

[ACM-F000]

ACM Forms

Management and Organization Department
Ramon V. del R College of Business
De La Salle University

This document lists the different forms used in the Applied Corporate Management Program, providing the rationale and historical background as practicable. The word documents are downloadable and the pertinent data can be filled in the computer.

FORM NO.	FORM DESCRIPTION	PROGRAM PHASE
ACM-F001	ACM Applicant's Checklist	Student Application
ACM-F002	ACM Interview Evaluation Form	Student Application
ACM-F003	Student's Information Sheet	Pre-Internship
ACM-F004	Intern's Code of Professional Conduct	Pre-Internship
ACM-F005	Memorandum of Agreement between Partner Company and DLSU	Company Application
ACM-F006	Parent's Waiver Form	Internship
ACM-F007	Endorsement Form	Internship
ACM-F008	Intern's Internship Information Sheet	Internship
ACM-F009	Internship Agreement	Internship
ACM-F010	Intern's Confidential Agreement	Internship
ACM-F011	Intern's Four-Week Report	Internship
ACM-F012	Supervisor's Monthly Evaluation	Internship
ACM-F013	Supervisor's Term End Evaluation	Internship
ACM-F014	Supervisor's Evaluation of ACM Program	Internship
ACM-F015	Intern's Competency Map	Internship
ACM-F016	Intern's Final Grading Sheet	Internship
ACM-F017	Student-Adviser Agreement	Thesis
ACM-F018	Plagiarism Confirmation Certificate	Thesis
ACM-F019	Adviser's Endorsement to Expert Faculty	Thesis
ACM-F020	Thesis Format Checklist	Thesis
ACM-F021	Plagiarism Certificate Summary	Thesis
ACM-F022	Thesis Proposal Endorsement Form	Thesis
ACM-F023	Thesis Proposal Evaluation Form	Thesis
ACM-F024	Thesis Proposal Summary Evaluation Sheet	Thesis
ACM-F025	Thesis Proposal Summary of Revision	Thesis
ACM-F026	Thesis Proposal Approval Sheet	Thesis
ACM-F027	Declaration of Originality	Thesis
ACM-F028	Thesis Defense Endorsement Form	Thesis
ACM-F029	Thesis Defense Evaluation Form	Thesis
ACM-F030	Thesis Defense Summary Evaluation Sheet	Thesis
ACM-F031	Thesis Excellence Nomination Form	Thesis
ACM-F032	Thesis Defense Summary of Revision	Thesis
ACM-F033	Thesis Approval Sheet	Thesis
ACM-F034	Thesis Excellence Award Rubric	Post-Thesis
ACM-F035	Thesis Excellence Award Decision Form	Post-Thesis
ACM-F036	ACM Program Exit Interview Form	Pre-Graduation
ACM-F037	RVR Student Excellence Award Checklist	Pre-Graduation
ACM-F038	RVR Student Excellence Award Rubric	Pre-Graduation
ACM-F-039	RVR Student Excellence Award Decision Form	Pre-Graduation

ACM-F001: ACM Applicant's Checklist

Applicants to the ACM program have to submit complete requirements at the onset as the first step in the screening process. This checklist is helpful to the applicants as it forces them to review their documents for completeness and authenticity. This form is also helpful to the Vice Chair of the Management and Organization Department (MOD) who will have to verify that the applicants have submitted all the requirements needed in the processing of the application.

ACM-F002: ACM Interview Evaluation Form

MOD uses this form during the interview phase of the application process. The current form has evolved over the years.

Prior to 2003, the interview process was very subjective. Each faculty member who interviewed an applicant had his/her own set of questions and made an assessment on how the applicant responded to the questions. In 2003, the Business Management (BM) Department, now MOD, structured the interview process so that applicants are assessed on pre-determined attributes using behaviorally defined questions. This means that the interviewers ask applicants to recall specific instances in their adult life to respond to very specific questions. Following industry practice, the MOD believes that how a person has handled a situation in the past is reflective of how the person will handle a similar situation in the future.

Initially, the ACM Committee designed the evaluation sheet to accommodate the assessment of three faculty members asking a question each per attribute. The questions were prepared in advance to help the interviewers ask the right kind of questions. In 2007, the ACM Committee of the BM Department changed the form so that faculty members could draw their questions from a longer list of pre-tested behaviorally defined questions. The list of questions became necessary to thwart applicants who had prior information about the three questions per attribute that interviewers ask in the interview and who used the advance information to prepare canned responses.

Also at this time, the ACM Committee reduced the number of faculty interviewees from three to two. Moreover, the interviewees were encouraged to interview together, rather than apart, to minimize the number of times an applicant had to prepare and undergo an interview. This, together with improved scheduling techniques, reduced the processing time considerably.

In 2010, the ACM Committee reformatted the interview evaluation sheet to conform to the University's move to utilize rubrics. Applicants may access the rubric through the DLSU websites so they know exactly how the interviewers will be assess them. However, the list of behaviorally defined questions remains in the control of the department.

ACM-F003: Student's Information Sheet

The ACM Committee requires students who go on internship to accomplish an information sheet. The information contained therein is helpful to the faculty adviser. The first portion contains the most recent contact data of the student. The second and third portions are more personal in nature. It provides the faculty adviser with a little more information to understand the students better. Previously a student intern accomplished the form each time the student went for internship. In 2010, this was changed to only once during the pre-internship stage. Moreover, soft copy submissions became the norm to minimize the accumulation of paper.

ACM-F004: Intern's Professional Code of Conduct

In 2010, the ACM Committee found a need for its students undertaking their internship to sign a code of conduct. This stemmed from some concerns raised by the intern's supervisors through the faculty advisers.

A faculty adviser visits an intern in the workplace at least twice during the internship trimester. During those occasions, the faculty adviser is able to communicate with the supervisors. It is in this setting that supervisors are able to express some of their concerns about the intern's behavior in the workplace. While it is not rampant, there are interns who have minor lapses in conduct. For instance, a handful would come in late for work or will be absent without informing the supervisor; or, in many instances, students would use the company time to answer e-mails and text messages. This is unacceptable behavior.

The Professional Code of Conduct (Code) reminds students that when they are in the workplace, they should behave professionally as their actions reflect on the University and the program. By affixing their signature, they state that they have read and understood the contents of the Code and will strive to comply with its terms. The student signs the Code before embarking on the first internship assignment.

ACM-F005: Memorandum of Agreement between Partner Company and DLSU

The success of the ACM internship program lies in the strong linkage the MOD has with the partner companies. In effect, the two parties commit to support each other so that an ACM student going on internship will receive the best training.

The Legal Office of DLSU reviewed and approved the initial version of the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA). Representatives from the partner company as well as representatives from DLSU sign the MOA. The Internship Coordinator then forwards the signed MOA to the Legal Office for notarization. The Internship Coordinator files a copy of the notarized document, forwards one copy to the partner company, and another to the External Linkages (EL) Office of DLSU.

In support of the initiatives of the newly created Intellectual Properties Office (IPO), the ACM Committee revised the MOA in 2009 to include a provision on intellectual property that the IPO director inserted. After the EL office approved the revised MOA, the ACM Committee called for a re-signing of all agreements. Thus in 2010, the Internship Coordinator ensured that the concerned parties signed the revised MOA.

The signing of the MOA is the responsibility of MOD administration. Whenever there is a new partner company, the ACM Internship Coordinator sends a copy of the MOA to the partner company for review. In most instances, the partner company does not object to any provision of the document. If there are comments, the Internship Coordinator sends the proposed revision to the EL and Legal offices for clearance. Once cleared, the Internship Coordinator facilitates the signing and notarization of the MOA.

ACM-F006: Parent's Clearance and Waiver Form

It is the policy of the University that all students who undertake academic related work outside the campus should have the prior clearance from their parents. At least one parent signs the form within one week from the start of the internship. The Internship Coordinator sees to it that the signature on the waiver form matches the signature on file. Submission of forged documents is subject to disciplinary action. Moreover, relatives cannot sign on the form unless they are designated guardians, in which case, a prior submission of the designation is imperative.

Previously, students submitted their waiver forms during the General Assembly although there were quite a few, who for whatever reason submit their signed forms mid-way or close to the end of the trimester. Since students should not be undertaking any activity outside school without such waiver form, it has become stressful to remind students about their submissions constantly. Consequently, MOD devised a control mechanism so that the students are forced to submit their waiver forms on a timely basis. This is tied up and discussed with the succeeding form.

ACM-F007: Endorsement Form

In the last 3-4 years, partner companies began to require an official endorsement of interns prior to the start of the internship. Prior to this, the endorsement of resumes sufficed. It has therefore become customary for the Internship Coordinator to release letters formally endorsing the students. The content of the letter differed depending on the Internship Coordinator.

From the experience, it has become apparent that companies process interns only after they receive the endorsement. Since it is important for interns to submit the endorsement to their supervisor, the release of the endorsement is now dependent on the submission of the waiver. If the student fails to submit a waiver form, the Internship Coordinator will not sign the endorsement. If the Internship Coordinator does not sign the endorsement, the intern cannot start. Thus beginning AY 2011-2012, the MOD has adapted the practice.

ACM-F008: Intern's Internship Information Sheet

At the beginning of an internship, the student must accomplish the internship information sheet and send a copy to the ACM Internship Coordinator. Prior to AY 2010-2011, the information sheets were hard copies collected by the ACM Internship Coordinator during the General Assembly and filed in the students' file. The ACM Committee decided to change to soft copies to shift to a paperless environment and to minimize the paper files that need to be stored.

There are two purposes for this form. The first is to provide the ACM Internship Coordinator with information about supervisors and work assignments. The Internship Coordinator encodes the data in a master file and uses the information for strategic planning purposes. The second is to provide the students' adviser with information about the internship. The information helps the adviser prepare for the company visit.

ACM-F009: Internship Agreement

Every student who undertakes an internship must sign an internship agreement. The document makes it clear that no employer-employee relationship exists and that the training the company provides is for academic purposes only. It also specifies what MOD administrators expect from the company and from the intern.

There are instances wherein a partner company will have its own internship contract or appointment papers. If this is the case, then the documents of the partner company suffice. During the occasion when there are no such documents, then the ACM intern must use this internship agreement that is signed by the company representative and the intern.

ACM-F010: Intern's Confidentiality Agreement

A very crucial item that merits a separate document and in fact forms part of the standing MOA is the need for interns to keep confidential all corporate information they have accessed during their internship. Consequently a separate confidentiality agreement was drafted. The agreement makes it clear that interns are not to disclose such information, consciously or unconsciously.

The intern and company representative sign the document.

ACM-F011: Intern's Four-Week Report

Each day during the internship, ACM student interns are to log their work assignment and indicate the skills they learned. At the end of a 4-week period, students reflect on their month's work. They must submit a monthly report to their respective supervisor who reads and notes the document. The interns forward the notated copy to their adviser.

The ACM Committee improved on the form in 2006. Prior to this date, students had to submit a daily account of their tasks. Since some tasks tend to be repetitive, the student requested a more general form that highlights their activities for a 4-week period.

ACM-F012: Supervisor's Monthly Evaluation

Twice during the duration of the interns stay, the ACM Committee expects the supervisors to evaluate the interns' performance. The form currently in use evolved after several consultations with different ACM batches. In the early years, there was only one evaluation done by the supervisor at term end. Around 2003, the past interns expressed for a more frequent evaluation to give them the opportunity to improve on their performance.

In 2006, the ACM Committee decided there should be a mid-term evaluation. The form used was the term-end evaluation sheet but without numerical ratings. Several trimesters after its initial use, subsequent interns requested that the ACM Committee consider a numerical value per criterion since many of them experienced excellent qualitative during the mid-term review but received poor numerical scores at the term-end. They reasoned that if they knew ahead of time how their supervisors rated them, then they have better information. The ACM Committee acceded to the request and emphasized that the numerical mid-term ratings had no bearing on the final grade of the student.

Again, after several trimesters of use, the interns further requested that the supervisors make two interim evaluations, one per month. They reasoned they would be able to know whether their supervisors would notice an improvement in their performance the first evaluation. Consequently, the ACM Committee designed a monthly supervisor's evaluation form to cover two 4-week periods.

Despite the changes in the monthly evaluation forms, the ACM Committee stressed the need for supervisors to discuss their rating of the students. The process is meant to open up communications between the two parties with the end in view of improving performance.

ACM-F013: Supervisor's Term End Evaluation

An integral part of the internship is the supervisor's evaluation of the interns' performance. This evaluation has a 50% weight on the final grade of the intern.

For many years, the supervisor evaluates interns on six items on a 4-point rating scale. The adviser then averaged the six scores and tied this up to the grading scale of the University. However, the process differed depending on the adviser as some would round up the figure and others would transmute. Thus in AY 2006-2007, the ACM Committee revised the 4-point scale rating to a range of grades per point. Instead of simply having 1, 2, 3, and 4, the rating became 70-77, 78-85, 86-93, and 94-100.

Despite the change in ratings, the past interns still complained. They argued that a supervisor could give a grade of say 94 with the impression they are giving high grades since it belongs to column 4. However, this translates to only a 3.5 rather than a perfect 4.0 score. To remedy the situation immediately, the ACM Committee included the DLSU grading scores below the form. The supervisors however got further confused. Consequently, the ACM Committee again revised the form in AY 2009-2010.

Following the move of the University, the ACM Committee developed a rubric to serve as the term-end evaluation form for supervisors. This is the current form that supervisors accomplish and discuss with their intern. The form includes five columns with grade point range that closely conforms to the rating scale of DLSU.

With respect to the qualitative portion, the AY 2006-2007 revision included the following questions:

- What development intervention(s) do you recommend for this particular student?
- What can the school and/or company do to help the student improve his/her performance?

ACM-F014: Supervisor's Evaluation of the ACM Program

To strengthen ties with industry and ensure that the design of the ACM program meets the demands of industry, the ACM Committee in 2010 decided to design an instrument that could capture what the supervisors relay to advisers during the company visits. Prior to this, the ACM Committee had requested the assistance of the Institutional Testing and Evaluation Office (ITEO) to conduct a survey among partner companies to assess the program. The ITEO presented the results in 2009.

The supervisor's evaluation of the ACM program is still to be tested. The ACM Committee intends for advisers to bring the form during the culminating activity of their respective interns. After the culminating presentation of the students, the adviser solicits the comments of the supervisor. The ACM Committee envisions that either, the supervisor accomplishes the form themselves or the adviser jots down the comments on the evaluation form. In either case, the supervisor must sign the form.

ACM-F015: Intern's Competency Checklist

At the end of the internship, the ACM Committee requires interns to accomplish the competency checklist. The interns submit one copy of the accomplished checklist to the adviser while retaining a second copy for future use. At the beginning of the next internship, the intern should show the competency checklist to the supervisor so the latter may know how to help the intern improve on the competencies. The process iterates until after the third internship.

The checklist was adapted in 2006 from the Idaho Division of Professional-Technical Education, Basic Workplace Competency. It was revised in the first trimester 2011-2012 to take into account the Expected Learning Attributes of MOD students.

ACM-F016: Intern's Final Grading Sheet

The adviser accomplishes the intern's final grading sheet. The adviser inputs the grade of supervisor and then inputs his/her own grade. For many years, the 50% assessment of the adviser was broken down as 30% report submission and 20% culminating presentation. In 2005, the ACM Committee split the 30% portion into 25% for report and 5% for attendance in department activities. However, during the early years, there was no form for this and the advisers simply submitted their final grade to the registrar.

In AY 2006-2007, the ACM Committee designed a form for advisers to accomplish. This form retains the 50% assessment of the company supervisor but redistributes the 50% of the faculty adviser to account for professional behavior of the ACM interns. Consequently, the current form used has the following breakdown:

50%	Supervisors assessment
15%	Professional conduct of intern
15%	Timely submission of forms and reports
10%	Attendance in meetings and department activities
10%	Performance in the culminating presentation

ACM-F017: Student-Thesis Adviser Agreement

In AY 2009-2010, the ACM Committee acknowledged that students and their advisers should clearly understand their responsibilities toward each other. It is the end objective that students prepare and defend a research paper that is befitting of a BS degree in Applied Corporate Management.

The thesis group accomplishes the form in triplicate copy and has the adviser sign on it. One copy is for the thesis group, another for the adviser, and the third is for the thesis coordinator.

ACM-F018: Plagiarism Confirmation Certificate

In AY 2010-2011, the ACM Committee decided that students should be more aware of what plagiarism is as well as its implications. Consequently, ACM students who are preparing their thesis proposals are required to take the online test prepared by the Indiana University on how to recognize plagiarism. Before the students proceed to defend their thesis proposal, they must submit to the ACM Thesis Coordinator, a confirmation certificate released by the Indiana University that they attach to this form. The Indiana University grants online the confirmation

certificate with a unique time stamp only if a taker perfects the score. The ACM Thesis Coordinator records the unique time stamp to control for fraudulent submissions.

ACM-F019: Adviser's Endorsement to Expert Faculty

Also in AY 2009-2010, the ACM Committee deemed it wise to design a form to control student consultations with faculty members who is not the thesis adviser. For many years, students would simply approach other faculty members or the adviser would recommend that they consult with others who have the expertise. There were occasions in the past that the advice of the other faculty members differed radically from the adviser thus placing students in a predicament. Moreover, there were faculty members who did not want to interfere with the directions of the adviser thus declining student consultations. To solve the roundabout, the ACM Committee decided that thesis students could consult with other faculty members only if the adviser officially endorses them. In this way, all parties concerned are aware of the outside consultation and thus minimize potential problems.

ACM-F020: Thesis Format Checklist

When the ACM Committee required ACM students to prepare their undergraduate thesis, they provided a simple presentation format, indicating all the necessary parts of the thesis. Every ACM thesis groups thereafter then copied the format of the earlier batches.

In AY 2006-2007, the ACM Committee agreed that all theses should utilize the American Psychological Association (APA) format, particularly on citations. Consequently, research faculty oriented the thesis students on the APA format and provided a guide. Thesis students worked within the guide but presented their research output adapting the template of their faculty advisers.

To standardize the format, make it more professional looking, and to prepare the ACM students for academic writing for journal publication, the ACM Committee designed a detailed thesis-writing guide used by students effective AY 2010-2011. The instructions, including a sample thesis using the prescribed format, is covered in the Thesis Instruction document, coded ACM-S005-2.

Despite the detailed instructions however, thesis students did not pay particular attention to the format nuances. The APA prescribes specific format for the presentation of tables, figures, headings, and the like. To alert the students further to the required format, the Department decided to provide them with a checklist, effective AY 2011-2012. The students then tick mark the box if they complied with the prescribed format.

ACM-F021: Plagiarism Certificate Summary

ACM thesis students who defend their thesis must pass the Indiana University plagiarism test and submit their certificate together with ACM-F018. As one of the important pages of the thesis proposal, each ACM thesis group must collectively attest to the integrity of their submission by accomplishing the Plagiarism Certificate Summary at the proposal stage and the Declaration of Originality (ACM-F027) at the final defense stage. At the end of each form, members of the group must list their Indiana University certification number.

ACM-F022: Thesis Proposal Endorsement Form

Thesis students who accomplish their thesis proposal must have the document approved by the faculty member who teaches the research course. The proof of the endorsement is this form. The thesis students download the form, accomplish it, and make two printed copies. They then insert the form with each copy of their thesis proposal. If their adviser signs the form, then they can submit the approved thesis proposal to the Thesis Coordinator.

In AY 2006-2007, the ACM Committee felt that the students must enroll in the Advanced Research Class for ACM Students (ADREACM). While enrolled in the course, the students prepare and defend their thesis proposal. Thus it was the ADREACM faculty who signed the Thesis Proposal Endorsement form. Prior to this, the students enrolled in Special Topics for ACM Students (ACSPETO) which the ACM Committee initially designed to be a catch-all subject to introduce latest trends in management. The ACM Committee had the subject dissolved with the creation of ADREACM.

Beginning AY 2011-2012, ADREACM is no longer a required course. The ACM Committee decided to phase-out the course with the introduction of Thesis I for ACM Students (THSAPC1). Instead of regular class days, the ACM Committee shall assign thesis students to a faculty adviser whose task is to ensure that the students prepare and defend their thesis proposal. The thesis adviser will sign the Thesis Proposal Endorsement form. Subsequently, the thesis students are to enroll in Thesis Proper (THSACMG/THSAPC2) where they prepare and defend their thesis with the same faculty adviser as the one assigned in THSAPC1.

ACM-F023: Thesis Proposal Evaluation Form

The evaluation of the thesis proposal evolved over time. Since there were very few ACM students who were taking their thesis, the ACM Thesis Coordinator was responsible for the approval of the thesis proposal. The ACM Thesis Coordinator later gave the thesis proposal grade to the thesis panel who incorporated the grade in the final thesis evaluation.

In evaluating the proposals, the ACM Thesis Coordinator considered the following:

20%	Research question
25%	Conceptual framework
20%	Literature review
15%	Research design
20%	Oral defense

Subsequently, the ACM Committee revised the weights. They removed the oral defense grade and gave equal weights for the remaining criteria.

With the advent of the Advanced Research for ACM students (ADREACM) class, the evaluation of the ACM Thesis Coordinator became moot. The responsibility became that of the ADREACM faculty. It was then the faculty member, who gave the thesis groups their class grade. A part of the grade included the proposal grade.

Following the move to use the rubric, the ACM Committee designed ACM-F023 in AY 2009-2010. The current form gives equal weight to the following items: Research Question, Conceptual Framework, Related Literature, Research Design, and General Comments.

ACM-F024: Thesis Proposal Summary Evaluation Form

The ACM Committee designed the summary evaluation sheet when thesis students began defending their proposal in front of a panel. Due to the various programs that the then Business Management Department was managing, the thesis proposal panel was composed of the research faculty and another faculty member who would in most likelihood become the thesis groups' adviser.

With the elimination of the ACM Thesis Coordinator grade, the ACM Committee allotted 10% of the thesis proposal grade to the group's attitude.

ACM-F025: Thesis Proposal Summary of Revision

The ACM Committee expects that thesis students revise their thesis proposals according to the suggestions of the thesis proposal panel. Previously, thesis students would make the corrections on the manuscript and the panel would have to re-read the entire document to find the revisions. To simplify, the ACM Committee prepared a summary of revision sheet where thesis students would highlight the suggested revisions and indicate the actions they undertook to meet the suggestions.

ACM-F026: Thesis Proposal Approval Sheet

When submitting the revised Thesis Proposal to the panel, thesis students also prepare the Thesis Proposal Approval sheet. If the panel members are satisfied with the revisions, they then sign the approval sheet. Once signed, the thesis students ring-bind the approval sheet together with their paper and submit two copies to the ACM Thesis Coordinator.

ACM-F027: Declaration of Originality

The ACM Committee required the submission of the Declaration of Originality together with the thesis, beginning AY 2010-2011. In the Declaration, thesis students attest to the originality and integrity of the work. They become fully aware that once they submit their thesis, the public scrutinize their work and any findings contrary to their attestation may lead to the revocation of their degree. While the attached document is not necessary for anyone to take action against the authors, the ACM Committee believes that the Declaration raises the awareness level of the thesis students, countering any future argument of ignorance.

ACM-F028: Thesis Defense Endorsement Form

It is the faculty adviser's responsibility to review the thesis prepared by thesis groups. If they are satisfied with the quality and integrity of the work, they sign on the endorsement form. As a further control, the ACM Thesis Coordinator also signs the form. However, instead of reviewing the paper for content, the ACM Coordinator or the designate evaluates the paper for compliance with the prescribed format. This ensures uniformity in thesis submissions.

ACM-F029: Thesis Evaluation Form

The thesis evaluation form also evolved as the thesis program progressed. In grade composition, the earlier versions included the following breakdown:

30%	Research objective
15%	Adherence to framework
15%	Adherence to methodology
10%	Grammar
10%	Completeness
20%	Oral defense

The ACM Committee used the original form with its corresponding weights for a long time until AY 2010-2011 when the committee decided to adapt the rubric form that the University prescribed. This rubric allocates 80% of the grade to the written submission and 20% to the oral defense. The breakdown of the thesis evaluation, which is also the final grade of the thesis groups, follows:

10	Research question
6	Body of knowledge
10	Methodology
24	Results discussion
20	Conclusion and implications
10	Composition
4	Organization
4	Delivery
4	Presentation content
4	Media and resources
4	Response to questions

Beginning AY 2011-2012, the ACM Program Head increased the point allocation for each criterion so that the raw score totals 1,000 points. For each criterion, the committee added an additional 0 so that research question for instance, has a range up to 100 points instead of only 10. In the summary table, the thesis panel drops the last zero to get the numeric score. The committee raised the total score from 100 to provide a wider range per rubric column.

ACM-F030: Thesis Summary Evaluation Form

While the thesis panel members, including the adviser, used the same thesis evaluation form, the weights differed in the summary sheet. In AY 2005-2006, the panel grade was 35% while that of the adviser was 65%. The ACM Committee changed the weights in AY 2007-2008. It became 30% for the panel grade, 50% for the adviser's grade, and 20% for the grade that the ACM thesis coordinator gave for the thesis proposal.

The ACM Committee again changed the weights to that used currently. Since the ACM Thesis coordinator no longer reviewed and graded the thesis proposal, the committee equally distributed the 20% allocation to the panel grade and to the adviser. The additional 10% for the adviser reflects the attitude of the thesis group.

The panel chair must submit to the ACM Thesis Coordinator, thorough the department secretary, the accomplished Thesis Summary Evaluation form, together with the individual thesis evaluation forms, immediately after the defense.

ACM-F031: Thesis Excellence Award Nomination Form

It was the practice of the ACM Committee to consider all thesis papers that garnered a grade of at least 90 points, for what was previously known as the Best Thesis award. Following the revision of the thesis evaluation form to the rubric format and reassessing the criteria for excellence award, the ACM Committee introduced in AY 2010-2011, a formal nomination form. The two faculty members who serve as panel members are the only ones who can nominate a paper for the Thesis Excellence Award for as long as it meets the following criteria:

A minimum thesis grade of 90

Paper is of national significance and/or has contributed to the body of knowledge

The two signatories have to sign the nomination immediately after the oral defense. The panel chair then announces the nomination when they announce the thesis grade. The panel chair must also forward the form attaching the thesis evaluation forms and summary sheet as evidence of minimum grade, to the ACM thesis coordinator, through the department secretary, as soon as the panel chair dismisses the thesis group. It is possible that a paper with a minimum score 90 is not nominated because it has no major practical or academic contribution

ACM-F032: Thesis Summary of Revision

Similar to the thesis proposal stage, ACM Committee expects that thesis students revise their thesis manuscripts according to the suggestions of the panel. Thesis students should indicate on the summary sheet the suggested revisions and the actions they undertook to meet the suggestions.

ACM-F033: Thesis Approval Sheet

When submitting the revised Thesis manuscript to the panel, thesis students also prepare the Thesis Approval sheet. If the panel members are satisfied with the revisions, they then sign the approval sheet. Once signed, the thesis students include the approval sheet in the green binding of the document. The thesis students submit only one hard copy to the ACM Thesis Coordinator who in turn will forward the copy to the University Librarian. Together with the submission are two compact disc copies of the manuscript including a scanned copy of the Thesis Approval Sheet.

ACM-F034: Thesis Excellence Award Rubric

The ACM Committee crafted the Best Thesis Award to give recognition to students who produced remarkable work. For several years, the ACM Thesis Coordinator convened an ad-hoc Best Thesis Award Committee made up of three faculty members. Each faculty member assessed the worthiness of thesis papers that garnered at least 90 points during the defense, using their own criteria. The assessments are then gathered and averaged. The Department Chair,

upon the recommendation of the ACM Thesis Coordinator, awarded the Best Thesis to the manuscript with the highest average.

In AY 2009-2010, the ACM Committee decided that only the top paper should be recognized and that a minimum grade should be required to be worthy of that recognition. It was also in the same year that, very specific criteria were established and a rubric designed to guide the ad-hoc committee members in evaluating the papers. Further, the ACM Thesis Coordinator approached faculty members who did not serve as thesis adviser or thesis panel to be part of the ad-hoc committee. The ACM Thesis Coordinator keeps the identities of the Ad-hoc Thesis Award Committee members as well as the thesis students confidential to eliminate personality bias.

The Ad-hoc Thesis Award Committee members give equal weight to the following criteria in the rubric that has a minimum score of 89 and a maximum score of 100 per criterion: thesis defense grade, significance of study, contribution to body of knowledge, technical quality, and composition.

ACM-F035: Thesis Excellence Award Decision Form

The ACM Committee designed the Thesis Excellence Award Decision form to show the tabulation of the evaluation scores of the ad-hoc Thesis Excellence Award committee members. The Thesis Coordinator attaches the signed form to the memo addressed to the Department Chair, who in turn makes the recommendation to the College Dean. The form was used beginning AY 2010-2011 since previously only the ACM Thesis Coordinator was privy to the scores that the ad-hoc thesis award committee members gave per manuscript.

ACM-F036: ACM Program Exit Interview Form

In AY 2002-2003, the Department Chair conducted exit interviews for all graduating students. The chair asked open-ended questions and recorded as well as summarized the responses of the students. The department did not formalize the practice so it was only in AY 2010-2011 when the ACM Committee decided that a more formal exit interview was necessary. In AY 2011-2012, the Department adapted the survey instrument developed by ACM students for their thesis.

ACM-F037: Student Excellence Award Checklist

With the creation of a new department supervising the ACM program, the administrators of MOD decided that the department should have its departmental award for student excellence at the undergraduate level. The request was presented to the University's Honors and Awards Committee for approval.

To qualify for the award, a student must have a CGPA of at least 3.0, must exhibit responsible leadership, must have contributed positively to society, and must be an effective communicator.

It is envisioned that interested students would apply for the award and that the MOD shall deliberate on who to give the award to. For comparative purposes, the ACM Program Head designed a checklist that students may use to ensure that they submit all pertinent documents and information so that the Department can select the best student for the award.

ACM-F038: Student Excellence Award Rubric

The MOD would like to be transparent in the manner it rates individuals. ACM-F038 was designed so that students are aware of, and evaluators have, a basis upon which to compare the qualifications of aspiring student awardees.

ACM-F039: Student Excellence Award Decision Form

The final form summarizes the scores of each faculty evaluator. This form shall be attached to the recommendation letter prepared by the Vice Chair to the Department Chair.