

Proceedings of the CHED Zonal Assembly August 29, 2008 CSB Hotel

The De La Salle University-Manila CHED-Zonal Research Center-NCR 1 spearheaded the CHED Zonal Assembly with the theme, "Enhancing Research Culture through Cooperation". The event was held last August 29, 2008 at the Banquet Halls of Asia and Africa of the CSB Hotel International Conference Center.

First Part

The program's emcee, Ms. Francejune Bitanga, a faculty member of the University of Makati and DLSU-Manila started the ceremony at nine-eighteen in the morning. Prior to that, registration commenced at eight o'clock. The Arellano Law Singers led the singing of the Philippine National Anthem followed by the Invocation.



Arellano Law Singers led the singing of National Anthem followed by the invocation

Opening Remarks

Dr. Wyona Patalinghug, Vice Chancellor for Research of De La Salle University gave the opening remarks. She mentioned about the survey that was conducted during the time that Father Dizon was still the President of the De La Salle System while she was the Vice-President for Academics. It was the survey held by Asia-Week Magazine before it shot down which identified the Top Universities in Asia. In the said survey, Dr. Patalinghug noted that four Philippine Universities entered the Top 50 list, namely; UP at rank 48, DLSU garnered the 71st spot, ADMU at 72nd place and UST was listed 74th. She stated that she was very much jubilant that La Salle inched out

Ateneo by one notch so she went to Father Roly to relish the so-called "achievement". However, the latter responded by saying that there is nothing much to be happy about for we should be worried that only four universities in the Philippines entered the list and that it was not the 1st, 2nd, 3rd or 4th in the country that mattered, it was the collective because it was the overall picture from the outside view point. With that comment, her perspectives changed and she went on by saying that CHED's role is very important in upgrading, benchmarking and monitoring standards in providing an environment for collective and collaborative research efforts which guards against setting up barriers both from within and without the institution. A new order of research which challenged the traditional wherein research was no more bounded by disciplines but with universal and persistent problems hence, was proposed. Such an order would address social problems which higher educational institutions suffer.



Dr. Wyona Patalinghug, Vice Chancellor for Research as she gave her opening remarks

Inspirational Address

The inspirational address was given by Fr. Rolando Dizon, the former chairperson of CHED and former President of the DLSU System. He started off by welcoming the appointment of Dr. Manny Angeles as the new Chairman of CHED, adding that the latter would do well in revitalizing CHED. According to him, it was in 2003 when the so-called "Republica" Awards were invented. Research and Publication that aimed to promote a stronger research culture among Higher Educational Institutions had been the core basis of these surveys and the academe must continue to deepen such. He

suggested the creation of a new category under the “Republica” Awards which was the Best Cooperative Research to be able to encourage more research-related initiatives.



Fr. Rolando Dizon, FSC, former Chairperson of CHED and DLSU System gave his inspirational talk

Fr. Dizon added that in a developing country like the Philippines, there was much need for developmental research- a research that would help the country in solving serious problems in terms of where we were in connection with morality, governance, corruption and massive poverty. Researches should contribute more to the development of ethics, corporate responsibility, better governance or even regarding the move to federalism. He said that there should be better research regarding the agricultural economy of the country because it was a pity to be not self-sufficient in rice.

There should be research geared in crafting a master socio-economic development plan that could wipe out poverty by the year 2020-2024. He further stated that there was a need to find ways to maximize OFW contributions and help solve their problems.

Moreover, he made mention of Gawad Kalinga which he considered the Pinoy Economic Miracle as it represented the best chance to fighting and ending poverty. Hence, there was a need to initiate research that would help discover ways on how to accelerate the production of 5millions homes by the year 2024.

Lastly, he noted that through research, ways to tap the private sector, the corporate and business industries were potential areas of inquiry. He added that this sector had research funds that were still to be touched and would be very helpful in the development not only of research but of the country as well. He ended by saying that he had been fighting cancer and that he would be declared as cured in 10 months, he had the rare opportunity last year to serve as a missionary in Bethlehem which made him a little bit more holy and humbler, he taught part time and was still working on his advocacies regarding good citizenship values and addressing poverty.

ZRC Accomplishments and ZRP for 2008-2011

Dr. Madelene Sta. Maria, Director of the DLSU-CHED ZRC NCR1 came next and talked about the ZRC Accomplishments and the ZRP 2008-2011. She began her talk by thanking the people who made possible the achievement of the zone and recognizing the 33 representatives in attendance out of 62 universities.

She continued by stating the ZRC Mandate which included database of research and researchers, research expertise building, research projects and research utilization. The ZRC was operating on themes such as the State of Higher Educational Institutions, A-I linkages, Business and Society, and Urbanization. She added that the Zonal Research Program of 2004-2007 focused on improving the research capability of many HEIs within the zone through an

immersion process. She also made a narration of the developments and achievements of the zone under each mandate.



Dr. Madelene Sta. Maria, Director, DLSU CHED-ZRC presents the accomplishment of the ZRC for the past 3 years and the plans for the next 3 years

Dr. Sta. Maria further stated that the challenge that the Zone of the ZRP 2008-2011 was to have at least 1 collaborative GIA project for each thrust every year and at least 5 HEIs involved in each project. In terms of Research Capability Building and Networking, there was a need to partner with and assist RCs. This would only be realized through trainings and apprenticeship on Research and Research Management, Research Utilization and Advocacy, and Research Practice Database. Dr. Sta. Maria concluded her talk by stating the themes that the participants had to brainstorm about in the workshop which included *Research Capability Needs and*

Concerns, Issues and Concerns on University Research Policies, How to Improve and Facilitate Work on the RMIS, and Trainings on Research and Research Management.

Open Forum

An open forum took place at 10:05am which enabled the participants to raise questions, suggestion and comments. Richard, from St. Scholastica College was the first one who approached the microphone and asked if the CHED Zonal Center would have its own publication or journal where in all the results or outputs of the GIA projects would be presented. Also, he asked what kind of logistical help can the CHED ZRC give to make possible the publishing of such outputs even by the HEIs themselves. Dr. Sta. Maria answered that the ZRC can help by means of conducting training workshops in manuscript and journal writing so that universities would be able to explore their audience and would be able to publish their outputs on their own.

Also in the open forum, Dr. Ching, again of St. Scholastica, expressed her appreciation on behalf of her team for experiencing the capacity building competency that the ZRC initiated because they were able to attain the Zone's objective and they were able to produce and come up with their own research. Lastly, Dr. Chikang from the Lyceum of the Philippines University conveyed her group's confusion as to who would publish the results for they were having financial difficulties on accomplishing the said task and were asking to be refereed. Dr. Sta. Maria answered by saying that there really was a need to conduct the writing workshop and that ways on how the funding would be addressed and worked on.

Workshop Orientation

After the forum, Dr. Sta. Maria went on to state the questions that needed to be answered in the work groups. Under the first theme which was *Research Capabilities and Concerns*, (1) "What are the problems/concerns faced by the higher educational institutions that limit research capability?" and (2) "What possible strategies can

be put in place to address this concerns?" are the questions to be answered.

Theme number two was *Issues and Concerns on University Policies*, where the specific questions were (1) "What HEI policy facilitates research productivity? -and name these HEI policy that can actually help in building a research culture." (2) "What gaps in policy formulation and implementation are evident in the different HEI?" and (3) "How can these gaps be addressed within the university and also as a zonal research group?"

Theme number three dealt with *Research Management Information System*. The first question was (1) "What possible strategies can be put in place to improve the collection of data?" and (2) "What specific institutions can immediately be adopted by this group so that there will be an improvement in the efficiency of data collection?" .

Lastly, theme number four which focused on *Research Capability Building* would address the questions, (1) "What capacities for research may have to be enhanced to improve research productivity?" and (2) "What suggested trainings and training strategies may have to be employed to enhance capability for research?". Alteration or changes to the given specific questions were allowed so as to encourage deeper and more comfortable brainstorming.

Workshop Proper

Mr. Louie Montemar facilitated the workshop which would be the basis of the ZRCs plan and actions for the next three years. He asked his students from De La Salle University to assist the participants and who also served as documentators. The brainstorming would last until lunch time and the outputs were to be discussed later in the afternoon.

Lunch was served at 12 noon and the talks started at 1:30 in the afternoon.

Talks

The first to deliver his talk was Mr. Marshall Valencia, Faculty, Psychology Department, De La Salle University. His presentation was entitled, *Anatomy of Research Publication Productivity in the Philippines*.

In the beginning of his presentation, he identified the importance of research productivity which included its implications for economic development and the large dependence on research capability of academic excellence and reputation which as he mentioned were evident in the performances and standing of educational institutions such as UP, Ateneo and La Salle.

He went on to define the research culture existing in the Philippines. He noted that research publication was not highly valued and that one of the common excuses given why the country had low productivity level was the lack of funding and other research related resources. However, he noted that it was more than lack of financial source because there were also institutions which had more than enough funding and resources but the productivity level was still way below par. Moreover, he noted that low research productivity levels were also below international benchmark standards. The international standard would be one ISI publication per faculty per year.

The first study he presented was about a *Bibliometric Analysis of Philippine International Scientific Publications* having the objective



Mr. Marshal Valencia, first presentor, talks about the "Anatomy of Research Publication Productivity in the Philippines"

to identify patterns using the bibliometric method. In this study, he looked into a total of 7,224 Philippine Bibliometric entries from the Science Citation Index. He extracted all entries from 1985 to July 2008 which he limited to articles. He looked at authorship and collaborative patterns and, productivity and quality levels across disciplines and institutions. He showed a graph presenting the yearly ISI publications from 1985 to July 2008 and noted that the trend was generally increasing from the 100-80 publications produced per year in the 1980s, in recent years, the publications produced in the country was already reaching the marks of 400-500. However, as compared to neighboring countries, the percentage increased in terms of ISI article productions in the country was still much lower. He showed also the top 10 countries with which the Philippines had collaborated with which included USA, Japan, Australia, China, Germany, India, England, Thailand, France and Netherlands. Further, he showed the top15 list of fields where the country was producing ISI publications which were topped by agronomy, plant sciences, marine and fresh water biology and, fisheries. However, it was shown that in terms of the Social Sciences, the country had low ISI production. Moreover, in terms of types of institution, a substantial part of the country's ISI publication came from the public HEIs and a bulk was from UP units. International organizations also had substantial contributions which mostly came from IRRI and Southeast Asian Fisheries. Included among the top 10 institutions in terms of ISI publications were UP, IRRI, SEAFDEC and DLSU. Among the top 10 HEIs were UP, DLSU, UST, CLSU and ADMU.

Moreover, in terms of quality, for the total publication that the country had, which was a total of 5,814 entries, the average citation per item was 11.85. He concluded that collaboration was a norm, publications came from a disproportionate view and there were generally low levels of publication productivity and quality.

Mr. Valencia then went on to discuss the second study which was entitled, *Scientific Productivity of Academic Scientists in Selected Research Universities*. The study was aimed to identify production productivity patterns at the individual and departmental levels in the top research universities, using bibliometrics as a method with 465

PhDs from Science and Engineering Departments of UP (LB and Diliman) and DLSU.

The general conclusions of the study stated that the average productivity was less than one ISI publication in five years and only one academic unit achieved international bench-mark levels which was the Marine Science Institute of UP Diliman.



The participants as they listened to the presentors

A Social Cognitive Analysis of Research Productivity Among Scientists in the Philippines, was the third study presented by Mr. Valencia. The objective of the study was to determine demographic, contextual, and social cognitive variable correlates of research productivity.

The general findings stated that the correlates of research productivity were academic rank, average work hours per week, percentage of work hours for extension activities, perceived adequacy of facilities, perceived motivating impact of rewards and incentives for research, level of access to research opportunities and level of contact with outside network of scholars. Those in the

negative correlation were percentage of hours of teaching, level of impediment of teaching load and family responsibilities.

He added that interests in research were fueled by own research expectations and the self efficacy or the belief to do research was the psychological pattern of research productivity.

However, contrary to expectations, it was shown in the study that there was no significant difference between the males and females, married and single, in terms of research productivity. It was also shown that percentage of work hours spent in research and also percentage of work hours spent for administrative work had no relation to research productivity. And that research productivity was positively related to percentage of hours spent for extension work and perceived level of access to funding was not related to research productivity.

The last study, *The Making of Prolific Researchers in the Philippines: A Grounded Theory Derived Model*, had the objective to explore the factors and socialization processes involved in the making of prolific researchers in the context of a developing country like the Philippines.

The concluding points of the research stated that prolific writers were not born, instead they were shaped and superior academic ability was not necessarily a major ingredient in the socialization process. Hence, it was generally recommended to strengthen local and international strategic collaborations, initially concentrate limited resources into building up and strengthening the disproportionate few research and fast track the development of a scientific publication in the Philippine HEIs by operationalizing mechanisms for modeling and intellectual stimulation.

Talks

The second speaker, Dr. Jesusa Marco, the former Director of the Social Development Research Center, College of Liberal Arts, DLSU had her talk entitled, *Managing a Research Center and*

Research Policies in a University. She started by saying that her talk would deal more about management and also of being an entrepreneur to enhance the research productivity of a research center. She added that one of the tasks of a research center was to sustain research productivity. She then went on to narrate the development of research in DLSU.



Dr. Jesusa Marco former Director of the Social Development Research Center presents her talk entitled "Managing a Research Center and Research Policies in a University"

Quoting, Tonatzky and Fleisher, she shared that "Whatever form a research center takes; it was more than complex hybrid organizational form. It represented an effective social technology. In order for something to be considered a social technology it should meet 3 criteria: a replicable set of structures, procedures, roles, behavior patterns, knowledge-based, and demonstrable and replicable effects".

Moving on, Dr. Marco uttered that in managing a research center, it was important to have a structure. It was the most visible and stable organizational feature of a center. Referring to Robbins, she focused on the three dimensions of structure; complexity, centrality, and formality. Part of the structure was also the university and center interface where most centers have little or no discretion over university policies and procedures that covered personnel appointments, budget, and ownership of equipment and facilities, intellectual property, publication policy, etc.

The Center Functions, Roles, and Responsibilities were as follows; *Centers are by definition multidisciplinary, boundary*

spanning units which may create turf problems among academic units or require dispensation from standard university procedure, the center reports to an official within the university hierarchy who has authority over policies and procedures, decisions about the research programs, and allocation of resource, center administration and research.

The external linkage functions such as GOs, NGOs/COs, Business and communities were very important because of survival. Moreover, the *Internal Center Operations were Role/job description policies and procedures, and Routine center procedures.*

She then dealt on the second important aspect of managing a research center which was planning because Centers needed to plan their research program to avoid chaos and organizational decline. Moreover, in formulating and programming a research strategy, a Vision and Mission statement should be created.

Thirdly, communications was vital in the management of a research center as Center Directors were responsible for more than their own personal communication; they were also responsible for establishing a center culture that facilitated effective communication. She stated that the **I – We – Them – It** Principle was communication of the chosen values, rather than the values themselves that was the hallmark of a successful center and that communication must begin with the Center Director. Further she also discussed the information flow within the organization and the seven components of communication.

The next important aspect of managing a research center as Dr. Marco discussed was **Control** which was generally defined as regulating organizational activities to achieve levels of performance in conformity with expected standards and objectives. The two major components of control were *budgeting and accounting*. In *Control and Evaluation Research*, a Center Director should encourage the incorporation of evaluation into a broad and continuing system of management and control rather than isolated or occasional evaluations. She also mentioned the Management Control

Checklist where she tackled the 5 rubrics which encapsulate ways of maintaining effective control.

Aside from managing, Center Leadership was also very important because when leadership worked, improvement was the effect. Dr. Marco reiterated that one of the broad challenges was to create a new enterprise or acting as an intrapreneur - Starting an enterprise from scratch required thinking and acting both as both an entrepreneur and intrapreneur.

She also noted that it was important to expand the Center Resource Base. Various growth strategies which appeared to make sense for centers at different stages in their life-cycle are *Expansion by Volume, Geographic Dispersion and Vertical Integration*.

In conclusion, Dr. Marco quoted Galbraith and Kazanjian and emphasized that Center Directors needed to be wary of trying to enlarge their centers too fast or too far from their core competency.

Presentation of Workshop Output

The presentation of the workshop groups followed the talks.

The first one to present was Dr. Caoili of the University of the East and University of the Philippines who presented their group discussion regarding *Research Capabilities, Needs and Concerns*.

- factors that limit research capability
 - **Teaching load-** She noted that the regular teaching load was from 18-24 units a week and some of the HEIs represented in their group had a large number of part-time faculty members ranging from 40-80% of the total faculty. And most of these part time faculty were practitioners (engineers, lawyers) who teach to earn money, thus, they were not interested in research.
 - They also noted that in most institutions, there tend to be a lack of qualified personnel to direct and coordinate as well as conduct research. Institutions may have a large pool of faculty who had MAs but their MAs were non-

thesis. Hence, they needed a director to help them think about a research problem.

- The possible strategies as identified by the group to address the above stated concerns included;
 - First, HEIs should provide financial support for faculties who do research. A full time faculty, for instance, should be given a load of 12 units, but is subject to a compensation equivalent to a full time salary for 1 year.
 - Second was to teach students to do research even at the undergraduate level and have a yearly Science and Technology Expo to showcase the outputs of the students.
 - Third, give cash awards to faculty who produce research such as publication awards and international, national and in-house journals such as in E, UST and DLSU.
 - Fourth, the recognition of research productivity and encouragement of research discipleship (e.g. UST awards gold and silver medal for a faculty who produced research and mentored a young faculty to develop research capabilities).
 - Fifth, the holding of university fellows in colleges and research centers who lead in the conceptualization and implementation of research projects, similar to that of DLSU. And lastly, monetary incentives were also given to faculties who came up with research articles.

Theme number two, *Issues and Concerns Regarding University Policies* was discussed by Ms. Canlas from the Lyceum of the Philippines.

- In response to the question, “What HEI policies facilitate research productivity in the HEIs?”, their group mentioned the following;
 - a system of rewards (incentives, deloading schemes, best research awards, ranking/promotion, honorarium, internal funding, educational trips abroad, and trainings);
 - structure;
 - implementation (granting of funds);

- And infrastructure (provision of facilities for research)
- Regarding the 2nd question, the evident gaps in the policy formulation and implementation outlined by the group were;
 - no takers,
 - some policies are not followed,
 - some are not open for change (seniority) ,
 - insufficient budget,
 - politics,
 - And no clear cut policies.
- These gaps, as stated by the group were to be addressed by;
 - revision of policies,
 - disciplinary measures/trainings/enhance research culture,
 - mentoring,
 - source external funding/transparency on the budget allocation,
 - vigilance,
 - periodic review/updating of policies.

The third group also responded to the *Research Capability and Concerns* questions. The group's presenter was Dr. Richard Pulmones.

- For issues and concerns, they identified
 - funding,
 - lack of takers;
 - initiative to do research,
 - fear of doing research (proposals being rejected) and
 - research confined to disciplinary areas.
- The strategies outlines by the group were
 - the having of a research faculty status,
 - more de-loading,
 - counterpart contribution of schools,
 - linking with industry to fund research,

- more exposures to collaborating research (internal and external),
- “bite” size pieces (more directed approach),
- classroom based research,
- And templates within case and cross case analysis where each case can stand on its own and can be published.

Marianito Gallego, Jr. of PUP was the fourth presenter who also dealt with the Issues and Concerns on University Policies.

- As presented, the HEI policies which were deemed to facilitate research productivity in the HEIs were;
 - a system of rewards and incentives which includes, deloading, honorarium, special awards and competition;
 - support from administration through budget;
 - presence of research organizational structure;
 - and publication incentive.

- The group identified the gaps in policy formulation and implementation which were evident. They listed;
 - a bureaucratic procedure in the release of funds,
 - and policies that integrate research and instruction.

- According to the group, these gaps were to be addressed by ;
 - formulating policies that integrate research and instruction,
 - develop linkages and external sources of funds = industry, gov’t (ERDT, DOST, CHED).

The next presenter was Mr. Elmer de Jose also of PUP. Their group worked on theme number 4 which was *Research Capability Building*.

- They identified the capacities to be enhanced which included ;
 - the retooling of researchers. Under retooling is the enhancement of the capability to enhance research methodologies, capability in developing instrument, analysis of data (qualitative/quantitative), improve presentation skills, writing for publication, and preparing effective proposals for funding.

- The strategies outlined by the group were;
 - aligning research agenda,
 - administrative support,
 - research mentoring,
 - collaborative support,
 - tapping expertise of graduate professors (GS Research Center should serve as model in research),
 - training in data analysis,
 - LGU/Industry-academe linkage,
 - research consortia, and
 - journal exchange.

Dr. Edward Gay-ya discussed the result of their group workshop regarding *Research Management Information System*.

- The possible strategies in the improvement of the collection of data or the research and capacity of HEIs were identified as follows:
 - specialization in universities (fields),
 - submit research profile of the universities in order to learn about areas and aspects of research in need for improvement,
 - yearly collection of data (number of research output),
 - assess the materials in research in order to find applicable solutions based on capability,
 - and CHED data bank (profile of institutions, more comprehensive profile of universities, faculties).

- The group further suggested the following specific resolutions:
 - have own website,
 - require universities to make a comprehensive profile of universities yearly (capability-ability),
 - CHED becomes the monitoring body,
 - identify the valid indicators of research,
 - catalog current researchers and
 - improve questionnaire (subjective).

The next presenter also reported on the deliberations by their group which also dealt with Theme number 3. Arlene Tumala stated that the answers to the questions were broken down into five areas.

- The first area was building positive attitude towards research to sell out first; the importance of research (attacking the affective domain of the students).
- Next was building research competence and in order to achieve such, a researcher should have the ability to;
 - conceptualize and design the research focus;
 - ability to formulate general and specific objectives and problems;
 - ability to construct, validate, administer research tools;
 - ability to choose and select appropriate sampling techniques, statistical techniques and features;
 - ability to analyze and interpret data;
 - ability to cross-check the findings from the review of related literatures;
 - ability to summarize, conclude and recommend based on the findings;
 - and ability to disseminate research results through colloquium and publication.
- Third, building the pre-requisites of research, hence, there was a need to develop linguistic competence and technical/scientific/academic writing competence.
- The fourth was that HEIs should have their own research capability building programs emphasizing those skills.
- And lastly, providing attractive incentives such as merit, deloading, financial subsidy and administrative assistance.

The last speaker was Dr. Elizabeth Manugue. She also reported on Theme Number 3.

- The possible strategies to improve the collection of data on research productivity and capacity in HEIs were identified by the group as follows;
 - purpose needs to be defined clearly,
 - definition of scope (student researchers, faculty researchers, research assets, CHED funded, Institutionally funded or others sources, published/unpublished),

- define the benefits of HEIs,
- and enhance knowledge sharing culture in the Philippines by:
 - strengthening database of HEIs and
 - building a network of HEIs for research data base managements for it to be a network for data collection,
- mapping of Research assets in the different HEIs wherein immediate resolutions for efficient data collection (network data collection, conduct regular activities to sustain the networks).

Presentation of CHED Grants

The Presentation of CHED Grants came next after the presentation of workshop discussions. Dr. Libertad Garcia, the Division Chief of the Office of Quality Planning Research and Information, was the one who talked about the grants.



Dr. Libertad Garcia, Division Chief, CHED-OPPRI presents the grants that the CHED supports

Dr. Garcia said that pursuant to RA 7722; CHED mandates the commission to promote research. The research division of CHED was tasked since 1995 to prepare the research agenda. The three functions of CHED were instruction, extension and research, hence, there was no means of improving the instruction and extension

program unless through the product of the research. Research supports instruction and extension program. Thus, in 1998, a 10 year program (1998-2007), the National Higher Education Research Agenda was prepared. However, despite the very attractive incentives and grants promised by CHED to promote the culture of research, very few proposals were submitted and some were not even funded. Because of this, in 2000, the 12 Zonal Research Centers were established, which served as the partner so that the function of the CHED Research Division would be centralized, having the mandate of helping in promoting research and improving research capacity of faculty members of HEIs. Then, in 2003, contracts were renewed and as of this year, 8 ZRCs were renewed, one was replaced and two were added.

Research capacity, research promotion and utilization, research awards and recognition, and research management were the programs of CHED in pursuance of the commission's important mandate which was research. As stated by Dr. Garcia, under the Research Capacity Building, the CHED offers thesis and dissertation grants. There was also the Visiting Research Fellowship which came in two categories namely, Senior and Junior. The other one, Dr. Garcia added, was the Support for Paper Presentation (travel grant).

Under the CHED Research Awards and Recognition, the pet-project of Fr. Dizon was the CHED Research and Publication Awards or the CHED Republica Awards. In her talk, Dr. Garcia invited the participants to submit their proposal for the Outstanding Research Program Award. The other CHED grants or supports were grants-in-aid and commission research. The difference between the two was that commission research was more competitive and was more on areas where CHED really needed input for their policy making.

After Dr. Garcia's talk, Dr. Sta. Maria initiated the Open Forum and asked Dr. Marco, being the experienced research center manager to answer questions such as "What if we have an unresponsive administration?" and other issues related to the administration of research. Dr. Marco said that it was a tension and dilemma for a university to balance the priority for teaching and

research. Ideally, there shouldn't be a conflict between the two. Citing for example DLSU which was primarily a teaching institution, research should input teaching. There was a need for a critical mass of faculty who had the passion for research before a research center should be put up in the university. It should be an advocacy and must be treated the only way to continuously talk with the administration regarding the promotion of research. She added that research was a life cycle. It was a process that should be carried and worked on by individuals, researchers who advocated the promotion of research.

Dr. Sta. Maria, responded to a question raised by one of the participants. She said that the ZRC was negotiating with the administration, so that the E-Lib or the sources of subscription of international journals that DLSU have would also be accessed by the other HEIs.

Dr. Petra Bautista of the National University raised the point that age doesn't really affect one's ability or interest to do research. She stated that it was only when she reached the age of 70 that she finished her dissertation because she had to do so to be able to teach in the graduate school. The results of her dissertation reflected that the reason why research productivity was low in the country was because very few people were interested in undertaking such.

Mr. Valencia also responded to the comment of Dr. Manugue regarding one of the concluding statements in his presentation which was to initially focus or bias our resources towards the disproportionate few who were producing. Such a statement was seemingly elitist as argued by Dr. Manugue. He admitted that in a way it was elitist, however, a look at the models of higher educational development in other neighboring countries would prove that such a model worked. It may be argued that there was no assurance that such a system would also work in the country, but there were indications that it would also work for us as shown in the experiences of the Marine Sciences in UP Diliman. He noted that such a model would fast track the culture to be able to attain HEI development through research.

Dr. Madelene Sta. Maria formally closed the program, in place of Dr. Jean Tayag who wasn't able to attend the event. She thanked the participants for coming and for their active participation. She ended by saying her anticipation of working intensively with the HEIs in the next three years.

The Zonal Assembly ended at 5:00pm.