Project Grants**

The University provides additional incentives for the conduct of research through special project grants to faculty members. Among the grants/awards available are the St. Miguel Febres Cordero Research Award, Research Grant for New Ph.D. Holders, and Sabbatical Leave Projects.

**St. Miguel Febres Cordero Research Awards**

These research awards are given every year in recognition of a faculty researchers achievements and contributions in their respective fields through the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research and Innovation.

These awards seek to recognize outstanding published scholarly articles written in Filipino, outstanding published book written in Filipino and in English, and outstanding works of translation.

The following awards shall be given:

- St. Miguel Febres Cordero Award for Outstanding Published Scholarly Article in Filipino (maximum of 3 awards)
- St. Miguel Febres Cordero Award for Outstanding Book/ Monograph in Filipino (maximum of 3 awards)
- St. Miguel Febres Cordero Award for Outstanding Book/ Monograph in English (maximum of 3 awards)
- St. Miguel Febres Cordero Award for Outstanding Published Filipino Translation (book/monograph or article; maximum of 1 award)

**Guidelines:**

- All the awards are open to scholarly works in all disciplines published by full-time teaching faculty members of the university
- Any member of the academic community may nominate a published work by submitting three copies of the published work and a nomination letter describing the outstanding qualities of the work
- The work should have been published in the calendar year preceding the year of the award
- The nominations are submitted to the respective College
Research Councils (CRCs), which shall pre-screen the nominations based on the indicated criteria

- The pre-screened nominations shall be forwarded to Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research and Innovation (OVCRI) which will have the Nominees evaluated by external referees
- The deadline for submitting the nominations to the OVCRI is on April 15 of every school year
- A committee composed of the academic deans, the URCO Director, and the VCRI shall make the final decision on the winners

The winners will be chosen using the following general criteria:

- High quality of scholarship
- Original contributions to knowledge in the discipline and/or sub-field
- Social significance of the study

The following incentives will be given to the award winners:

- Award for Outstanding Published Scholarly Article in Filipino
  - Support for two projects funded by URCO and PhP10,000 cash
- Award for Outstanding Book/Monograph in Filipino
  - Support for two projects funded by URCO and PhP30,000 cash
- Award for Outstanding Book/Monograph in English
  - Support for two projects funded by URCO and PhP30,000 cash
- Award for Outstanding Published Filipino Translation
  - Support for two projects funded by URCO and PhP10,000 cash for a translated article or PhP30,000 cash for a translated book/monograph
Research Grant for New Ph.D.

This grant enables the new Ph.D graduate to begin his/her research program, continue the momentum of research developed during graduate school, and begin to establish his/her research track record.

General Qualifications

Faculty members who apply for the Grant must:

1. be a full-time faculty member of De La Salle University
2. have been conferred the doctoral degree within the last 12 months; those pursuing postdoctoral studies must have graduated within the last 24 months
3. be eligible for funding under the University Research Coordination Office policies
4. not have been a previous recipient of this grant (i.e. this grant can be enjoyed only once)

Funding

Maximum of P100,000.00 drawn from a separate research fund.

Application Procedure

1. The proponent submits a fully-developed research proposal to the University Research Coordination Office. The proposal may not be for materials development.
2. The College Research Council with the presence of the Dean shall deliberate on and approve the proposal.

Expected Output

The research output must be submitted for publication.
Sabbatical Leave Projects

Term Prior to Leave

1. Regardless of fund source (University Research Coordination Office, College Research Council, Externally-Funded/Personally-Funded), all proposals for sabbatical research should be submitted to the University Research Coordination Office one term prior to the scheduled effectiveness of the sabbatical leave.

   1.1 All proposals should pass through the College Research Council for evaluation and approval before submission to the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academics.

   1.2 Proponents are to observe the deadline set by the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academics and University Research Coordination Office. (See Flowchart for Approval of Sabbatical Leave on p. 36)

2. Criteria for Evaluation of Sabbatical Leave Proposals

   2.1 The sabbatical leave project (if possible) should fall within the research thrust of the department or the college.

   2.2 A dissertation may be submitted as the sabbatical leave output. However, the College Research Council will have to further determine whether the dissertation fulfills the requirements for a sabbatical output.

   2.3 A sabbatical proposal with external funding must satisfy the requirements of a sabbatical research.

   2.4 Sabbatical leave may be spent on enrolling for post doctoral Studies, but there should still be a research output.

3. Processing Proposals

   3.1 The College Research Council must look into the proposal to determine whether such a project necessitates/fulfills the requirements for a sabbatical research project grant.

   3.2 A sabbatical leave project proposal that is not approved by the College Research Council may be revised and resubmitted. The College Research Council convenes an Ad-Hoc Committee for a second appraisal of the project.
4. Monitoring Sabbatical Leave Projects

4.1 All sabbatical leave projects undergo strict monitoring by the University Research Coordination Office.

4.2 Faculty proponents must submit progress reports based on the scheduled deadlines indicated in the Research Grant Agreement form.

4.3 If the fund source is the University Research Coordination Office, the project must undergo standard procedures such as evaluation and liquidation.

Term After Leave

Expected Outputs

1. At the end of the leave, the faculty must submit a research output to the Vice Chancellor for Academics and Vice Chancellor for Research and Innovation through the University Research Coordination Office.

2. The faculty must submit a report or a publication disseminated in a forum within the year of return.

3. The faculty must submit a bound copy as a report (if sabbatical leave was used for dissertation writing).

4. Extensions of one term after sabbatical may be given to allow the researcher to consolidate findings.

Sanctions for Failure to Submit a Report/Research Output

1. The faculty proponent may not apply for any other University Research Coordination Office or College Research Fund grant.

2. The faculty will not receive support for any faculty development initiative on research or training program.

3. The College Research Council may act as a recommendatory body to the Academics Council. The Academics Council deliberates on whether to give the sanction(s) (no professorial chair, no research faculty grant) to a faculty proponent who has not completed his/her sabbatical research.
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Research Councils at De La Salle University

A. University Research Council

Composition

The University Research Council is composed of the following:

1. The Vice Chancellor for Research and Innovation who automatically chairs The University Research Council.
2. The Deans of the following Colleges/School:
   a. School of Economics
   b. Ramon V. del Rosario College of Business
   c. College of Computer Studies
   d. Br. Andrew Gonzalez FSC College of Education
   e. Gokongwei College of Engineering
   f. College of Liberal Arts
   g. College of Science
   h. College of Law

3. The College Research and Advanced Studies Director of the following Colleges/School:
   a. School of Economics
   b. Ramon V. del Rosario College of Business
   c. College of Computer Studies
   d. Br. Andrew Gonzalez FSC College of Education
   e. Gokongwei College of Engineering
   f. College of Liberal Arts
   g. College of Science
   h. College of Law

4. The University Research Coordination Office Director.

Functions

The University Research Council

1. Initiates the formulation, review and amendment of policies governing
Internally-Funded Research Projects as well as University Research Coordination Office-Administered Externally-Funded Research Projects;

2. Reviews the annual allocation of Internally-Funded Research Projects funds in each of the colleges;

3. Encourages the conduct of research activities in the University; and

4. Acts as advisory/recommendatory body to the Academics Council and President's Council in setting research thrusts and directions for the University.

The University Research Council Chair

1. Convenes and presides over the meetings of the Council; and

2. Ensures that University policies and standards governing Internally-Funded Research Projects and University Research Coordination Office-Administered Externally-Funded Research Projects are implemented uniformly across colleges.

Voting Powers

Each college has two (2) votes on any deliberation. The URCO Director also votes. The Vice Chancellor for Research and Innovation, who presides over the Council meetings, votes only to break a tie.

Meetings

Regular University Research Council meetings are held every term of the academic year. Special meetings may be called as the need arises.

B. College Research Council

Composition

1. The members of the College Research Council are appointed by the Vice Chancellor for Research and Innovation upon the recommendation of the College Dean.

2. The College Research Council is made up of one representative from each of the departments of the College, and the College Research and Advanced Studies Director, with the inclusion of the University Research Coordination Office Director as member. The Dean or Vice Dean of each college automatically becomes a member of the Council.
Term of Office

1. Each member has a term of one (1) year, which is renewable.
2. To ensure continuity of the Council's performance of its functions, the majority of the College Research Council members should have been members during the previous year.

Functions

The College Research Council

1. encourages research activities among the faculty of the College;
2. acts as advisory body to other college research councils in setting research thrusts and directions for the College;
3. ascertains that research proposals are in consonance with University needs and priorities;
4. is constituted as a College Research Ethics Committee (CREC) to facilitate the ethical review process of proposals to ensure that research procedures will be put in place for adherence to the research ethical principles;
5. evaluates, approves and prioritizes research projects submitted by the proponent;
6. approves the research unit equivalence for the projects;
7. allocates the research funds of the College; and
8. meets/deliberates/acts on requests of proponents for reconsideration of disapproved proposals/appeals to make changes in the previously approved project proposals (i.e. project title/objectives/methodology), research unit equivalence, extension of grant/project deadline, supplementary budget, transfer of funds from one budget item to another, and similar developments. The decision arrived at by the Council is final.

Meetings

The College Research Council meets at least once every term. Special meetings may be called by the College Research and Advanced Studies (RAS) Director and/or the Dean as the need arises.

The College Research and Advanced Studies Director

The RAS Director in each College or School is focused on promoting and monitoring the synergy between research, conducted in the academic departments and the affiliated centers, laboratories and institutes, and the academic activities both at the undergraduate and graduate levels.
1. Term of Office

1.1 The College Research and Advanced Studies Director is appointed by the College Dean.

1.2 The College Research and Advanced Studies Director has a term of one (1) year, which is renewable.

1.3 The College Research and Advanced Studies Director must have been a College Research Council member during the previous year.

2. Reporting and Organizational Structure

2.1 reports to the College / School Dean and works with the individual departments through the department chairpersons, thesis coordinators, graduate coordinators, and in some cases, the Vice Dean.

2.2 works closely with the VCRI office and the URCO, the IP Office, as well as with the various centers, institutes, and laboratories were faculty members of the college/school are involved.

2.3 chairs the College Research Council

2.4 acts as the de facto IP auditor of the college, unless the Dean expressly appoints another person to the post

3. Administrative Support

3.1 The RAS Director will have shared staff with the Deans office, and will get its operating budget from the Dean.

3.2 The RAS Director enjoys a 3-unit deloading every term.

4. Specific Tasks and Responsibilities

4.1 conducts an expedited ethical review of proposals’ submitted by College/School faculty for funding by the University or by external agencies;

4.2 presides over all meetings and activities of the CRC;

4.3 coordinates and promotes URCO-sponsored programs among faculty members;

4.4 solicits, receives, and makes preliminary evaluation of submitted projects for URCO funding (i.e. check whether all required documents have been submitted, proposed budget are consistent with URCO policies, preparation of project proposal is consistent with URCO standards and guidelines);
4.5 encourages faculty members to align undergraduate and graduate thesis projects with the research themes and topics of their department or of the various centers and institutes;

4.6 periodically endorses to the offices of the VCRI, VCA, and Stratcom various research projects or student theses that are worthy of press release, recognition, or nomination to external award-giving bodies;

4.7 organizes college/school events that highlight the research accomplishments of the college, such as search for outstanding thesis, innovation and research commercialization events, congress/conference/workshops and other fora;

4.8 represents the school/college in university-level committees and task forces that organize research and technology transfer events, conferences and similar fora, and various research- and thesis-related competitions;

4.9 prepares year-end reports, reflecting the scope and responsibilities of the position; and

4.10 assists the Dean in all or any of the research-related undertakings of the College or School;

Annual RAS Reports

Undergraduate and Graduate Thesis projects – submitted at the end of the 3rd term based on data from the past 3 years:

Aside from the Master’s and Doctoral thesis titles, student names, adviser name (organized by degree program), the report would include summative figures over a period of 3 years showing how past thesis projects (including undergraduate thesis projects) have been used, e.g. when they are used as basis for journal publications, re-used as improved or more in-depth version in another student thesis project, engendered other types of thesis projects, became the basis for a conference paper or an URCO project, became the basis for a project-proposal for external funding, served as prototype or concept for a commercialized product, has led to a patent; has been the basis for a start-up company, attracted venture capital, has been the subject of major awards and public press releases.

Research Productivity of Faculty Members – submitted at the beginning of the 3rd term, based on data from the 3rd term of the previous school year to the end of the 2nd term of the current academic year

Aside from the complete list of research publications, research projects, creative work, patents, and other research outputs per faculty member), research productivity figures are collated using data from URCO/VCRI and validating/Completing these in coordination with the department chairs.
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Research Honoraria Scale and Guidelines for Honoraria Release by URCO*

Honoraria Scale for Individual Researchers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Rank</th>
<th>Monthly Rate</th>
<th>Weekly Rate</th>
<th>Per term (14 weeks)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>3,125</td>
<td>43,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>2,250</td>
<td>31,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>1,625</td>
<td>22,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assumptions Used:

1. The median overload rate per unit of each faculty rank was used as basis in computing the proposed monthly rate as follows:

   Basis
   - Full Professor: 1,044 Full Prof 1-10 overload rate
   - Associate Professor: 750 Asso Prof 4 overload rate
   - Assistant Professor: 557 Asst Prof 4 overload rate

2. The following is the computation for the proposed monthly rate:
   - Full Prof. = 1,044 per unit X 3 units X 4 weeks = 12,528
   - Asso Prof. = 750 per unit X 3 units X 4 weeks = 9,000
   - Asst Prof. = 557 per unit X 3 units X 4 weeks = 6,684

3. The amounts computed above were rounded off in such a way that there is an advantage of P2,500 and P3,500 between ranks as follows:
   - Full Prof 12,500 Higher by P3,500 from Associate Prof rate
   - Asso Prof 9,000 Higher by P2,500 from Assistant Prof rate

* Approved by the University Research Council on September 7, 2012.
**Prepared by Ms. Ma. Inores Palmes, University Controller.
Guidelines for Research Honoraria Release

1. Upon approval of research proposal by the College Research Council, the faculty researcher(s) shall sign the URCO project contract and submit a workplan with a schedule of deliverables.

2. Thirty percent (30%) of the research honorarium shall be released to the faculty upon approval of the grant, the signing of the URCO project contract, and the submission of a project workplan.

3. Thirty percent (30%) of the research honorarium shall be released upon submission of a mid-term report, or in case progress reports, at ten percent (10%) for each progress report at the end of each Academic term.

4. The remaining forty percent (40%) of the research honorarium shall be released upon:

   a. Submission of a research paper to a peer-reviewed journal. The faculty shall provide a copy of the submitted paper and the acknowledgement of submission from the journal editor for the release of the last honorarium tranche to be facilitated, or

   b. Submission of a published peer-reviewed paper in a journal, conference proceedings, chapter in an edited volume, or a book.

For Part-Time Faculty Members:

1. Upon approval of the research proposal by the College Research Council, the faculty researcher(s) shall sign the URCO project contract and submit a workplan with a schedule of deliverables.

2. The full honorarium shall be paid to the proponent upon submission of any of the following:

   a. A research paper to a peer-reviewed journal. The faculty shall provide a copy of the submitted paper and the acknowledgement of submission from the journal editor for the release of the last honorarium tranche to be facilitated,

   b. A published peer-reviewed paper in a journal, conference proceedings, chapter in an edited volume, or a book.
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De La Salle University

Code of Research Ethics and Guide to Responsible Conduct of Research*

The Code of Research Ethics establishes the standards for the responsible conduct of research at De La Salle University. As a foundational code, it forms the basis for formulating and implementing policies and regulations of research organizations and academic units in the University. It also guides the professional practice of research by the community of scholars, artists, and learners in the University.

Research is defined here as any systematic investigation that aims to contribute to a body of knowledge or theory. This definition forms the basis for more specific and detailed definitions that can be applied to the various disciplines and professions practiced in the University. Research organizations and academic units in the University are responsible for articulating definitions and paradigms of research applicable to their respective disciplines and professions.

The Code applies to all disciplines and professions practiced in the University, and it articulates the standards in broad terms. Research organizations and academic units in the University provide more detailed and specific guidance in the responsible conduct of research, as well as formulate and implement policies and regulations that address the varieties of research practice and their nuances. Such policies and regulations must complement the Code.

The Code complements and upholds the ethical research codes of professional associations, and does not replace them. The Code also complements and upholds University policies, such as those for intellectual property, health and safety, and management of finances, and does not replace them.

The Code is a dynamic, evolving document, and is subject to periodic review, amendment, and revision, each period not to exceed five (5) years. The review, amendment, and revision process is initiated and conducted jointly by the Vice Chancellor for Research, the University Committee on Ethics and Intellectual Property, which shall be augmented by a full complement of University sectoral representatives, and the University Research Coordination Office.

This introduction is followed by (1) statements declaring the principles that guide the framing of (2) the general ethical standards for the conduct of research in the University. The sections that follow constitute (3) a detailed guide for the responsible conduct of research following the principles and standards enunciated in sections A and B, and (4) a framework for handling breaches of the Code.

* Approved by the University Research Council on August 23, 2011.
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ETHICAL REVIEW PROCESS FLOWCHART

Faculty submits research proposal to URCO

Faculty is given the General Ethics Checklist to complete

The Proponent answers YES to any of the items in the General Ethics Checklist

YES

Faculty completes Research Ethics Checklist for a particular category:
- A. Human participants
- B. Animal Subjects
- C. Wildlife
- D. Infectious agents
- E. Toxic substances

NO

The URCO informs faculty that an ethical review process is not necessary and that the proposal will be submitted to the CRC for approval

The URCO submits the complete checklist and proposal to the CREC for ethical review

The CREC conducts the ethical review

NEXT PAGE
The CREC judges that the faculty proponent is able to address the pertinent ethical issues in the research plan?

- YES
  - The RASD certifies that the faculty proponent has satisfactorily adhered to the ethical principles for research by signing the Ethics checklist form.
  - The CRC proceeds to deliberate on the proposal for final approval.

- NO
  - The CREC is able to come up with suggestions for adherence to research ethical principles?
    - YES
      - The RASD lists these suggestions, and certifies that the CRC has undertaken the ethical review by signing the Ethics Checklist Form.
      - The CRC proceeds to deliberate on the proposal for final approval.
    - NO
      - The RASD writes the University Research Ethics Committee (UREC) and requests that it decide on the ethical issues in the research plan.
      - The CRC postpones the decision for approval until the UREC issues its decision on how the principles of ethics can best be adhered in the proposed research.
Procedure for the College Research Ethics Committee (CREC)  
Expedited Ethical Review

1. The proposals and ethical checklists which have been filled out for the appropriate research category will be submitted to the Research and Advanced Studies Director (RASD).

2. In the meeting where the College Research Council (CRC) is constituted as a College Research Ethics Committee (CREC), the RASD informs the members of the Council how the proponent has incorporated the appropriate procedures in the research plan to adhere to ethical principles.

3. When no other issues are raised by the CREC members regarding the planned procedures, the CREC approves the planned research ethics procedures. The RASD signs the ethics checklist form, and proceeds to have the CRC deliberate on the proposal for approval.

4. When issues are raised by CREC members regarding the planned ethical procedures, suggestions for alternative procedures are provided by the members. These are noted down by the RASD in the Ethics Checklist form to signify that these alternative procedures are to be adopted by the researcher(s) in the implementation of the project. The RASD then signs the form, and proceeds to have the CRC deliberate on the proposal for approval.

5. When the CREC is unable to find a resolution to the issues raised, that is, the CREC cannot agree on alternative procedures for adherence to research ethical principles, the RASD writes a letter to the VCR recommending that these unresolved issues be subjected to deliberation by the UREC.

6. The deliberation for approval of the proposal by the CRC will be scheduled upon receipt of the UREC’s written recommendation as to how the ethical issues identified in the proposal may best be addressed.
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Faculty Research Program (FRP)/New Ph.D. Grant

Application Procedures

1. Call for Proposals

- **PropONENT**
  - obtains proposal form from URCO or downloads from the Intranet at [www.dlsu.edu.ph/offices/urco/forms.asp](http://www.dlsu.edu.ph/offices/urco/forms.asp)
  - fills out the proposal form answering all items accordingly
  - discusses the proposal with the CRC representative

- **Department Chair, CRC Representative, Dean**
  - Endorses the proposal by affixing their signatures
  - Dean endorses the proposal of Part-Time faculty members

2. College Research Council

- **PropONENT**
  - reviews/evaluates research proposals

3. Decision

- **PropONENT**
  - submits proposals to the Research and Advanced Studies Director (RASD) of the College Research Council (CRC)
  - CRC/Ad-hoc Committee
  - reviews/evaluates research proposals

4. Decision

- **PropONENT**
  - may request for reconsideration
  - resubmits proposal to CRC

- **URCO**
  - convenes Ad-hoc committee

5. Decision

- **PropONENT**
  - receives and has proposals undergo initial screening by an expert/reader. Proposers are requested to incorporate revisions in the proposal before submission to the College Research Council
  - facilitates the ethical review process. Proposers are requested to accomplish the appropriate ethics checklist. Proposals undergo ethical review through the CRC.
  - submits proposals to the Research and Advanced Studies Director (RASD) of the College Research Council (CRC) for distribution to the CRC members

Processing of Proposals

- **URCO**
  - communicates with the proponent about the action of the CRC

- **URCO and PropONENT**
  - facilitates contract signing
  - sends copy of the IP disclosure form
  - sends copies of the guidelines for cash advance/liquidation, evaluation form
  - monitors research units (delinking/overload/honorarium)
  - monitors research progress and budget status
  - monitors release of funds for direct expenses
  - monitors evaluation of research outputs
  - handles dissemination of research outputs
  - oversees publication of research outputs

Approved

Disapproved

Minor/major revision

2

3
Interdisciplinary Research (IR)

Application Procedures

1. **Proponent**
   - obtains IR proposal form from URCO or downloads from the Internet at [www.citsu.edu.ph/offices/urco/forms.asp](http://www.citsu.edu.ph/offices/urco/forms.asp)
   - fills out the proposal form answering all items accordingly
   - discusses the proposal with the CRC representative

   **Department Chair, Research Panel, Dean**
   - Endorses the proposal by affixing their signatures
   - Dean endorses the proposal of Part-time faculty members

2. **Proponent**
   - revises/finalizes IR proposal based on Research Panel’s comments/suggestions
   - resubmits IR proposal to Research Panel

   **URCO**
   - receives and has IR proposal and facilitates the ethical review process.
   - Proposers are requested to accomplish the appropriate ethics checklist. IR Proposals undergo ethical review through the CRC.
   - submits IR proposal to the Research Panel

   **College Research Panel**
   - reviews/evaluates IR proposals

   **Research Panel/d-hoc Committee**
   - reviews/evaluates IR proposals

   **Proponent**
   - May request for reconsideration
   - resubmits IR proposal to Research Panel

   **URCO**
   - convenes Ad-hoc committee

Processing of Proposals

1. **URCO**
   - communicates with the proponent about the action of the Research Panel.

2. **URCO and Proponent**
   - facilitates contract signing
   - sends copy of the IP disclosure form
   - sends copies of the guidelines for cash advance/liquidation, evaluation form
   - monitors research units (deadlines, overload [honorary] units)
   - monitors research progress and budget status
   - monitors release of funds for direct expenses
   - monitors evaluation of research outputs
   - handles dissemination of research outputs
   - oversees publication of research outputs
# Flowchart of Procedure for Approval of Sabbatical Leave

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In-charge</th>
<th>Process/Document</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty member</td>
<td>Letter of application</td>
<td>Submits letter of application for a sabbatical leave, endorsed by the dean and department chair, to the office of the Vice Chancellor for Academics (OVCA)</td>
<td>At least one term before the sabbatical leave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academics (OVCA)</td>
<td>Eligibility for sabbatical leave</td>
<td>OVCA checks eligibility of faculty member for sabbatical leave (in terms of years of service). If faculty member is eligible, OVCA sends a letter to the faculty member informing him/her of the requirements for approving a sabbatical leave.</td>
<td>One (1) week after submission of application for sabbatical leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty member</td>
<td>Sabbatical research proposal</td>
<td>Submits his/her sabbatical research proposal, endorsed by the department chair and CRC representative to the University Research Coordination Office (URCO)</td>
<td>Four (4) weeks after start of term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Research Coordination Office (URCO)/College Research Council (CRC)</td>
<td>Approval of sabbatical res. proposal</td>
<td>Sabbatical research proposal undergoes the ethical review process through the CRC. After proposal evaluation and proposal reviewers by the faculty member, URCO forwards the sabbatical research proposal to the CRC for deliberation and approval. Upon approval, URCO prepares the research grant agreement form/contract of the faculty member.</td>
<td>Eight (8) weeks after submission of sabbatical research proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty member</td>
<td>Res. Grant agreement form/contract</td>
<td>Accomplishes and signs the research agreement form/contract. Submits a copy of the research grant agreement form/contract to the office of the OVCA.</td>
<td>One (1) week after receipt of the research grant agreement form/contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academics (OVCA)</td>
<td>Approval of sabbatical leave</td>
<td>Upon receipt of the research grant agreement form/contract, OVCA approves the sabbatical leave of the faculty member and informs him/her later.</td>
<td>One (1) week after the approval of the sabbatical research proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty proponent</td>
<td>Implementation of sabbatical leave project</td>
<td>Implements the sabbatical leave project during the sabbatical leave.</td>
<td>Following term after approval of the sabbatical leave by the OVCA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Schedule of Progress/Mid-term/Final/ Revised Final Reports

First Term Approved Projects (for implementation Second Term)

1. **Schedule A (One-term Project)**
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final Report</th>
<th>December 21</th>
<th>14 weeks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>14 weeks/one term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
   
   | Revised Final Report  | January 31  | One month after evaluation of Final Report |

Projects with Funding less than P50,000.00

1. **Schedule B (Two-term Project)**
   
   | Mid-term Report       | December 21 | 14 weeks |
   | Final Report          | April 18    | 14 weeks |
   | **Total**             |             | 28 weeks/two terms |
   | Revised Final Report  | May 31      | evaluation of Final Report |

2. **Schedule C (Three-term Project)**
   
   | Mid-term Report       | February 22 | 21 weeks |
   | Final Report          | August 30   | 21 weeks |
   | **Total**             |             | 42 weeks/three terms |
   | Revised Final Report  | September 30| One month after evaluation of Final Report |
Projects with Funding more than P50,000.00

1. **Schedule B (Two-term Project)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Type</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Progress Report</td>
<td>October 31</td>
<td>7 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Progress Report</td>
<td>December 21</td>
<td>7 weeks after 1st Progress Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Progress Report</td>
<td>February 22</td>
<td>7 weeks after 2nd Progress Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Report</td>
<td>April 18</td>
<td>7 weeks after 3rd Progress Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total - Revised Final Report</strong></td>
<td>May 31</td>
<td>28 weeks/two terms One month after evaluation of Final Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Schedule C (Three-term Project)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Type</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Progress Report</td>
<td>November 16</td>
<td>10 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Progress Report</td>
<td>February 8</td>
<td>10 weeks after 1st Progress Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Progress Report</td>
<td>June 2</td>
<td>10 weeks after 2nd Progress Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Report</td>
<td>August 30</td>
<td>12 weeks after 3rd Progress Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total - Revised Final Report</strong></td>
<td>September 30</td>
<td>42 weeks/three terms One month after evaluation of Final Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second Term Approved Projects (for implementation Third Term)

1. **Schedule A (One-term Project)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Type</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final Report</td>
<td>April 18</td>
<td>14 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total - Revised Final Report</strong></td>
<td>May 31</td>
<td>14 weeks/one term One month after evaluation of Final Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Projects with Funding less than P50,000.00

1. **Schedule B (Two-term Project)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Type</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mid-term Report</td>
<td>April 18</td>
<td>14 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Report</td>
<td>August 30</td>
<td>14 weeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** - 42 weeks/three terms

Revised Final Report  May 31  One month after evaluation of Final Report

Projects with Funding more than P50,000.00

1. **Schedule B (Two-term Project)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Type</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Progress Report</td>
<td>July 11</td>
<td>7 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Progress Report</td>
<td>August 30</td>
<td>7 weeks after 1st Progress Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Progress Report</td>
<td>October 31</td>
<td>7 weeks after 2nd Progress Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Report</td>
<td>December 16</td>
<td>7 weeks after 3rd Progress Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** - 28 weeks/two terms

Revised Final Report  January 31  One month after evaluation of Final Report

2. **Schedule C (Three-term Project)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Type</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Progress Report</td>
<td>August 1</td>
<td>10 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Progress Report</td>
<td>October 17</td>
<td>10 weeks after 1st Progress Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Progress Report</td>
<td>December 16</td>
<td>10 weeks after 2nd Progress Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Report</td>
<td>April 18</td>
<td>12 weeks after 3rd Progress Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** - 42 weeks/three terms

Revised Final Report  May 31  One month after evaluation of Final Report
Appendix 7

URCO Procedure for Projects with Wastes or Excess Materials

Preamble

Observations have been made by several quarters that some projects have generated wastes of a hazardous nature. On some occasions, the wastes from these projects have not been adequately treated or disposed. In other instances, the wastes were properly disposed of but documentation was either missing or insufficient. Observations have also been made of equipment left unused with uncertain status and ownership.

To correct this situation, the following procedures will be implemented for all projects beginning with proposals submitted for 2nd Term, SY2005-2006

Proposal Requirements

• All proponents for internally funded research projects are required to complete the declaration of wastes and excess materials
• The College Research Councils will assess proposals for compliance
• Disposal Costs shall be added to the project budget

Project Completion Requirements

In addition to the usual requirements, proof of disposal or administrative turnover of all Category 1 wastes will be required.

If disposal or administrative turnover is not provided upon completion of the other project requirements, the project will be considered "provisionally complete" for a period of one year. During this period, the proponents will be allowed to embark on new projects. If proof of disposal or administrative turnover is provided during this period, the project will be considered "complete". Beyond this one year period, the "provisionally complete" will revert to an "incomplete" status and no more new projects will be allowed. If a proponent has two provisionally complete projects, then no more new projects will be allowed.
Declaration of
Wastes and Excess Materials

Instructions:

Please classify anticipated wastes or excess materials into the following categories. Do not include ordinary office or kitchen waste.

*Category 1:*
- toxic and hazardous chemicals (include excess reagents)
- live plants and animals
- radioactive sources
- fuels and lubricants
- electronic equipment and printed circuit boards
- batteries
- bacterial cultures
- medical wastes

*Category 2:*
- packaging and containers
- glassware
- pipes and tubes
- concrete
- machine parts not included in Category 1

For the estimated quantity, only an order-of-magnitude estimate will be required.

- Please use any of the following for anticipated action:
- Disposal - identify method, cost and contractor, as appropriate.
- Administrative Turnover - identify the unit or department who will assume responsibility for the materials. Head of the unit should countersign the form
- Retained for use in succeeding project
Declaration of Wastes and Excess Materials
(replicate as necessary)

Please check as appropriate

- No Category 1 or Category 2 wastes or excess materials will be generated
- Category 1 or 2 wastes will be generated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of material</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Estimated Quantity</th>
<th>Anticipated Action (method)</th>
<th>Contractor/Receiving Unit</th>
<th>Disposal Cost (if any)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proponent Name and Signature**

**Name and Signature**
Department Head of Receiving Unit
(for Administrative Turnover only)
Definition of Terms

Commissioned Research Project (CRP) - refers to a project which has been recommended or initiated by any of the following: the Office of the President and Chancellor, or the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research and Innovation.

Ongoing Projects - refer to projects that are on-schedule or delayed. Specifically, these are classified as:

1. **On schedule** - an ongoing project which has not gone beyond the original expected date of completion.

2. **Delayed** - a project which has gone beyond the original expected date of completion.

   2.1. **Delayed with Extension (DWE)** - a project which has gone beyond the original expected date of completion, but with written request for an extension for the submission of final report/revised final report.

   2.2. **Delayed without Extension (DWOE)** - a project which has gone beyond the original expected date of completion, and without any written request for an extension for the submission of final report/revised final report.

Completed Project - refers to a project which has undergone the evaluation procedure and, where applicable, the recommended revisions have been incorporated in the final output of the research project.

Deferred Project - refers to a project which has not officially been started on the approved/supposed date of implementation. The Research Grant Agreement Form has not been signed.

Terminated Project - refers to a project which has been discontinued or abandoned by the proponent(s).

Cancelled/Withdrawn Project - refers to a project which was never started/ implemented.
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