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1.0 PURPOSE

The purpose of this document is to define the procedure, responsibilities and records for corrective action.

2.0 SCOPE

2.1 This procedure applies to corrective action for:

2.1.1 customer complaints/ feedback (students),
2.1.2 customer complaints/ feedback (personnel),
2.1.3 internal quality audit findings,
2.1.4 personnel violations (as specified in Employee Discipline Procedure),
2.1.5 low rating on Teacher Rating Sheet (TRS) and staff performance evaluation, and
2.1.6 faculty absence from classes.

3.0 RESPONSIBILITY

3.1 Responsibilities are as specified in the respective procedures:

3.1.1 customer complaints/ feedback (students)
   - CC-5.2-PR-01 Handling of Student Feedback
3.1.2 customer complaints/ feedback (personnel)
   - HR-5.2-PR-01 Handling of Personnel Feedback
3.1.3 internal quality audit findings
   - CI-8.2.2-PR-01 Internal Quality Audit
3.1.4 personnel violations
   - HR-6.2-PR-11 Employee Discipline Procedure
3.1.5 low faculty TRS
   - as specified in the procedure below
3.1.6 faculty absence from classes
   - as specified in the procedure below
3.1.7 employee discipline procedure HR-6.2- PR-11

4.0 DEFINITION OF TERMS

4.1 Classification of Corrective Action Requests:

4.2.1 Major CAR- this is a non-compliance that involves any of the following:

   4.2.1.1 total breakdown of a process or procedure critical to educational service quality or in the effective operation of CPU’s quality system
4.2.1.2 there is total absence of a requirement demanded by ISO 9001:2000 Standard or CPU’s quality system
4.2.1.3 there are a number of minor lapses in a process, which when taken together, collectively suggest a total or important breakdown in the process
4.2.1.4 the nonconformity is likely to result in an immediate risk to the quality of the product or service being offered

4.2.2 Minor CAR- this is a deficiency that has been identified within a process in CPU’s educational service system, but which is less severe than a major CAR

4.3 Observations - audit findings which are the value-added part of the audit. They can be reported like CARs but these include-

4.3.1 Good educational service practices which could benefit other processes within CPU
4.3.2 Areas of concern which are not yet serious enough to need a CAR
4.3.3 Situations that have to be addressed so as not to become CARs
4.3.4 Deficiencies for which the auditor is prepared to give CPU the benefit of the doubt
4.3.5 Suggestions for action to improve the effectiveness of CPU’s quality management system

5.0 PROCEDURE

5.1 For items 3.1.1 to 3.1.4, refer to respective procedure.

5.2 For poor performance, i.e., TRS rating below 4.0 for faculty and performance rating below 75 for staff:

5.2.1 The personnel concerned is counseled by respective unit head/ dean.

5.2.2 If the concern cannot be resolved at the unit head/ dean’s levels, the personnel is called for counseling with the Career Development Officer at the HRD Office.

5.2.3 An interview is conducted and the process of determination of root cause using techniques e.g. cause-and-effect diagram, fishbone diagram.

5.2.4 Results of this interview including recommendations are noted in HRD Form 64 Record of Employee Counseling/ Interview.

5.2.5 Actions taken are followed up by the Career Development Officer including evaluation of effectiveness of action taken.
5.3 For faculty absence during random check of attendance by attendance checker or his authorized alternate, the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA) issued a notice (VPAA Form 19) to the dean or chairman concerned regarding the absence of the faculty. The faculty and the unit head are required to come up with an action plan to correct the absence. This notice is then returned to the Office of the VPAA.

5.4 For disciplinary action on absences or poor performance, refer to HR- 6.2 –PR-11 Employee Discipline Procedure.

6 REFERENCE

6.1 CC-5.2-PR-01 Handling of Student Feedback
6.2 HR-5.2-PR-01 Handling of Personnel Feedback
6.3 CI-8.2.2-PR-01 Internal Quality Audit
6.4 HR-6.2-PR-11 Employee Discipline Procedure

7.0 RECORDS

7.1 CPU IQA Form 05 - Corrective Action Requests
7.2 CPU VPAA Form 19 – Notice re Faculty Absence
7.3 HRD Form 14 – Staff Performance Evaluation
7.4 HRD Form 30 – Personnel Complaint and Feedback Form
7.5 HRD Form 42 – Teacher Rating Sheet
7.6 HRD Form 54 – Explanation for Failed Log-in/ Log-out Form
7.7 HRD Form – Record of Employee Counseling/ Interview
7.8 University Training Plan