

Documents Section

**Introduction to the Report of the
Management Review Committee**

The University of the Philippines, first established in Manila in 1908, has grown over the past 30 years into a multicampus System now comprising three autonomous universities, four regional colleges, and two extension units outside its main campus in Diliman and Manila. Although begun before the war, much of this expansion has taken place only during the past decade, and has accentuated a number of problems and issues about the University's policies, resources, and management capabilities for responding to the nation's needs and demands for its services.

Review Organization and Methods

The Management Review Committee was constituted by President Edgardo J. Angara to examine and submit recommendations on questions relating to the organization and management of the University's academic programs, administrative functions, and support or auxiliary services. Together with its Technical Staff, the Committee divided itself into four subcommittees to investigate four areas of concern:

1. The University's legal framework, Central Administration, central-local relations, and management of academic programs and support services;
2. Planning, financing, budgeting, fiscal control, and auxiliary enterprises;
3. Personnel, supply, and records management, and maintenance of physical facilities; and
4. Health, housing, police, and other community services.

Individual assignments were undertaken to review pertinent documents, conduct interviews, and prepare reports on specific topics. A questionnaire survey was made of Central Administration offices. The Committee or its members also held meetings with individuals and groups knowledgeable or concerned about certain questions. Seminars were co-sponsored with the Management Education Council on central-local relations and program management, the UP Graduate School issue, the regional colleges, and on the relations of research and extension centers with degree-granting units. The Committee likewise consulted the reports and members of other *ad hoc* bodies assigned by President Angara to review specific management problems.

A management audit of selected academic units was intended but was not pursued on a detailed basis by the Committee. It was felt that the seminars, consultations, and review of previous studies had served the purposes of the audit. In any case, the Committee has had to be selective due to time and resource constraints. Thus, at operating unit levels, it went only so far as inter-rather than intra-unit relationships. On the other hand, while it devoted most of its attention to management problems, it also considered major policy issues whenever their resolution seemed necessary to provide a basis for management improvement.

The Committee and its Technical Staff worked so closely together as to blur the formal distinction between them. They met at least once a week to discuss the progress and results of the review, and devoted one session to a joint discussion with the Committee to Review Academic Programs (CRAP). Following agreed terms of reference and outlines, the MRC discussed individual reports and recommendations as they became available. These reports are annexed to this document and are occasionally referred to below for more detailed information or recommendations.

This report begins with a brief historical overview of the growth of the University System and subsequently presents the findings and recommendations of the Committee on specific areas of policy, organization, and management processes. The findings and recommendations are grouped into four major parts. Part I includes proposals for implementation in 1982, as well as longer-term recommendations.

The Growth of the System

The problems and issues addressed in this report may be better understood in the light of the growth, present scale, and basic structure of the University System and subsequently presents the findings and recommendations of the Committee on specific areas of policy, organization, and management pattern afterwards, as may be gleaned from accounts by Dr. Oscar M. Alfonso and others.

Before the war, the University organized branches in Los Baños (1909), Cebu (1918) and Vigan (1921). (The latter transferred to Baguio in 1938). But national government authorities discouraged any further expansion in the immediate future. The operation of Cebu and Baguio was interrupted during the war years and up to the early 1960s, while three new branches were opened elsewhere (UP College Iloilo, 1947, UP Extension Division at Clark Air Base, 1953 [converted to a College, 1978], and UP "unit" in Tarlac, 1964). The Tarlac unit occasioned a policy declaration by the Board of Regents to extend UP's services to other regions, but it was a rather restrictive commitment. Tarlac was closed in 1974 for failure to comply with one of the Board's requirements for establishing and maintaining branches.

By the early 1970s, the University had inaugurated a more expansive but still cautious policy. In 1972, by virtue of Presidential Decree 58,

"autonomy" was granted to UP at Los Baños (UPLB) and the Board of Regents was authorized to establish UP as a "System" (effective 1973) and to create other autonomous universities. University authorities felt at this time that it could best concentrate its development efforts in Diliman, Manila, and Los Baños, but left the door open for new regional units. In 1973, UP College Tacloban was opened in Eastern Visayas, and in 1974, President S.P. Lopez raised the prospects of regional units eventually becoming autonomous universities and advocated the opening of a branch in Davao, Mindanao. UP Extension Division Davao was created in 1977 but was absorbed in 1979 by the new state University of Southeastern Philippines. In 1977, the Board created the Health Sciences Center in Manila and UP Visayas in Iloilo as autonomous universities. In 1979, UP College Clark's Extension Program in San Fernando, Pampanga was organized.

Problems and Solutions: A Preview

Alongside its geographic expansion, the University has also grown in terms of the number and sizes of the constituent units on the different campuses. This is true particularly of the research and training centers or institutes, which have been set up as part of, and often enough apart from, existing degree-granting colleges, schools, and departments which otherwise work in allied fields. While some of the newer campuses have begun with or acquired substantial resources and student patronage, other campuses (including the older regional colleges) are still beginning or struggling to attain scale in terms of funds, physical and institutional development.

In any event, the expansion of the University during the last decade has strained its resources and exacerbated problems concomitant with growth. Despite efforts to clear them up, there remain ambiguities in the University's policy toward further expansion and the sustenance of its outlying branches. Moreover, the scale that it has been able to attain has been attended by considerable complications, imbalances, and deficiencies in its institutional administrative, and legal framework. The "System" has been poorly defined, resulting in confusion in the structure of authority and misallocation of functions and programs. Important roles and functions that should be centrally performed, such as those of resource-generation, program coordination, and management improvement, are inadequately articulated or discharged. On the other hand, the Central Administration directly administers services that may well be decentralized. Apparently, there has also been an accumulation of bureaucratic overgrowth out of proportion to the operating units and academic manpower.

In these circumstances, it is difficult to develop and govern the System in a rational manner and to administer its day-to-day affairs efficiently. In order to do this, the University should have:

1. A clearer vision of the scope of its response to the nation's needs for its services;

2. Better-defined roles for the leadership of the System and of its different campuses;
3. A modicum of order in its basic institutional, legal, and organizational framework;
4. Enhanced capacities for planning, resource-generation, and efficient use of resources; and
5. Improved abilities to coordinate its academic programs, solve management problems, and administer support services.

To achieve these objectives, we find a need for and recommend a series of short- and long-term measures, some calling for clarification of University policies, others requiring changes in its legal and organizational foundations, and still others prescribing new management functions and improvements in administrative techniques, procedures, and services.