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# I. Introduction

Internationalization is a strategic approach that integrates global dimensions into the university’s teaching, research, extension, and governance. This manual provides guidelines, policies, and operational procedures to ensure systematic, inclusive, and sustainable implementation of internationalization initiatives.

# II. Vision, Mission, and Objectives

## Vision

To be a globally recognized State University that fosters international collaboration, intercultural learning, and research excellence.

## Mission

To provide accessible and quality education, research, and extension services enriched by international perspectives and partnerships.

## Objectives

1. Strengthen global partnerships and linkages.  
2. Promote mobility of students, faculty, and staff.  
3. Integrate international perspectives into curriculum and research.  
4. Enhance institutional capacity through global benchmarking.  
5. Foster intercultural competence and global citizenship among stakeholders.

# III. Guiding Principles

• Inclusivity and Equity – International opportunities are accessible to all.  
• Reciprocity – Partnerships must provide mutual benefits.  
• Quality Assurance – International engagements align with CHED, ISO, AUN and global standards.  
• Sustainability – Programs must be financially and institutionally sustainable.  
• Academic Freedom and Integrity – Respect for institutional values and ethical standards.

# IV. Organizational Structure

1. Office of International Affairs (OIA) – Oversees and implements internationalization programs.  
2. Internationalization Committee – Policy review, monitoring, and coordination.  
3. Focal Persons per College/Institute – Coordinate international activities at unit level.

# V. Program Components

## A. Academic and Curriculum Internationalization

Objective: To integrate global perspectives, standards, and innovations into the university’s teaching and learning systems.

Key Activities:  
1. Curriculum review and mapping for international outcomes.  
2. English and foreign language course offerings.  
3. Joint/double degree programs.  
4. International accreditation.  
5. SDGs and intercultural content infusion.

Responsible Offices: Office of Academic Affairs, Colleges/Institutes, Registrar, OIA.

**Procedures:**- Academic units propose revisions → Reviewed by Internationalization Committee → Academic Council → BOR approval.  
- Joint curriculum agreements with foreign universities → Accreditation → CHED recognition.

**Monitoring Indicators:**- Number of accredited programs.  
- Courses with global outcomes.  
- Number of joint degree programs.

## B. Student, Faculty, and Staff Mobility

Objective: To provide opportunities for academic and cultural exchange, capacity building, and global exposure.

Key Activities:  
1. Outbound mobility (exchange, practicum, sabbaticals).  
2. Inbound mobility (hosting foreign students/professors).  
3. Pre-departure and re-entry orientation.  
4. Credit transfer and recognition.  
5. Scholarship sourcing.

Responsible Offices: OIA, Student Affairs, HR, Colleges/Institutes.

**Procedures:**- Announcement → Screening → Selection → Orientation → Monitoring → Re-entry integration.  
- Hosting inbound: Visa → Arrival orientation → Mentor assignment.

**Monitoring Indicators:**- Number of inbound/outbound exchanges.  
- Utilization ratio of agreements.  
- Re-entry program completion rate.

## C. Research and Extension Internationalization

Objective: To strengthen collaborative research and innovation while extending services beyond borders.

**Key Activities:**1. International collaborative research.  
2. Joint conferences and workshops.  
3. Indexed publications.  
4. International extension projects.  
5. Innovation hubs with partners.

Responsible Offices: Research & Extension Office, Graduate School, OIA.

**Procedures:**- Proposal → R&E review → Funding application → Project implementation → Joint publications.  
- Extension: Partner community identification → Proposal → MOA → Implementation.

**Monitoring Indicators:**- Number of research collaborations.  
- Publications in refereed journals.  
- International conferences hosted.  
- Extension projects abroad.

## D. Partnerships and Linkages

Objective: To establish sustainable, reciprocal, and mutually beneficial collaborations with foreign institutions and organizations.

Key Activities:  
1. MOUs/MOAs with institutions.  
2. Membership in academic networks.  
3. Industry linkages abroad.  
4. Alumni engagement.  
5. Partnership evaluation.

Responsible Offices: OIA, President’s Office, Legal Office.

**Procedures:**- Partner scouting → Initial discussions → Draft MOU → Legal vetting → BOR approval → Signing.  
- Annual review and output evaluation.

**Monitoring Indicators:**  
- Number of active MOUs.  
- Percentage of partnerships with outputs.  
- Network memberships.

## E. Cultural and Language Programs

Objective: To foster intercultural competence, diversity awareness, and multilingual communication.

**Key Activities:**1. Language center establishment.  
2. International festivals.  
3. Integration of culture in student activities.  
4. Faculty/staff intercultural training.  
5. Buddy system for international students.

Responsible Offices: OIA, Student Affairs, Cultural Affairs Office, Colleges.

**Procedures:**- Language program design → Hiring of experts → Rollout.  
- Cultural events: Coordination with embassies, consulates, student orgs → Execution → Documentation.

**Monitoring Indicators:**- Number of cultural programs.  
- Language courses offered.  
- Percentage of student/faculty participation.

# VI. Risk Management

- Legal Risks: All contracts vetted by legal office.  
- Cultural Adjustment: Pre-departure and arrival orientation.  
- Financial Risks: Diversify funding sources.  
- Safety and Security: Emergency protocols abroad.

# VII. Communication and Promotion

- Internationalization portal, website, and newsletters.  
- Social media promotion.  
- Alumni engagement for networking.

# VIII. Review and Amendment

This Manual shall be reviewed every three (3) years or as necessary to respond to emerging global trends and national policies.

# IX. Effectivity

This Manual shall take effect upon approval by the Board of Regents of the University of Southern Mindanao.

**Appendices**

# Appendix 1. Mechanism for Evaluating Linkages

To ensure that institutional linkages remain relevant, effective, and sustainable, an evaluation mechanism shall be developed and institutionalized. This mechanism will objectively determine whether the objectives of the partnership are attained and shall guide decisions on renewal, modification, or termination of the linkages.

## I. Evaluation Objectives

- To assess the extent to which the objectives of the linkage/consortium have been achieved.  
- To measure the benefits gained by all partner institutions and stakeholders.  
- To identify strengths, gaps, and areas for improvement in the partnership.  
- To provide evidence-based recommendations for renewal or discontinuation.

## II. Evaluation Framework

The evaluation will adopt a Results-Based Monitoring and Evaluation (RBME) framework, focusing on inputs, processes, outputs, outcomes, and impacts.

## III. Indicators of Success

Indicators shall be developed based on the objectives of each specific linkage or consortium. These may include:

Quantitative Indicators:  
- Number of joint activities completed vs. planned.  
- Number of beneficiaries served (students, faculty, community stakeholders).  
- Research outputs, publications, patents, or technologies generated.  
- Resources mobilized (funding, facilities, expertise).

Qualitative Indicators:  
- Stakeholder satisfaction (measured through surveys, FGDs, interviews).  
- Quality of collaboration and communication among partners.  
- Relevance of activities to institutional mandates and community needs.  
- Perceived sustainability of initiatives beyond the partnership.

## IV. Evaluation Tools and Methods

- Surveys and Questionnaires administered to faculty, students, and partner agencies.  
- Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) with consortium leaders and partner representatives.  
- Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) with stakeholders and beneficiaries.  
- Document Review of MOAs, activity reports, financial reports, and terminal reports.  
- Scoring Matrix/Rubric to provide an objective rating of performance against set criteria.

## V. Evaluation Schedule

- Mid-Term Evaluation: Conducted halfway through the linkage/consortium duration.  
- Terminal Evaluation: Conducted at the end of the linkage/consortium term.  
- Renewal Review: Based on the terminal evaluation results, with renewal only considered if at least 70–80% of objectives are attained and sustainability mechanisms are in place.

## VI. Utilization of Results

Results shall be documented in an Evaluation Report containing findings, strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations. The Evaluation Report shall be presented to all consortium members and approving authorities. The decision to renew, revise, or terminate the linkage/consortium shall be based on the evaluation results.

## VII. Evaluation Matrix

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Indicators | Means of Verification | Rating Scale |
| Input Assessment | Adequacy of resources (funds, facilities, expertise) contributed by each partner | MOAs, financial reports, resource sharing documents | 1–Poor, 2–Fair, 3–Good, 4–Very Good, 5–Excellent |
| Process Assessment | Effectiveness of coordination, communication, and governance structures | Minutes of meetings, communication records, organizational charts | 1–Poor, 2–Fair, 3–Good, 4–Very Good, 5–Excellent |
| Output Assessment | Delivery of agreed activities (trainings, workshops, publications, etc.) | Activity reports, attendance sheets, publications, modules | 1–Poor, 2–Fair, 3–Good, 4–Very Good, 5–Excellent |
| Outcome Assessment | Short-term benefits (capacity building, knowledge transfer, innovations adopted) | Evaluation surveys, FGD results, reflection papers | 1–Poor, 2–Fair, 3–Good, 4–Very Good, 5–Excellent |
| Impact Assessment | Long-term benefits to institutions/communities; sustainability of initiatives | Impact studies, tracer results, community feedback | 1–Poor, 2–Fair, 3–Good, 4–Very Good, 5–Excellent |