MY VISION, MISSION AND DEVELOPMENT GOALS FOR THE POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY OF THE PHILIPPINES

Emanuel C. De Guzman

President, Polytechnic University of the Philippines

ABSTRACT

The concept of epistemic community as applied in the academe has been the selling point in the crafting of the vision, mission and development goals of the author in his initial vie for the presidency of PUP. Using this context "clearing the path towards making PUP a reputable acedemic and professional epistemic community," he proposes that changes could be done , in terms of devolution and democratization of processes,   transparency in rewards and sanctions, refurbishing classrooms and creation of spaces for students to decongest the main campus, reconceptualization and reinstitutionalization of the student council and the student paper, and lobby for higher state subsidy as well as look for opportunities to augment budget through research and academic excellence

keywords: epistemic community, development goals

PERSONAL STATEMENT

I am an alumnus of PUP. I served as Editor-in-Chief of the student paper, "The Catalyst", for two years (I was a member of the Editorial Board in all of my four years of studentship). I have seen PUP from the lens of students who clamored for social change immediately after EDSA. I have seen what PUP has become in the last twenty five years as a student, a member of the faculty and administrator (Chair of a department and Director of two research centers). In 1991, the Sociology Department took me in as a member of the faculty and since then I have had no other job except teaching, doing research and all the other things academics do. I have seen what departments and colleges and the central leaderships do and how they manage the university—the processes which are replete with the politics of patronage that has become a taken for granted reality in the university.

This, as we know, is not only happening in PUP but also in the society in general; but as an insider, a witness, I am sure I can turn things around (at least) in PUP. Since Dr. Prudente left the presidency to run for a senate seat in 1992, PUP has been on a quality downturn. There have been developments in infrastructures and quantity: new buildings have been built, new income generating satellite campuses have emerged in various parts of Luzon, giving PUP a large territorial spread. Although already up to a point of bursting at the seams, PUP student populations continue to increase while tuitions are kept to a level accessible to the poor. But our systems could not cope with our numbers, which results to a breakdown in quality in many academic and administrative areas. The quality of the faculty has suffered because of staggering numbers (55 or more average class size) of students. We have a good number of intellectually capable teachers but the lack of development opportunities opened to them by the university has caused many of them to be content with what and where they are. Still, those who have the drive to further develop in their profession have to rely on their own personal networks to keep on going. Many of these faculty members of high quality have found their way to other schools for better pay and working conditions.

We have to reconceptualize and reconstitute the student paper and the student council to attune them with the fast changing times. Students have to have legitimate venues to air their opinions or even to voice their dissent; otherwise they will be spending their youthful energies and passions in other less legitimate venues. These are all part of what we call academic freedom.

A new rebuilding process has to commence through building on the good contributions of past administrations while transforming what I call the PUP lifeworld which is replete with the anachronistic politics of patronage and which has been pulling us down for the longest time.

Somebody organic to PUP must take the lead in this rebuilding process. Somebody who has been with PUP long enough to know what it has become but young enough to have the idealism to change this

institution must have the courage to take charge. This is the reason why I am taking my chance to become PUP's new leader.

Vision and Mission for PUP

Clearing the path towards making PUP a reputable academic, intellectual and professional *epistemic community* which is critically aware of itself (its people, their groups and their differences) and its meaning environments (the academe, the professions, the public and private worlds, the immediate societies and the hyper-globalizing world) in and through which the university as a community is entangled, situated and contextualized.

An epistemic community is a community which generates, deploys and manages knowledge not only for the good of the community but of society and the world in general. Critical awareness of the self (as a community, PUP community) and its meaning environments or what is known in academic circles as *reflexivity* is crucial for the vision of turning it into an epistemic community. The self is reflexive when it insistently interrogates itself—its capabilities and incapabilities, its place in society and the world—such as to prevent the self from taking itself for granted, which is equivalent to having a status of the self losing sight of itself. When the realities and processes of a community are taken for granted, the community members take these realities and processes as like natural and thus unchangeable social things. An epistemic community never takes anything for granted because if it does it loses its status as knowledge generating, deploying and managing community. Knowledge, of course, to be useful and effective must be reflexive, self-aware and monitoring of itself and the knowledge environment in which it works.

The Enabling Paradigm

I am taking a perspective that allows me to look at PUP as an outsider without having to abandon my insider point of view. This is not easy to do but I think fruitful in the sense that I will be able to see PUP

critically and rationally and not as a taken for granted reality in which I am caught up with, which in a crucial way could limit my reflexivity.

System-Lifeworld Internal Colonization

A community like PUP has two opposing but inextricably linked discursive realities or aspects. A community, of course, is discursive (filled with discourses, perspectives, even ideologies) in the sense that it is a humanly constructed and sustained reality through human interactions and communications. It is the set of communicative actions of its members in the everyday life of a community that sustains and develops this community; hence, a community is simply made up of communicative actions and the meanings that people attach to what they do. Communicative actions belong to discourses which groups in the community take up as their fundamental ways of looking at themselves and their worlds.

The Lifeworld

The quotidian aspects of human interactions, the close-up worlds of people constitute what I already described above as that aspect of the community which is taken for granted by its members—that which is not consistently critically discussed and interrogated by the members of community because of their familiarity and closeness. This is designated in Jurgen Habermas' System-Lifeworld Colonization Theory as the *Lifeworld*—the world usually taken for granted by community members and to which they are not critically related even if they actually live in it. The lifeworld consists of deeply embedded ideas and practices in the forms of traditions, customs and belief systems which guide people's behavior as they live their lives almost unconsciously, habituatedly, everyday. Even in a supposedly rational-scientific place like PUP, much of what takes place in the lifeworld lacks modern rationality as it is the tendency of lifeworlds to be conservative, traditional and customary. Hence, we find in the lifeworld the persistent phenomena of (political) patronage and the predominance of kinship ties in human social networks. In these places where the lifeworld is so powerful, feudal patron-client relationships and nepotistic arrangements prevail over supposedly rational-bureaucratic structures

characteristic of modern organizations and communities. Traditionalism and conservatism prevail in the lifeworld.

In PUP, the lifeworld has been the dominant structures of the lives of people, where patronage is a norm and nepotism a rule and rules are arbitrary and dependent on the authority that feeds on the same lifeworld structures. Power, thus, in the lifeworld that is PUP, prevails over reason, over rational, democratic reason. In this case, the discretion of power is arbitrarily deployed anywhere. Here, power rules instead of governs. This is the discourse of the lifeworld, its way of looking at and negotiating the world.

The obvious outcome of such pre-modern structures in the lifeworld is the absence or lack of critical-rational rules of interactions and decisions which should have been at the fundaments of community institutions. PUP, being a state university, is supposed to be supported by legal-rational structures (as rules) and bureaucracies of the state. There have been laws which are supposed to rationalize, modernize and democratize its operations like the Higher Education Modernization Act (RA 8292) but the persistence of practices and the resistance of the PUP lifeworld insulate PUP from such laws. The lifeworld, quite expectedly, resists and defends itself against intrusions by the state.

The System

The System in this conceptual scheme is that aspect of the community which despite being distinct and different from the lifeworld is coeval with and an outcome of lifeworld practices and discourses themselves. Lifeworld ideas and practices despite being taken for granted by most community members are not fixed and immutable; they do change over time albeit slowly and serendipitously. This work of changing the lifeworld, of elevating aspects of its discourses and practices into higher forms of rationality (such as from feudal-monarchical to liberal-democratic) and thus to challenge lifeworld rules is done by individuals and groups in the community who/which in the process of living within lifeworld rules have managed to develop critical thinking and the employment of

reason as bases of communicative actions and decisions. Usually these individuals have had the occasion to experience life in other communities or societies and who have been creative enough to subject their own community to critical thinking and rationality—a fruitful reflexive exercise of interrogating themselves and their own internal culture. This is like seeing the self through the lens of the other: Reflexivity.

The discourse of system inhabitants challenges the legitimacy of lifeworld interactions, processes and ultimately structures. The focal points of change are the deeply embedded traditional practices, ideas, values and norms in the social/community body. It can easily be seen here that those focal points of change are what constitute the social order in the community and hence are very difficult to actually change. Endowed with a progressive and new paradigm, the system embarks on a project of "colonization of the lifeworld." The system deploys various media of colonization to "steer" the lifeworld away from old but persistent traditional ideas and practices. Lifeworld resistance is thus expected although in the course of the colonization process, if this theory is correct, the higher rationality of the system in the long run will prevail. The most rational argument wins out in the end but only to bring the clash of rationalities to a higher plane.

The usual steering media which the system deploys to colonize the lifeworld are those that have to do with democratization and rationalization in the forms of communicative discourses (laws, rules, new norms). The crucial key is to make the lifeworld inhabitants assimilate the logic of reflexivity and critical-rational knowledge to open them up to system intrusions. In the course of the clash between the lifeworld and system, relationships and interactions are transformed and the community evolves into a higher and different entity. Lest it be misconstrued here that this paradigm justifies colonization in general it will be useful to add that the colonization of the lifeworld is internal in the sense that the system itself came from the lifeworld. If not for the already famous term "colonization" essayed by Habermas, I would have called it simply transformation of the lifeworld by the system.

My vision is to continue the internal colonization of the PUP lifeworld by its own self generated system which was started by Dr. Nemesio Prudente way back in the 70s and 80s and which has encountered major obstacles along the way.

A discursive warning against system colonization

Rationalization and systemization should not be taken as absolute good when they become dominant in societies and communities. When the system triumphs, there is the tendency to establish a world which is devoid of human intimacies, friendships, sentiments as an effect of the privileging of rationality, science and systems. The system, because of too much rationality, transforms into what Max Weber called an Iron Cage in which human beings become less of the kind of beings who care for others and long for intimacy, friendship, aesthetic pleasures, responsibility and commitment than the numbed, number-chasing, cold, calculating machines of late modernity. Although right now PUP needs professionalized rational structures, it must be assured that at the core of the vision to establish PUP as a reputable academic, intellectual and professional epistemic community is a reflexive adherence to critical humanism. The system could not be allowed to transform us into beings who are seen more as forms of capital (human capital, which is now less virulently called human resource) than as persons of complex human constitution. The triumph of the system is going to be a nightmare if we lose the human being in our processes and operations in PUP. There should thus be a dual privileging of establishing efficient, rational system processes in our lifeworld and maintaining the humanity in us. Human agency oriented but rational and scientific processes have to be established in PUP.

Finding and understanding the task of the university

Despite being one of the main institutions that has been driving us into a hyper-rationalizing Iron Cage, the university is paradoxically also the bearer of the antipode of this Cage's dehumanizing effects. On the one hand, it is of course in the university where science flourishes, where the iron clad logic of reason is pushed to its extreme and where technology as

practical reason is regarded as a new God, representing everything that is desirable, true, good and beautiful. The university as a stringently modern institution, indeed, was founded on and is sustained by scientific, rational discourse. It is its birthright and reason for being. On the other hand, the university likewise bears a discourse that reflexively inquires about the ethicality of reason and science as ideological regimes, i. e. as rationalism and scientism. Thus, aside from just inculcating the modernistic values of scientific and rational education, the university—by being aware of the consequences of modern educational systems—also bears the task of forming the human person of the human being by embedding humanist and aesthetic values at the core of scientific and rational disciplines.

This is the task of the discourses of the human sciences and the arts in the university system in particular and society in general. It must be made clear here, however, that despite the urgency of restoring humanistic/ aesthetic values at the fundaments of scientific, rational systems such as the university this task is neither purely anti-positivistic nor absolutely fanatical (such as to become an ideology) about the arts (aestheticism) and the human sciences (humanism) but reflexive of the fatal dangers of parallel ideological schisms that everywhere lurk in our social worlds. This sets not the goal but both the core principles and direction of the kind of transformation I will be instituting as the President of the Polytechnic University of the Philippines. Reflexively treading the tightrope between rationality and science on the one hand and the arts and humanities on the other is the challenged I am taking up for the university to pursue under my leadership.

Development Goals and Directions
Internal Colonization of the Lifeworld by the System

Lifting out embedded practices from the PUP community and re-embedding them as transformed critical-rational, reflexive, democratic and institutionalized rules requires assailing the prevalence of lifeworld discourses in PUP operations. This entails interrogating the legitimacy of old norms and formal rules which hinder progressive development. A

thorough critical analysis of the state of things in PUP is thus crucial and necessary. For this, I am endorsing a way through which the status of PUP can be properly known and evaluated: by using the humanistic principle of the participatory development approach. Equipped with a newfound reflexivity and critical rational knowledge, system agents can proceed with the internal colonization by guiding discussions on the ground, consulting lifeworld inhabitants and keeping an eye on their local knowledge to build consensus and trust. It must be noted that the colonizers themselves, the change agents, were once lifeworld inhabitants so it will not be difficult for them to facilitate participatory processes with their fellow community members.

Who are the colonizers?

PUP hosts a complex mix of individuals and groups of different persuasions. Right now, I am in the middle of a critical, intellectually capable and well-meaning group of leaders whom I have assembled as my colonizing team. Most of these leaders belong to the same age range as I do (35-45 years old). Most of us are organic to PUP—alumni who began serving PUP right after graduation.

The goals of colonization

1. <u>Democratize lifeworld processes</u> through the institution of transparency and the politics of difference and participation. The PUP publics should know what the leadership is doing, where it is heading and how this leadership is going to bring about positive changes. Crucially, the PUP publics must be involved—or at least their representatives—in the weaving of plans and their implementation. Differences should not be obstacles to development but rather should be strengths of the institution.
2. <u>Rationalize lifeworld realities</u> through the institutionalization of rules so that the rules are set apart and above individuals. This will also professionalize work and human relations in PUP for

efficiency and ultimately laying the foundations of collegiality among community members.

3. <u>Humanize the lifeworld</u> to counterbalance the rigors and rigidities of rationalization and democratization through weaving a sense of community of PUP publics, which despite their differences could draw up boundaries of a common identity, i.e. as PUPians, without dissolving group differences. Rituals of solidarity as PUP community have to be consistently performed to celebrate our identity and allow community members to imagine their own community and that they share the same meanings with others in the same community.

4. <u>Develop a strong social conscience among community members.</u> PUP is part of the larger scheme or structures of things, of communities such as the nation, the world and humanity in general. What is happening to a particular individual in the PUP community is linked with the society in which the individual is part of because we share the same social structures. We need to build a positive and strong civil society in PUP.

The main publics of PUP

Below is quick survey of the status of the different publics of PUP: the Faculty and Students. It also presents some insights on how to make things better after identifying some problems.

THE FACULTY

Since PUP became a polytechnic (from being a College of Commerce) the university has been literally and figuratively on a soul searching mode. President Prudente deliberately veered away from the traditional notions of a polytechnic by opening programs which a comprehensive university offers such as those which have to do with the arts and humanities like literature, philosophy, sociology and the hard sciences like engineering, physics, chemistry etc. Since then there has been a proliferation of academic programs and disciplines such that there is now an observed "too much

spread of programs and disciplines" and that PUP "is all over the place." This situation is reflected in the spread of disciplines in the faculty that bears heavily on disciplinal integrity. Very few faculty members have their own specific disciplines in which they not only teach but also do research. We are not cross dressers but certainly inasmuch as we are on a soul searching mode we have to admit we have an identity crisis. There is too much crossing of disciplines in the university in general and the colleges in particular, much more than what is necessary. Taking on various disciplines is good when it is done for good reasons. When it is done just for the convenience of earning a second degree at the next level, it is bound to hurt our core disciplines in the university. A psychology teacher (who presumably has a first degree in the discipline) who embarks on an MA in Mass Communication is betraying a core discipline in the CA. A doctorate degree in Public Administration later on will significantly sever this teacher from the research communities of psychology and relevant humanistic disciplines.

Very few from among the faculty have been teaching in disciplines in which they have done some reputable studies like a master's thesis or a conferred paper in a relevant discipline. Writing a Ph.D. thesis in the same discipline in which one is teaching, e.g. a psychology teacher who has written a Ph.D. thesis in Psychology is something almost unheard of in the College of Arts. There are even teachers who do not have a first degree in the discipline in which they teach. In the Department of Sociology and Anthropology (DSA), for instance, we do not have a first degree holder in anthropology. The number of teachers in the department with a first degree in sociology can be counted without using the fingers of the other hand. We have but one Ph.D. in sociology. To avoid a creeping suspicion that I am advocating here a strictly formalist criterion that requires formal degrees in specific disciplines as indicator of quality, it must be noted that it is not (only) the piece of paper where a degree is written that makes a faculty member deserving of the label "faculty" (meaning a mind that specializes in a legitimate academic discipline) but the amount of work, talent and discipline a faculty member has spent in doing research in the discipline, that is, in contributing to the current knowledge production of the discipline. It is more the research papers presented in scholarly

conferences than the formal academic degrees—although we can have both—that qualify teachers to become competent, legitimate and productive members of a certain faculty. It is a must therefore to encourage existing faculty members to do a higher second research degree (a thesis MA degree) in the same discipline where they are teaching. In higher second (MA) and third (Ph.D.) degree levels, the faculty members are initiated to and are sustained in their careers by their research interests (like ontology or ethics or logic in philosophy, social theory or ethnography or ethnomethodology in sociology, clinical or industrial psychology or human resource management in psychology, fiction or essay or literary criticism in literature, etc.) in their discipline.

It is the period in which they can produce new knowledge and begin to explore interdisciplinary research possibilities such as what sociologists do when they collaborate with philosophers, historians, political scientists, literary writers, statisticians, economists, linguists, engineers and even with specialists of the natural sciences. Interdisciplinary research is usually done at postgraduate level.

The objective I am trying to establish here is towards laying down the disciplinal infrastructure for each of the programs and core discipline by spurring the faculty to do a combination of formal graduate research and self or team initiated research projects for research conferencing and publication. Senior and well-established faculty will take up the task of mentoring the young and the up and coming faculty. A program must be laid out for this.

Faculty Recruitment and Evaluation:
towards a faculty with disciplinal integrity

A university is only as good as its faculty. Even the potentials of intelligent and talented students could be wasted by a mediocre teaching force. We have to assemble a high quality faculty that can do research and teach and inspire their colleagues as well as their students. The path towards establishing a competitive, professional, and productive faculty is paved by having a clearly laid out faculty recruitment policy. As has

been said elsewhere, as much as possible, we should accept applicants who are already embarking on a master's program in the same or closely related discipline as their first degree. Applicants must first meet a set of minimum standards before they are tested and screened. Minimum standards will be formulated by a standards committee of the college. The committee will be headed by the dean with the chairpersons and reputed faculty members as members. A faculty performance evaluation system will be institutionalized in the college with the corresponding system of positive and negative sanctions. The standards committee will have two subcommittees within it, one for research and another for instruction. Each department, depending on their proportionate numbers and available experts will have representations in this committee. The faculty will be consulted regarding the policies and decisions of the standards committee in a general faculty meeting to be held once in each semester or as called by the deans. College consultations facilitated by the deans will be held prior to a general faculty meeting.

**Faculty development through research, scholarship grants
and fellowships**

Young, talented and intelligent members of the faculty have to commit their time and effort to a career development program if they want their status and ranks to progress in the college. An earned higher second degree in a reputable university in anyone of the disciplines of the department they are teaching should be the minimum requirement for an award of tenure (permanency). While still doing the higher second degree a faculty member will be on a temporary status. A maximum of three to four years of being on a temporary status will be allotted for the candidate for tenure to finish a higher second degree. Extensions can be negotiated but not guaranteed. A program for young, talented and intelligent faculty members must be instituted to facilitate their career development.

In case faculty members do not have the time to do a higher second degree, they can have a tenured status if they can prove their worth in knowledge production in a research track professorship. Even without a master's degree, a faculty member can be tenured if s/he can produce at

least four relevant, legitimate and published/publishable papers in his/her discipline. Being a legitimate paper means having been presented and conferred in legitimate national or international professional research communities or published in a refereed national or international journal. For producing two legitimate, publishable papers (usually 6,000 words per paper), a part-time faculty member can be awarded a temporary status. Producing two more papers while seeking publication for earlier works must earn for the faculty a tenured (permanent) status. For research track professorship, promotion is determined by production, conferencing and publication.

THE STUDENTS

Quality of entrants

Improving the quality of student entrants in various colleges of the university entails having been able to prove that our programs are of highly competitive quality, socially important, and thus desired by a great number of students. The quality of our programs is measured up with other programs in the eyes of the public, the university administration, parents and ultimately the students. As much as we can, programs in PUP must be valued on par with coveted programs in other universities. Students flock to courses they think will improve their social standing and chances of getting employed. Changing our paradigm, our way of looking at ourselves through disciplinal integrity and research competence I am advocating will put PUP and its programs at the core of the country's academic system. This will enhance our status and image to our clienteles as well. When a lot of students covet a place in PUP not only because of the low tuition but due to the quality of education they will get, we are in a good position to choose from among so many applicants and thus will ensure the quality of minds the university is taking in.

We should not sacrifice quality for numbers. The number of students in each class must not exceed 45. If we cannot afford to create new sections we must cut the number of entrants to the university to maintain an acceptable level of instruction and progress monitoring. Most of our

rooms are only good for a maximum of 35 students. The university must have a sense of its carrying capacity physically and intellectually.

Student development

Progress of students in their programs must be monitored through an effective advisement system. Major courses must be taught with an eye to prepare students for thesis writing in their final year. A stratification system should be set in place to cluster students based on their performance and progress. This is to assure that no one among them is losing out in the level of learning that they are supposed to get. As much as possible we should not "kick" students out of our programs as doing so is a proof of our weakness in developing them. Our mandate is such that we have to work on the students that we have to prepare them for meaningful and productive social lives.

Students who want to pursue their other interests (aside from their interest in their program/discipline) such as campus politics, sports, literary and artistic pursuits, etc. should not be restrained from doing so unless such pursuits are getting in the way of their academic development. These students must be encouraged to maintain a good mix of their academic development and extra-academic pursuits. Students are entitled to enjoy their full term in the university.

Student participation in decision making processes

Students decide for themselves as they do in their everyday lives in their social worlds. However, decisions that have to do with their academic progress and performance have to be made for them more by their academic managers (the dean, chairpersons, and teachers) than by themselves alone. This should not mean or be taken as constraining their agency or ability to decide based on their interests. Students need guidance in the process of learning. The university must provide them this guidance following institutionally legitimated values and principles such as adherence to professionalism, participatory decision-making processes, and institutional integrity. As collective bodies, students will

have representation to proper decision making committees at ideally every level of operation. For instance, their selected representative will have a seat in the University Standards Committee. The leadership of the college must create venues of dialogues between the administration and students.

ACADEMIC MANAGEMENT

Production of instructional materials

Syllabi

Each faculty member must be tasked to produce his/her own syllabus for review by the department chair and a senior faculty member. This policy is against having a common syllabus. Such a practice builds a database of syllabi that the faculty members can use in updating the current one they are using. Having a common syllabus limits the range of faculty members in terms of what they can do in their class. Also, allowing them to annually produce their own syllabi is a good measure of their own progress within their disciplines. For instance, the department can keep tabs of the readings that the faculty members are prescribing and suggesting to their students. A new faculty member must be allowed to make his/her own syllabus as well. Review of existing syllabi must be done periodically by the colleges and department through the deans and chairpersons and senior faculty members.

Modules and textbooks

No faculty member will be allowed to use or sell a module that has not been reviewed and approved by the university and the college. It is the duty of the college to protect students from the bad practice of selling dubious and illegitimate modules. To regulate module use and production, the university must assign module writing projects to teams of faculty members. All outputs must pass the clearing house of the standards

committee and must be properly processed, edited, copyrighted before they reach the students. The same regulation also applies to production, prescription and use of textbooks.

On field trips, seminar-workshops, film showings, stage plays and related activities

A comprehensive review of the existing guidelines for the conduct of these activities must be done by the Executive Committee and to cascade to the colleges, administrative divisions downwards. As a rule, no such activities can be had without the proper approval of the student services director, dean and chairpersons. A fair and sound process must be established to regulate these activities.

Below is an enumeration of what must be done to change PUP:

1. **Academic Excellence**: faculty recruitment and development, competitive salaries, restructuring colleges, vertical articulation of academic degrees, undoing academic structures which breed mediocrity (inbreeding and non-thesis masters in the graduate school); reconfiguring books production and selling processes to stop corruption; chairs must be at least MA in the discipline, deans at least MA in a program and Ph.D. in a closely related discipline; institutionalization of the Academic Personnel Committee (APC) for faculty recruitment, change of status and promotion; institutionalization of faculty evaluation each year per college; stopping the rampant rackets (field trips, culminating activities, ticket selling, illegal collections etc.) of unscrupulous faculty victimizing the students; encouraging the faculty to do research in the discipline they are teaching for tenure and promotion; involve students in the decision making processes of the colleges and departments; as much as possible, nationally competitive standards must be followed in evaluations for promotion, tenure and designation;

2. **Devolution and Democratization of processes**: colleges must be given enough autonomy to plan for themselves; deans and chairs must be empowered to make and execute policies in their respective levels but must consult faculty members and students; there must be local autonomy and local democracy to make processes participatory and critical of power; the deans and chairs must participate in the formulation of the over-all direction vision of the president and creatively translate this to policies and programs in their own spheres of operation;

3. **Transparency in Rewards and Sanctions**: the faculty and employees should know which career opportunities they can aspire for; vacant positions should be published/posted; a fair system of evaluation will have to be established and institutionalized; violators, cheats, and other unscrupulous members of the community must be dealt with stringently but democratically; inasmuch as community members must know opportunities and rewards they also must know possible sanctions for offenses;

4. **Refurbishing classrooms and creation of spaces for students to decongest the main campus:** 65,000 students in 19 campuses, 45,000 in the main campus in Sta. Mesa alone—these are staggering numbers of people in not-so-large spaces. Fifty to sixty students are packed in small classrooms. Class size has to be standardized to a maximum of 45 students per class.

5. **Reconceptualization and Reinstitutionalization of the Student Council and Student Paper: (**The Catalyst—I was Editor of this paper way back 1989-90)**.** It is unimaginable that in this day and age, a state university like PUP does not have a recognized student council and student paper. These student institutions are the cornerstones of academic freedom in the university. These should be brought back to the center of student life in PUP.

6. **Lobby for a higher state subsidy while looking for opportunities to augment the budget through research and academic excellence:** The sustainability of programs depends on the resources which allow those programs to run and be effective. Aside from asking for a higher state subsidy, PUP must use what it currently possesses in terms of academic excellence to look for partnerships with other (private and public) institutions to augment its budget.

My networks in PUP, Ford Foundation, Philippine Social Science Council, Institute of Philippine Culture in Ateneo De Manila University, Commission on Higher Education Technical Committees and Panels, Philippine Association for the Sociology of Religion, International Association of Historians of Asia, British Alumni Association, British Sociological Association, International Sociological Association, Radboud University in Nijmegen, Gadjah Mada University will be of great advantage in realizing what I want to do as PUP president. I can tap the expertise of my associates in these organizations to supplement the talents we have in PUP. My experience in these research/academic organizations will greatly inform me in reviewing the organizational structures, processes and academic personnel in PUP. I will borrow institutional processes of these organizations to help me frame the changes I will be instituting in PUP.

To the distinguished members of the Search Committee for the Presidency and the Board of Regent of PUP I am humbly but proudly submitting for your evaluation my Vision, Mission and Development Goals and Direction for PUP as a candidate for the Presidency.