

TOWARDS GREATER ABSORPTIVE CAPACITY FOR UPLB

A Statement on the Large Class Size Project

WE, the members of the UPLB Management Committee, the Council of Deans, and the UPLB Committee on Large Class Size, do hereby manifest that the Large Class Size project is our administration's joint and collective effort to implement solutions to real problems and concerns that have plagued the University and to be true to the mandate of making UP education accessible to more of the country's promising high school students.

UPLB's Absorptive Capacity as a National University

- Pursuant to its status as a constituent unit of the National University, UPLB seeks to increase its capacity to provide quality education to more deserving Filipino youth.
- The quality education provided by UPLB cuts across 27 undergraduate and 82 graduate degree programs that are responsive to the country's needs and are sustained by its cadre of well-trained and seasoned faculty members with a strong research and extension culture and public service orientation.
- UPLB's current capacity is about 10,000 students at any given time. Each school year, UPLB absorbs about 2,000 students and produces an annual average of about 1,800 graduates (Please see Table 1).
- However, this capacity is still considered sub-optimal due to solvable limiting factors, such as the existence of "bottleneck courses".
- The number of UP Qualifiers who waitlist with UPLB, numbering about 1,000 each school year, reflects the potential demand that UPLB could still respond to.

The Challenge of Bottleneck Courses

- Bottleneck courses are courses where enrolment demand is not completely met or satisfied by the department/institute offering these thereby causing delays in the graduation of a student or changes in his/her plan of study/course work (Please see Table 2);
- Bottleneck courses exist because of a number of reasons, among which are as follows:
 - Lack of qualified faculty members who can teach the course
 - High mortality rates in a course
 - Lack of facilities, laboratory rooms and other equipment
 - Conflicts in scheduling of courses
 - Seasonal courses
 - Institution of new degree programs and non-degree student requiring a course

- Faculty members handling bottleneck courses are also adversely affected and most often, carry heavy teaching loads that prevent them from pursuing graduate degrees within the time allotted by the University (for Instructors); prevent faculty from undertaking research activities and publishing their results to obtain tenure or get promoted (Assistant Professor and up).
- Other impacts include high faculty turn-over rate, bottom-heavy faculty profile, limited reach of seasoned faculty among students, lack of mentoring opportunities for junior faculty by senior faculty members, etc.

Table 1. Enrolment and graduation profile of UPLB, 2005-2009

College	Year									
	2005		2006		2007		2008		2009	
	Enrollment	Graduate	Enrollment	Graduate	Enrollment	Graduate	Enrollment	Graduate	Enrollment	Graduate
CA	1202	264	1201	215	1219	186	1228	205	1212	217
CA-CAS	72	6	60	13	64	7	64	10	71	5
CAS	3384	606	3394	589	3313	573	3319	565	3381	570
CEM	925	211	899	196	883	192	876	169	875	169
CEAT	1700	213	1716	241	1738	227	1832	208	1940	234
CFNR	481	91	454	102	425	106	394	89	393	94
CHE	599	98	631	109	651	125	675	101	703	114
CVM	467	73	433	61	430	56	402	59	402	40
CDC	629	130	586	141	588	116	600	114	640	95
GS	869	212	812	182	854	184	902	168	1071	179
TOTAL	10328	1904	10186	1849	10165	1772	10292	1688	10688	1717

Table 2. Extension of Residency Profile, UPLB, 2005-2010

College	School Year and Number of Students				
	SY 05-06	SY 06-07	SY 07-08	SY 08-09	SY 09-10
CA	21	30	41	44	50
CAS	59	58	97	84	93
CDC	4	13	13	25	16
CEAT	10	13	18	21	21
CEM	7	1	14	21	21
CFNR	3	1	0	8	11
CHE	5	3	7	10	15
CVM	0	0	2	n.d.	n.d.
TOTAL	109	119	192	213	227

- Closer scrutiny by the UPLB administration of the problem in 2006 indicated that small class sizes were possibly compounding the problem for the bottleneck courses and adopting large class format could therefore possibly resolve the problem and increase UPLB's absorptive capacity.

We likewise manifest that for a period of three school years, i.e. SY 2007-2008, SY 2008-2009 and SY 2009-2010, our administration has worked with the various administrative offices, colleges and units and have undertaken necessary consultations to make the project succeed.

Responding to the Challenge

- UPLB and its different units adopted various strategies to address the problem of bottleneck courses. These include the following:
 - Increasing class sizes (e.g. 15-20 to 30-40)
 - Hiring additional qualified faculty members as lecturers
 - Requesting faculty members from other units to teach a course (affiliate faculty)
 - Coordination between units in the scheduling of their courses
 - Improvement of physical facilities (improvement and repairs, etc)
 - Use of large class size mode

The Large Class Size Mode Project

- The most wide-scale solution explored by the UPLB administration was the pilot testing of the Large Class Size mode in SY 2007-2008 and its expansion in SY 2008-2009 and SY 2009-2010.
- The large class size mode involved offering a 3-unit course with at least 120 students in any of the following formats:
 - 3-hour pure lecture
 - 2-hour lecture with a 3-hour laboratory
 - 2-hour lecture with 1-hour recitation
- To set the enabling environment, the UPLB administration provided the following core investments:
 - Repair and refurbishing (i.e. architectural and electrical repairs and installation of air-conditioning units) of nine (9) lecture halls;
 - Construction of a new lecture hall;
 - Procurement and installation of computers and audio-visual hardware and hiring of Computer and Audio-Visual Hardware Operators (CAVHOs) to assist in the use of the equipment and maintenance of the lecture halls;
 - Provision of funds for the development of new materials for large class size mode;
 - Provided funds for the conduct of seminars, trainings and workshops for faculty members who will teach large classes and encourage the conduct of regular large class conversations among participating faculty.
- The following units participated in the pilot-testing starting first semester SY 2007-2008:
 - IMSP, IBS, ICS, INSTAT and DHK of the College of Arts and Sciences, the College of Human Ecology, the Department of Economics of the College of Economics and Management, the College of Forestry and Natural Resources, and DEE of the College of Engineering and Agro-Industrial Technology.
- Beginning first semester of SY 2008-2009, other units also pilot-tested the use of large class mode in some of their bottleneck courses. These include:
 - DHUM of CAS for English10, DSS for PI 100 and SOSC 1 (SSP) and the College of Development Communication for DEVC 30, DEVC 40 and DEV 50.

We acknowledge and recognize that our efforts are bearing fruit and have brought UPLB to the threshold of grappling with bottleneck courses to accepting more students starting SY 2010-2011.

Lessons and Prospects

- The use of the large class size mode was by far the most effective and efficient way of eliminating bottleneck courses since most courses using this strategy have been removed from the list of bottleneck courses.
- Recognizing that it is the mandate of the University of the Philippines, being a National University, to provide quality education to as many students possible, the adoption of large lecture classes in the University of the Philippines Los Baños becomes imperative, as this allows the University to increase its absorptive capacity. Additional freshmen can be accepted into programs with national priority that have limited quota or programs that have been instituted lately.
- The test implementation which was started in June 2007 revealed that class size does not unilaterally affect the performance of students. In most mathematics courses, the passing rates increased compared to the student performance in the previous years. Hence large classes may be as effective a mode of teaching as small classes. A cursory perusal of the Student Evaluation of Teachers will reveal that the SET scores of teachers who participated in large class project did not vary from their previous scores. Some of them even obtained higher SET scores in large class mode.
- This scheme will expose our students to the best teaching practices of our most seasoned faculty members. A lot of students will be under the tutelage of our best teachers, those who have the breadth and depth of knowledge in their field. This is especially important in GE courses where the GE Framework mandates that only senior faculty members should handle these courses. In addition, lectures will be supplemented with state-of-the-art presentation techniques thus making the lectures interesting to a large number of students.
- With this scheme repetition of lectures, not only twice but maybe six times, will be minimized. Routine lectures and hence teacher burn-out will be avoided.
- Less number of lecture sections will be needed to achieve the required workload for the faculty. Thus, our senior and junior faculty will have more time to devote to other scholarly endeavors, such as research, creative work or graduate studies.
- The number of bottleneck courses will be reduced since the only limitation to the class size is the size of the lecture room. This will, in effect, address the delayed graduation of regular students who were not accommodated to sections with limited class size.
- Large class can be followed by break-up sessions.

- Finally, as there will be minimal number of lecture sections for each course, the use of the limited resources of the University (physical as well as personnel) will be optimized.

While we recognize that there are a number of faculty members who do not believe that the courses they are teaching can be taught in large class mode, we believe that their refusal to participate in the program should not be allowed to halt its progress and limit the attainment of UPLB's goal of increasing its absorptive capacity and bringing quality education to more Filipino youth.

- The primary opponents of the full implementation of the project are faculty members from the College of Arts and Sciences, particularly from the Department of Social Sciences and Humanities.

Table 3. Distribution of faculty who are against the large class*

Faculty Rank	CAS	CA	CEM	CPAF	CFNR
Instructor	20				
Assistant Professor	23	2	1	1	
Associate Professor	2		1	1	
Professor	2	3		1	1
Lecturer	1				
Non-Faculty		1			1
TOTAL	48	6	2	3	2
GRAND TOTAL	61				

**Based on letter of appeal of Dr. T. Mendoza and Dr. C. Rapera to Chancellor Velasco dated February 18, 2010, with signature sheets attached thereto.*

- CAS has the most number of degree programs, offers almost all the RGEP courses, has the greatest number of faculty members but with junior faculty comprising more than 80% (almost 50% are Instructors). It has the highest teaching overload and the highest faculty turn-over rate. It handles all the bottleneck courses. However, its major degree programs have the lowest student faculty ratio. (See Figures in following pages)

Teaching Overload Profile of UPLB Units from SY 2005-2006 to SY 2008-2009

College	TOTAL OVERLOAD UNITS							
	SY 2005-2006		SY 2006-2007		SY 2007-2008		SY 2008-2009	
	1ST SEM	2ND SEM	1ST SEM	2ND SEM	1ST SEM	2ND SEM	1ST SEM	2ND SEM
CA	12.53	10.00	1.50	5.83	1.91	-	1.51	-
CAS	793.55	696.12	644.74	518.27	494.90	508.73	577.33	577.94
CFNR	20.21	12.98	12.08	-	1.62	2.65	-	4.11
CEAT	13.67	27.38	3.06	3.68	2.75	1.92	6.19	9.37
CEM	18.47	28.82	7.82	26.14	8.50	20.35	2.48	9.75
CHE	137.59	59.74	121.68	61.18	61.11	44.58	17.76	66.24
CPAF	-	-	2.25	6.77	-	-	-	-
CVM	2.31	9.86	1.25	12.53	0.97	20.00	0.64	19.94
CDC	5.09	2.71	2.62	1.40	8.55	5.73	-	-
SESAM	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	1,003.42	847.61	797.00	635.80	580.31	603.96	605.91	687.35

CA	BS Agriculture	Courses Proposed for Large Class Size Format (AY 2010-2011)					
	BS Food Technology	RGEF Courses		Foundation Courses			
	BS Agricultural Chemistry						
CAS	BA Communication Arts	SSP	MST	AH	GE	Major	
	BA Philosophy					AEC 1	
	BA Sociology					AGRI 11	
	BS Applied Mathematics					AGRI 111	
	BS Applied Physics					AGRI 199	
	BS Biology					ANSC 1	
	BS Chemistry					ANSC 2	
	BS Computer Science					CRPT 1	
	BS Mathematics					CRSC 1	
	BS Mathematics and Science Teaching					CRSC 2	
	BS Statistics					FST 11	
CDC	BS Development Communication						
CEM	BS Agribusiness Management					BIO 150	
	BS Agricultural Economics					BIO 30	
	BS Economics					BIO 70	
CEAT	BS Agricultural Engineering					BOT 1	
	BS Chemical Engineering					BOT 3	
	BS Civil Engineering					MCB 1	
	BS Electrical Engineering					ZOO 1	
	BS Industrial Engineering					CHEM 15	
CFNR	BS Forestry					CHEM 16	
CHE	BS Human Ecology					CMSC 11	
	BS Nutrition					CMSC 124	
CVM	Doctor of Veterinary Medicine					CMSC 127	
CA-CAS	BS Agricultural Chemistry					CMSC 131	
						CMSC 137	
						CMSC 141	
						CMSC 2	
						MATH 26	
						MATH 27	
						MATH 28	
						MATH 36	
						MATH 37	
						MATH 38	
						PHYS 3	
						PHYS 13	
						PHYS 81	
						PHYS 82	
						PHYS 83	
						DEVC 10	
						DEVC 20	
						DEVC 40	
						DEVC 50	
						ECON 101	
						ECON 102	
						ECON 11	
						MGT 101	
						ENSC 1	
						ENSC 18	
						ENSC 90	
						EE 1	
						NASC10	
						NASC6	
						NASC7	

Table . Student to Faculty Ratio and Faculty Distribution (as of 31 Dec 2008)

College	No of UG Degree Programs*	No. of faculty	No. of Undergrad Students**	Student to Faculty Ratio	Distribution of Faculty (%)					Average Annual Turn-Over (2005-2009)	
					Instructor	Assistant Professor (aP)	Associate Professor (AP)	Professor (P)	Research Faculty	Accession	Separation
CAS	11	397	3669	9.24	49	38	8	5	0	57.8	48.4
CA	3	112	1143	10.21	7	31	15	35	12	3.0	7.0
CEAT	5	81	1739	21.47	51	31	12	6	0	12.2	12.0
CFNR	1	56	356	6.36	7	45	32	14	2	3.2	2.0
CEM	3	54	845	15.65	11	52	22	15	0	3.2	3.2
CVM	1	35	395	11.29	0	57	11	32	0	2.4	3.2
CHE	2	32	677	21.16	28	56	13	3	0	3.0	2.6
CDC	1	26	589	22.65	38	46	12	4	0	15.0	11.0
CPAf	0	20	0	0.00	0	40	40	20	0	1.0	2.8
SESAM	0	4	0	0.00	0	0	50	50	0	1.0	0.0
Total	27	817	9413								

*Includes one Joint Program (CA-CAS)

**Includes UPRHS Students for CAS (493), CertFor for CF (61) and PreVet for CVM (139)

- The adoption of and willingness to adopt the Large Class Size mode by other Departments of CAS has already addressed much of the bottleneck course problems in the University and is addressing many of its associated issues.

- Likewise, it shall hamper the resolution of other problems associated with overloaded faculty members such as failure to obtain a Master's Degree on time for Instructors, and undertaking research and producing publications for Junior and Senior faculty, among others.

With its attendant benefits, positive gains and potentials for increasing UPLB's absorptive capacity and improving the welfare of our faculty members, while maintaining UPLB's high academic standards, WE, do hereby collectively agree to pursue the full scale adoption of the large class size mode for the offering of RGEP, FOUNDATION COURSES and OTHER POTENTIAL BOTTLENECK COURSES at UPLB starting SY 2010-2011, in accordance to the attached guidelines.

The UPLB Council of Deans

Dr. Domingo E. Angeles
 Dr. Asuncion K. Raymundo
 Dr. Cleofe S. Torres
 Dr. Flordeliza A. Lantican
 Dr. Arsenio N. Resurreccion
 Dr. Rex Victor O. Cruz
 Dr. Sue Liza C. Saguiguit
 Dr. Agnes C. Rola
 Dr. Conrado A. Valdez
 Dr. Oscar B. Zamora
 Dr. Maria Victoria O. Espaldon

mfe
Asuncion K. Raymundo
re the e. raymundo
Flordeliza A. Lantican
Dr. Arsenio N. Resurreccion
Rex Victor O. Cruz
Sue Liza C. Saguiguit
Agnes C. Rola
Conrado A. Valdez
Oscar B. Zamora
Maria Victoria O. Espaldon
 ON TRIP

The UPLB Management Committee

Dr. Luis Rey I. Velasco
 Dr. Rita P. Laude
 Dr. Enrico P. Supangco
 Dr. Roberto F. Rañola, Jr.
 Dr. Ruben D. Tanqueco
 Dr. Virginia R. Cardenas
 Dr. Cecilio R. Arboleda
 Dr. Florinia E. Merca
 Dr. Myrna G. Carandang
 Dr. Vivian A. Gonzales
 Dr. Emmanuel R.G. Abraham
 Prof. Ma. Stella C. Tirol
 Dr. Fernando C. Sanchez, Jr.
 Dr. Elpidio M. Agbisit, Jr.

mfe
re the e. raymundo
Flordeliza A. Lantican
Dr. Arsenio N. Resurreccion
Rex Victor O. Cruz
Sue Liza C. Saguiguit
Agnes C. Rola
Conrado A. Valdez
Oscar B. Zamora
Maria Victoria O. Espaldon
ON TRIP

Prof. Faustino Q. Arrienda II
Prof. Moises A. Dorado
Dr. Grace D. De Ocampo

The Large Class Management Committee

Dr. Rita P. Laude
Dr. Grace D. De Ocampo
Dr. Myrna G. Carandang
Prof. Rolando G. Panopio
Prof. Lynie B. Dimasuay
Prof. Genaro A. Cuaresma
Prof. Dulcinea R. Laforteza

Member, UPLB Management
Committee
Member, UPLB Management
Committee
Member, UPLB Management
Committee

Signed this 23rd Day of February 2010 at UP Los Baños, College, Laguna

Guidelines for the Adoption of Large Lecture Classes at UPLB

Class Size

The lecture sizes for courses without laboratory shall range from 120 to 160 depending on the demand for the courses and the available lecture rooms. These lecture sections may be broken down to several recitation groups with sizes ranging from 25-40. On the other hand, the lecture size for those courses with laboratory shall be increased to meet the said range. Courses with lower number of enrollees shall not be divided into smaller sections.

Course Structure

Three unit courses with large enrolment can opt to choose from the following modes:

- 2 unit lecture with 1 unit recitation (2 hours a week lecture and one hour a week recitation)
This mode is for courses with minimum student-teacher interaction required.
- 1 unit lecture and 2 unit recitation (1 hour a week lecture and 2 hours a week recitation)
This mode is for courses that require lots of small group discussions and interactions with minimal lecture topics to discuss.
- 1.5 unit lecture and 1.5 unit recitation (1 1/2 hours a week lecture and 1 1/2 hours a week recitation)
This mode is for courses that require less lecture time but need more time for activities that may take 1 1/2 hours to finish.
- 3 unit lecture (3 hours a week lecture and no recitation)
This mode is for courses that are designed primarily for appreciation or do not require a recitation component.

A Unit has the option to propose another mode or a variation of a mode that suits their courses. To effect spontaneous interaction between students and lecturer, students shall be allowed to ask questions during the lecture. A portion of the lecture time may be allotted to an open forum for this purpose. Also, other technologies, such as cell phone, electronic discussion group, etc. may be used to promote interaction.

The lecture component

The lecture may be utilized to:

- introduce a new topic

Lectures can be used to establish a mind-set or readiness, or to give a bird's eye view of the lesson in order to motivate the students. Also, the

lecture can be used to give directions for the expected tasks ahead and show their relation to the past work and experience.

- supplement the textbook or readings of the students
Lectures can be used to give additional information not found in the learning materials given to the students. These can also be used to explain points or to correct misconceptions that the students may have developed while reading the textbook. Additional explanation and supplementation of the materials or facts may be given during the lectures to enlarge the student's point of view. These give the so-called "personal touch" to what is being studied.
- organize and summarize past lessons to produce coherence and wholeness
- give illustrative talks to arouse interest and help build favorable attitudes and appreciation of the students
Talks can be made after film showings or other activities in order to synthesize or analyze what had been presented. Resource persons may also be invited to give talks. Prominent guests can add motivation to students and enhance their learning of the lesson. However, prior approval shall be secured from authorities in case outsiders are to be invited.

Lectures shall be carefully planned and designed to consider state-of-the-art educational technologies and delivery strategies. In addition, the lectures shall be supplemented with learning materials suited for self-instruction in case no textbook is prescribed for use in the course.

Only faculty members with rank of assistant professor or higher may be assigned as lecturers. For GE courses, the qualities of the ideal GE faculty as mandated in the GE Framework should be seriously considered in assigning lecturers.

Lecturers shall organize the course content and delivery strategies together with the recitation instructors assigned to a particular lecture section. Lecturers shall also coordinate the activities of the recitation sections under their lecture sections. Lecturer and recitation instructors shall decide upon the content of the final examination and other requirements of the course.

Lecturers may encourage recitation instructors to attend lectures and meetings to ensure that there is articulation between lecture and recitation.

Lecturers may request for lecture assistants who may be chosen from among the faculty members of the Department/Institute. A lecturer may have more than one lecture assistant if the lecture class requires the conduct of activities such as computational exercises, guided writing sessions, and skills building exercises. The request for the provision of a lecture assistant(s) should include a justification.

The Recitation/Discussion Session component:

The recitation sessions can be used for:

- Skills-building exercises
- Group discussions
- Testing
- Perspective building and error recovery
- Group or individual reports
- Problem solving
- Hands-on exercises

Recitation sections may be assigned to instructors. The 12 unit minimum workload per semester, an instructor shall not be assigned more than 6 units of recitation. This translates to a 4 recitation classes of 1.5 hours each or 6 recitation classes of 1 hour each. If needed, senior faculty members may also be assigned recitation sections.

Recitation instructors shall take care of keeping student records. Both lecture and recitation teachers shall compute and submit final grades of students.

Credit Loading for the Faculty

The current policies for computing load credit for large classes and GE courses shall be adopted. The formula as approved by the UP Board of Regents for credit load with multipliers is as follows:

- For large non-GE 3 unit courses: $(\frac{N - 40}{120} + 1) \times 3$
- For large GE courses: $(\frac{N - 40}{120} + 1) \times 3.99$

where N is the number of enrollees and provided that credit load is not more than twice the course credit, whenever large class multipliers are applied. Moreover, GE multipliers (1.3 for every unit) shall only be applied for the computation of overload honorarium purposes and not to satisfy the minimum teaching load. (Excerpts from 1048th BOR meeting, March 26, 1992, OP Memo No. 40, July 21, 1992, 1091st BOR meeting, Oct. 24, 1995)

One unit-teaching load shall be given to recitation instructors in case recitation section meets once a week. For two hours a week recitation sections, 2 units shall be given to the recitation instructors and 1.5 units shall be credited for recitation that meet 1.5 hours per week. In addition, faculty members who are tasked to assist lecturers of large classes shall be given a teaching load of 0.5 per course. The duties and responsibilities of lecture assistants shall be defined at the outset.

Sample computations of teaching load can be seen below:

For Small Class (30-40 students)

- GE Course
4 lecture sections x 3 units/section = 12 units x 1.33* = 15.96 units

(*GE Multiplier applied if the teaching load is greater than or equal to 12 units)

- Non-GE Course
4 lecture sections x 3 units/section = 12 units

For Large Class (120-160 students)

- GE Course (3-unit lecture with 120 students)
$$\left(\frac{N-40}{120} + 1\right) \times 3 = 5.0 \text{ units per lecture section}$$

To satisfy a 12 unit teaching load, a faculty member should handle 2 lecture sections with 120 students plus 2 units additional teaching assignment.

- GE Course (3-unit with 160 students)
$$\left(\frac{N-40}{120} + 1\right) \times 3 = 6.0 \text{ units per lecture section}$$

To satisfy a 12-unit load, a faculty member should handle 2 lecture sections with 160 students.

Using the above computations, the teaching load credits for various modes are tabulated below:

Course credit	GE or Non-GE	Mode	Lecture/Rec Size	TLC for Lecturer	TLC for Rec
3	Non-GE	3 L	160	$3 \times 2 = 6$	0
3	GE	3 L	160	$3.99 \times 2 = 7.98$	0
3	Non-GE	2 L, 1 R	160/25-40	$2 \times 2 = 4$	1
3	GE	2 L, 1 R	160/25-40	$2.66 \times 2 = 5.32$	1.3
3	Non-GE	1L, 2R	160/25-40	$1 \times 2 = 2$	2
3	GE	1L, 2R	160/25-40	$1.3 \times 2 = 1.3$	$2 \times 1.3 = 2.6$
3	Non-GE	1.5L, 1.5R	160/25-40	$1.5 \times 2 = 3$	1.5
3	GE	1.5L, 1.5R	160/25-40	$1.5 \times 1.3 \times 2 = 3.9$	$1.5 \times 1.3 = 1.95$
2	Non-GE	2L	160	$2 \times 2 = 4$	0
5	Non-GE	3L, 2R	160/25-40	$3 \times 2 = 6$	

TLC: Teaching Load Credit

L: Lecture

R or Rec: Recitation

The comparison of the small and large class courses in terms of number of sections and contact hours to satisfy the required minimum workload is shown below:

SMALL CLASS (30-40 Students)						LARGE CLASS (120-160 students)				
Faculty workload	No. of Sections	Unit/section	Total Contact Hours	Total Teaching Load		Course Type	No. of Sections	Unit/section	Total Contact Hours	Total teaching Load with LCM* (GE or Non-GE)
				Non-GE	GE					
Teaching only (no extension/ research/creative work/ study load)	4	3	12	12	15.96	1.5 lect 1.5 recit	4 lect	1.5	6	10-12
						1.5 lect 1.5 recit	4 recit	1.5	6	12
						(3 lect small class)	(2 lect)	(3)	(6)	
						2.0 lect 1.0 recit	3 lect	2.0	6	10-12
						2.0 lect 1.0 recit	6 recit	1.0	6	12
Teaching and 3-unit study load	3	3	9	9		1.5 lect 1.5 recit	4 recit	1.5	6	9
						(3 lect small class)	(1 lect)	(3)	(3)	
						2.0 lect 1.0 recit	6 recit	1.0	6	9
Teaching Load and 6 units of extension and/or research or creative work	2	3	6	6		1.5 lect 1.5 recit	2 lect or 4 recit	1.5 1.5	3 6	3 6

Faculty Development

It cannot be denied that the teacher of large classes and the recitation instructors play vital roles in ensuring the success of the large class schemes. Thus, it is imperative for the Administration to provide intensive trainings for the faculty which shall include classroom management strategies, development of multimedia lessons, content delivery strategies, assessment strategies and record-keeping techniques among others.

Resources

The Administration shall ensure that all necessary resources for teaching large classes are available. Lecture Halls identified for holding large classes shall be refurbished and provided with the required enabling environments. To ensure that large classes will be given priority in scheduling, the Office of the University Registrar shall prepare schedule of classes for the identified lecture halls in coordination with the respective Unit Heads. The maximal use of these lecture halls shall be a major consideration in scheduling classes. Moreover, provisions shall also be given for the repair and maintenance of rooms for lecture halls for the large and regular size classes.

Moreover, an incentive of PhP 20,000 per course shall be given as grant for developing lecture materials and course syllabus indicating course parameters, course objectives, course outline with activities per week, and references or reading list. The grant, which shall be requested from the Office of the Chancellor, shall be used for development activities such as workshop and training and for supplies needed for the initial offering of the course in large class mode.

In addition, the UPLB Centennial Faculty Grants may be given to a team of faculty members (with proven teaching competence) who can develop interactive/self-instructional learning materials which could supplement the lecture or recitation. The materials shall be peer-evaluated and shall be required to be used in the course.

Administrative Aspects of the Scheme

To effect the efficient management of the large classes in the University, there shall be a management committee for large classes whose main task is to oversee the implementation of the scheme. In particular, this Committee shall have the following functions:

- Promote the development of pedagogy and didactics for large classes
- Sponsorship of Large Class Conversations for Teachers
- Preparation of plans and programs, including budgetary requirements, that will lead to full institutionalization of the project, under the direction of the UPLB Management Committee and the Council of Deans
- Assessment and evaluation of the large class scheme
- Oversee the efficient and sustainable management of the large-class lecture halls in close coordination with the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Administration and the Deans of the respective colleges where the lecture halls are situated
- Oversee the optimal scheduling of classes and allocation of lecture halls in close coordination with the Office of the University Registrar, the Deans, Directors and Unit Heads offering courses in large class mode;
- Oversee the management and maintenance of the refurbished lecture halls, including the development of additional large lecture halls, in close coordination with the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Administration and the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Planning and Development;

-
- Formulation and recommendation to the Chancellor, of detailed policies and guidelines governing the use and allocation of large class facilities, in close coordination with the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Administration, College Deans, Unit Heads and Building Administrators.

Final Caveat

This set of guidelines shall serve as an initial set only and should not be considered as “carved in stone”. It is understood that as the implementation of the large class scheme goes full blown, some modifications or ramifications are expected. However, as a matter of policy, all deviations from this set of guidelines shall be reported to the Management Committee and will be subject to the approval of the Chancellor.