

The Facilitating and the Hindering Factors in the Implementation of Government Assistance to Students and Teachers in Private Education (GASTPE) Program and Its Contribution to the Participating Secondary Schools

MERLY PABATANG-ABIVA

<http://orcid.org/0000-0003-1502-7049>

merlyabiva@yahoo.com

Saint Joseph Institute of Technology

Butuan City, Philippines



ABSTRACT

The study was initiated to determine both the hindering and facilitating factors in the implementation of Government Assistance to Students and Teachers in Private Education program and its contribution to the participating secondary schools in Butuan City and Agusan del Norte, Caraga Region, Philippines. Descriptive research design was used with 902 respondents: ten school heads, 108 teachers, 392 ESC grantee-students and 392 parents of the ESC grantees. DepEd Orders were utilized as one of the references. The statistical tools used were Mean, Frequency Count, and ANOVA one way. Results showed that GASTPE has improved the school quality and maintained financial viability of the private secondary schools, improved the standards of the school, cost-effective, helps keep the teachers stay in school for long ; makes secondary education accessible to students even the poor and marginalized. Meanwhile, refusal of the principals to declare “aisle” students; lack of parental support, and the amount of subsidy and distance of home from school are the hindering factors. The study concludes that GASTPE has improved the performance of the beneficiary schools and has met what is expected per guidelines of implementation.

KEYWORDS

Educational Management, Implementation of GASTPE, Contribution to the Participating Schools, Hindering and Facilitating Factors, Descriptive Research Design, Butuan City and Agusan del Norte, Philippines

INTRODUCTION

Today, education in the developing world faces the twin challenges of getting and keeping a number of children in school, while at the same time ensuring that learning outcomes improve (La Roque, 2008). La Roque further posited that governments around the world, particularly those in the developing countries, face significant educational crisis, about 115 million are not in school; bulk on these children live in SubSaharan Africa and South Asia (United Nations 2005). While progress has been made toward meeting the education Millennium Development Goals (MDGS), much remains to be achieved. This is particularly true in the least developed countries.

The Philippines has one of the largest public-private partnership programs in education in the world, serving almost 9 percent of the 6.5 million high school students in 2009. Hence the program increases access to quality basic education at the secondary level by especially school graduates who wish to attend private high schools that have contracted with the government. In effect, the ESC program improves school quality, relieves congestion in public secondary schools as well as sustain financial capability of private schools (more than one-third of private secondary schools enrollment are supported by the program), keeps the overall costs of public secondary education in check, and encourages households to invest in education (Philippines Private Provision, Public Purpose: A Review of the Government's ESC Program, 2011).

It is in this viewpoint that this study is conducted to determine the level of implementation of the GASTPE program and its concrete and tangible contributions to the participating secondary schools in Butuan City and Agusan del Norte probing that government's funds are spent judiciously.

FRAMEWORK

Recognition that low-cost private education is serving large numbers of low-income families in developing countries is very recent. In many instances, it is assumed that non-state provision has arisen in response to state failure to provide services – and is thus the only option for those who cannot get access to public provision. The mushrooming numbers of poor people who have access to public services but who vote with their feet and make use of neighboring non-state services is testament to this.

Government assistance to private institutions can be readily felt in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA). For example, private involvement in secondary education assumes both provision and financing. Private provision includes elite schools often owned and operated by faith-based organizations (FBOs); low-quality dwelling house' type schools owned by small community associations; free-paying classes private-for-profit operators; community schools run by parents or community associations; and private tutoring. Private source of financing include formal and informal fees and charges paid by parents, contributions from NGOs, well-wishers and corporation to support school improvement. In fact it is the responsibility of the government to establish a policy framework to ensure that access to quality education is provided to eligible students in the private schools. (Verspoor, A. M. 2008)

This study is anchored on the partnership principle espoused by Jeffares (2009) that to foster collaboration and commitment in partnership the purpose must be clear, aligned and realistic. GASTPE program is a demonstration of Government's commitment in keeping up the viability of private learning institution, a partner in the delivery of quality basic education (DepEd Order No.26, s. 2014). It has policies and guidelines in implementation.

The Department of Education in its effort of making quality basic education available and accessible to all Filipino citizens issued policies and guidelines to ensure its effective and efficient implementation (DepEd Order No. 31, s. 2010). The management of GASTPE has been contracted out by DepEd to the Private Education Assistance Committee, which is the trustee of the Fund for Assistance to Private Education (FAPE), a private institution. Patrinos (2000) stressed that the main rationale for developing PPP thru GASTPE is amplify the potential for spreading out equitable access to schooling and improving education outcomes, especially for marginalized groups instead of engaging a private organization to operate a public school.

The GASTPE Program was implemented to serve as a vehicle for the private schools to participate in the provision of education, bridging the resource gaps like classrooms, textbooks, computers, laboratories, and other school facilities which are supposed to be provided by the public sector (DepEd Order No. 86, s. 2009).

The through put of the study are the facilitating and the hindering factors. Facilitating factors are any factors which stimulate, provide or promote a fertile environment for public education. Education is today largely paid for and almost entirely administered by government bodies or non-profit institutions. The result has been an indiscriminate extension of governmental responsibility.

In the process, both hindering and facilitating factors were experienced. The aim of education is to provide individual children with the knowledge and skills necessary to make them self-reliant and functional. On socioeconomic point of view, Jennifer 2013 enumerated that family income level, parents' level of education, as well as cultural traits and gender influence the quality and availability of education.

There is dearth of literature on GASTPE implementation because high school teachers rarely write research. Hence, there are no available studies.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- To describe the facilitating and hindering factors as experienced by the school in the implementation of the program?
- To ascertain the contribution of the GASTPE program as perceived by the school heads, the teachers, the students and the parents in terms of support to facilities; teaching and learning assistance and select performance indicators like participation rate; cohort-survival rate; enrolment rate and completion rate?
- To determine the significant difference in the perceptions of the school administrators, teachers, students and parents as to the contribution of the GASTPE program considering support to facilities and assistance to teaching and learning.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The study used the descriptive research design because it aims to examine the facilitating and hindering factors of GASTPE implementation.

Research Environment

This study was conducted in Northeastern Mindanao, Philippines. A total of ten schools were included in the study from the two divisions of Caraga Region. Five of the ten schools are from Butuan City, the capital city of Agusan del Norte. Four of these schools are found in the heart of the city. Agusan Business and Arts Foundation Inc. is located at Capitol Drive its nearby school is Butuan City Colleges. For the school year 2011-2012, ABAFI showed 92% enrolment rate, 29% school leaver rate and 76% completers rate. Butuan City Colleges, a family owned non-sectarian school. It is located at Montilla Boulevard. Adjacent to it are Saint Joseph Institute of Technology and Agusan Institute of Technology presently named Colegio de Caraga. Butuan City Colleges has an enrolment rate of 68%, dropout rate of 27% and completion rate of 57% for the school year 2011-2012. It is very close to commercial establishments such as fast foods, banks and other commercial site.

The Respondents

A total of 902 respondents were involved in the study: 10 school heads, 108 teachers who have been with the school for four years, 392 students who were grantees since First Year and 392 parents of the said ESC-grantees.

Table 1. Distribution of Respondents and Sample Size from the GASTPE Participating Schools of Butuan City and Agusan del Norte

Division	School Heads	Teachers		Students		Parents		Total	
		N	n	N	n	N	n	N	n
Butuan City	5	83	69	359	189	359	189	806	452
Agusan del Norte	5	43	39	413	203	413	203	874	450
Total	10	126	108	772	392	772	392	1680	902

Slovin formula. However, a thorough enumeration was used for the school heads considering their number.

Research Instrument

The researcher used a self-made questionnaire adopted from the Implementing Rules and Guidelines issued by the Department of Education and from the ESC Re-Certification Instrument prepared by PEAC-FAPE Secretariat 2013. The self-made questionnaire was validated through a try-out test to a group of secondary teachers and students who were not involved in the study to determine if the phrases and terms were clear. The questionnaire underwent reliability testing using Cronbach alpha with $Q=0.93$, indicating that the questionnaire is highly reliable.

Data Gathering Procedure

A permit to float the questionnaire was secured from the Office of the Regional Director of the Department of Education Caraga Region where the divisions are under his jurisdiction. In like manner, approval from the Office of the Schools Division Superintendents of Agusan del Norte and of Butuan City was also secured. In the school level, a letter of request was sent to the principal for his consent.

The findings of the study were presented to a forum to validate the results or findings of the study. The participants were school heads; teachers, student leaders and parents who were not respondents of the study but from GASTPE recipient schools as well. It was likewise attended FAPE and DepED Caraga officials. The inputs by all the respondents and participants of the forum were properly recorded by the documentation committee and were considered to serve as validation of the findings of the study.

Statistical Treatment

Statistical tools used were Mean, Frequency/Rank, t-test and One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 2. Facilitating and Hindering Factors in the Implementation of the GASTPE Program as Perceived and Ranked by the School Heads, Teachers, Students and Parents

Indicators	Mean	Rank
1. The Teacher Salary Subsidy (TSS) helps keep the teachers stays in school for long.	5.0	5.0
2. The ESC subsidy is cost-effective on the part of the parents.	4.75	4.75
3. The ESC subsidy makes secondary education accessible to all students even the poor and marginalized students.	5.25	5.25
4. Refusal of some public high school principals to declare aisle hinders the GASTPE's purpose to decongest public high school classes and make quality education accessible to all.	6.5	6.50
5. The GASTPE program improves the standards of the private schools.	4.75	4.75
6. Lack of parental support of the ESC grantees on their other needs.	8.5	8.5
7. The amount of subsidy to student grantees is enough to pay the top-ups of the tuition fee.	10.25	10.25
8. All ESC grantees are poor but deserving.	7.75	7.75
9. GASTPE improves school quality and maintains financial viability of private secondary schools.	4.0	4.0
10. The GASTPE program motivates the parents to eagerly enroll their children for secondary education.	7.0	7.0
11. Distance of home from school.	8.25	8.25
12. Financial resources to defray other expenses in schooling.	11.25	11.25
13. Improved institutional and program delivery practices.	12.5	12.50

The indicators at the top six ranks are considered facilitating while those below are considered the hindering factors. As shown in the table the facilitating factors are: GASTPE has improved the school quality and maintained financial viability of private secondary schools (Rank 1); in the interview with respondents, they explained that GASTPE is their main source of extend income and greatly supported the school operations. Another is, the program has improved the standard of the school (Rank 2); the principals supported by teachers and students; perception said that the GASTPE implementations have possible requirements for school performance indicators to qualify for subsidy. This mandated school to improve their performance. ESC subsidy is cost effective on the part of the parents (Rank 3); the Teacher Salary Subsidy (TSS) helps

the teachers to stay in school for long (Rank 4); ESC subsidy makes secondary education accessible to all students even the poor and marginalized (Rank 5). The students replied that if not, GASTPE many of them would not be able to obtain high school education.

The rest of the factors contained in the table which are highlighted and colored green got the lower ranks and considered as hindering factors hence were re-worded as: the refusal of high school principals to declare “aisle” students hinder the purpose of decongesting public high schools; lack of parental support on the other needs of grantees; the amount of subsidy is only for tuition fees; the grantees are not poor the fact that they can pay for the top-ups; distance of home from school; lack of financial resources to defray other expenses in schooling; and less improvement in the delivery of program services.

Part of the major problem of this study is the contribution of the GASTPE program as perceived by the administration, the teachers, the students and the parents in considering support to facilities and the schools performance indicators in terms of cohort survival rate; simple drop-out rate and completion rate.

Rank number 5 of the facilitating factors in the implementation of GASTPE program as ranked by the respondents is that ESC subsidy makes secondary education accessible to all students even the poor and marginalized. Education Investment Guides 2010 advanced that individual private income is not the only source of funding for private education providers, because multilateral agencies, bilateral agencies and government like in the case of GASTPE program are also subsidizing and contracting with private sector schools and colleges to provide education in their behalf. This is what we call Public Private Partnerships (PPPs) and GASTPE program is one. Through GASTPE several private schools increasing their tuition and other fees are assured of DepEd continued financial assistance to poor and deserving students who wish to study in private high schools. Thus this would mean more 20% for the improvement of school facilities. For DepEd requires private schools to set aside 70% of the increase in tuition for the salaries of teachers and 20% for the improvement of school facilities while only 10% is allowed as return of investment ([www.sunstar.com.ph/cebu/localnews/2012/04/11 / dep-ed-continue-assistance-scholars-private-schools-215681](http://www.sunstar.com.ph/cebu/localnews/2012/04/11/dep-ed-continue-assistance-scholars-private-schools-215681)).

In effect, provision of appropriate school facilities are must for student learning and strengthens academic program. (Educational Facilities DepEd 2010). The Philippines is one of the countries with the largest public-private partnerships in the world in terms of education, serving more than 567,500 students in 2009. This implies an increase in the participation rate of the school age children which consequently, increase the enrolment and completion rate of the students. Nevertheless, the aims of Service Contracting (ESC) program is to increase access to quality basic education at the secondary level, enhance school quality, decongest public high schools, and maintains the financial viability of private secondary schools are attained. (A Review of the Government’s Education Service Contracting 2011). Such is a manifestation that GASTPE program positively contributes to the partner schools.

Table 3. Contribution of the GASTPE Program in terms of Support to Facilities as Perceived by the School Heads, Teachers, Students and Parents

Indicators	Mean	Qualitative Description
a. The beneficiary school's campus has improved.	2.91	ME
b. Additional classrooms are constructed.	2.61	ME
c. The school building is regularly audited and inspected.	2.82	ME
d. Repairs and maintenance of facilities and utilities are regularly performed for effective operation.	2.83	ME
e. Athletic and playground facilities: Basketball and Volleyball Courts, and basic sports equipment are provided.	2.76	ME
f. Defective chairs are replaced with new and additional chairs are purchased.	2.78	ME
g. All classrooms are provided with electric fans	2.93	ME
h. Science and TLE laboratories are equipped with the necessary fixtures, tools, and equipment.	2.92	ME
OVERALL MEAN	2.79	ME

Legend: Above 3.50- Exceeded what is Expected (EE); 2.51-3.50 – Meet what is Expected(ME); 1.51-2.50 –Less than what is Expected(LE); .0.50-1.50- Did not Meet what is Expected(DME); Below 0.51 – None at all.

Of the eight indicators reflected in the table as contribution of the GASTPE Program for physical facilities, the indicator on classrooms are provided with electric fans got the highest mean (2.93). This is followed by the indicator which states that Science and T.L.E. laboratories are equipped with the necessary fixtures, tools and equipment (2.92); meaning that it meets what is expected, and the indicator which is on beneficiary school's campus has improved with the mean of 2.91 which implies that it meets what is expected.

On the other hand, the indicator getting the lowest means are on the construction of additional classroom (2.61); the provision of athletic and playground facilities (2.76) and defective chairs are replaced and purchase of new and additional chairs were made (2.78).

The overall rating is 2.95 to mean the contribution of the program has only met what is expected. This result suggests that GASTPE beneficiary schools have to ensure a judicious use of the school's budget for the improvement of its facilities and laboratories. As stated by Basilan (2012), DepEd requires private schools to set aside 70% of the increase in tuition for the salaries of teachers; 20% for the improvement of the school facilities, and 10% for the Return of Investment.

Table 4. Contribution of the GASTPE Program in Terms of Assistance to Teaching and Learning as Perceived by the School Heads, Teachers, Students and Parents

Indicators	Mean	Qualitative Description
a. An increased in students' academic achievement.	2.64	ME
b. School budget includes training for teachers and students.	2.58	ME
c. Teachers' trainings and seminars are financed by the school.	3.05	ME
d. Organization building enhancement activities and programs are taken care of by the school.	2.82	ME
e. Purchase of updated teaching and learning materials.	2.37	LE
f. Purchase of additional computers, Science and T.L.E. tools and equipment.	2.51	ME
g. Purchase of new equipment in preparation for the senior high school.	2.47	LE
h. Allocation of budget for students' support activities.	2.71	ME
OVERALL	2.65	ME

Legend: Above 3.50- Exceeded what is Expected (EE); 2.51-3.50 – Meet what is Expected(ME); 1.51-2.50 –Less than what is Expected(LE); .0.50-1.50- Did not Meet what is Expected(DME); Below 0.51 – None at all.

As shown in the Table 4, the school financed teachers' training and seminars (3.05) got the highest mean followed by the organization and enhancement activities and programs are taken care of by the school (2.82); and allocation of budget for students' support activities (2.71).

On the other hand, the indicators with lowest means are on the purchase of updated teaching and learning materials (2.37) followed by purchase of new equipment in preparation for the senior high school (2.47) and purchase of additional computers, Science and TLE tools and equipment (2.51).

Generally in terms of return of investment, the overall rating is 2.65 which means the program has meet what is expected.

The next problem of the study is to test the hypothesis that there is no significant difference on the perceptions of the four groups of respondents considering the contribution of the GASTPE program to the beneficiary schools. The one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used.

Table 5. ANOVA Result

ANOVA: Single or Fact				
SUMMARY				
<i>Groups</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>Sum</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>Variance</i>
Column 1	8	22.01	2.75125	0.087013
Column 2	8	21.34	2.6675	0.133079
Column 3	8	19.75	2.46875	0.053441
Column 4	8	21.53	2.69125	0.021727
ANOVA				
Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	
Between Groups	0.359984	3	0.119995	
Within Groups	2.066813	28	0.073815	
Total	2.426797	31		

As shown in the table, the computed F of 1.6256 is less than the critical F of 2.9466 at 0.05 level of significance with degrees of freedom of 3 and 28. The null hypothesis of no significant difference as to the perceptions of the school heads, teachers, students and parents on the contribution of the GASTPE program to the beneficiary schools is accepted.

Another factor that is considered to measure to the contribution of the GASTPE program is the school's performance indicators. The Department of Education defines performance indicator (PI) as a type of performance measurement. Performance indicators therefore, define and measure the progress of educational goals. It also evaluates the success of an organization. Some of these factors are cohort survival rate; simple drop-out rate and completion rate which are categorized as access indicators. Cohort survival rate is determined by computing the percentage of a cohort of students who are able to reach Year IV. It is a means by which internal efficiency is evaluated. Completion rate measures the percentage of year 1 entrants who graduate in secondary education and simple drop-out rate calculates the percentage of students who do not finish a particular year level but do not enroll in the next year level following in the following school year (DepED Report, 2014). In this study, the GASTPE program is considered to contribute to the selected performance indicators as perceived by the respondents.

Table 6. Historical Data of Selected Performance Indicators of Private Secondary Schools from the Divisions of Agusan del Norte(ADN) and Butuan City(BC) from SY 2009- 2010 to SY 2012-2013

Performance Indicators	SY 2009-2010		SY2010-2011		SY 2011-2012		SY 2012-2013	
	ADN	BC	ADN	BC	ADN	BC	ADN	BC
Participation Rate	12.21	9.40	14.33	9.33	19.65	14.23	14.60	10.39
Enrolment Rate	18.13	12.51	18.82	13.47	19.50	14.23	18.99	13.56
Cohort Survival Rate	81.39	93.60	86.35	84.77	85.37	88.11	88.00	86.35
Completion Rate	75.95	61.21	81.87	78.70	82.49	76.22	83.50	77.12

Source: Policy, Planning and Research Division (PPRD), DepEd Caraga, January 2015

The participation rate, cohort survival rate and completion rate of Agusan del Norte Division are increasing for the last four school years except for enrolment rate where there is a slight decrease of 0.51% in SY 20122013.

As to the division of Butuan City, it can be gleaned from the table that all the identified performance indicators are erratic. This could be attributed to the fact that most of the residents of the city are more mobile than that of the municipalities or the province in general.

Based on the findings on the weaknesses in the implementation of the GASTPE program in terms of the Average Rating of the School on the latest Re-Certification by FAPE and DepEd; School Mean Percentage Score in the National Achievement Test, Level of Implementation of the GASTPE Program in terms of Adequacy of Recertification, Monitoring, Administration, Timeliness of the Subsidy Releases and Submission of Reports of Beneficiary Schools; Best Practices; Hindering and Facilitating Factors and the Contribution of the GASTPE Program in terms of Support to Facilities, Assistance to Teaching and Learning and School Performance Indicators, the following policy recommendations are formulated.

Weaknesses in the Implementation of the GASTPE Program	Policy Recommendation
1. Of the nine areas being assessed, six were evaluated to exceed the minimum standards based on guidelines set by DepEd and FAPE. However, three areas were evaluated to be practicing the minimum standard only. These are School Plant and Physical Facilities and Equipment, Student Services and Instructional Program.	1. There is a need for the school administrators to allocate a budget for the improvement of the school plant, physical facilities and equipment for these are facilitating agents in all the educational activities. 2. There is a need for the DepEd or FAPE to look into the 70-20-10% scheme of the school budget allocation required by DepEd to private schools is followed.

	<p>3. There is a need for the school academic supervisors to revisit their instructional program to assure that its curriculum and the pedagogical strategy are aligned to the vision of the school at the same time attuned to what is prescribed by DepEd.</p>
<p>2. As to the level of achievement of GASTPE beneficiary schools in the NAT, not one of the ten schools under the study got the proficient and advanced levels; four out of ten in the Approaching Proficiency Level; five out of ten are in Basic Proficiency Level; and only one out of ten is in the Pre-Basic.</p>	<p>4. There is a need for the school to revisit their instructional program and the competencies taught to the students if they are aligned to DepEd and to utilize the NAT results as basis of their academic intervention program.</p> <p>5. There is a need for DepEd to provide each school of the NAT result in hard copy containing the individual student performance in five core subjects together with the detailed overall performance of the school for them to anchor on for their academic framework.</p> <p>6. There is a need for the school to conduct a survey among its students to find out on the factors such as technology, extracurricular activities, media, study habit and motivational practice of parents, etc. that may affect the academic performance of the students.</p>
<p>3. The adequacy of the re-certification was perceived to be exceeding the minimum standard however, the presence of verifiable facts and evidence to support the rating was perceived to be the lowest or the weakness.</p>	<p>7. There is a need for the implementing agency, DepEd and FAPE to require the beneficiary schools to really prepare and present evidences so their rating in this area will improve likewise the assessors will have a concrete means of verifying the validity of their actions based on the guidelines of the program.</p> <p>8. There is a need for the beneficiary schools to present the necessary report and documentation in detail in a portfolio.</p>
<p>4. Monitoring was found to be done only once or twice a year usually for head count purposes only.</p>	<p>9. FAPE and DepEd may strengthen monitoring to include other concerns like the strict compliance of the guidelines of the program.</p> <p>10. The implementing agencies, FAPE and DepEd may require the beneficiary schools to make profile among the ESC grantee students reflecting among others their economic status, academic performance, attendance in schools and parental involvement in their schooling.</p>

<p>5. It was found out that schools received the subsidy allotted for them; however the timeliness of the subsidy releases was perceived to have the lowest rating in the areas assessed.</p>	<p>11. Subsidy for the school year can be released earlier so that the impact of the implementation of the program can be felt by the beneficiaries. 12. There is a need for FAPE to give the fix additional slots of grantees to the recipient schools as early as February so documents can be all set before August 15 of the year. 13. In effect to number 12 policy recommendation, FAPE may change the deadline of the submission of documents as early as July 15 of the school year so subsidy to teachers and students can be released as early as second quarter of the school year.</p>
<p>6. Of the perceived practices by the respondents, engaging in community outreach activities by the school was considered a weakness.</p>	<p>14. FAPE may require the beneficiary schools to present or submit a strategic community outreach program aligned to the curriculum. 15. The School Administrators may organize a Student Community Outreach Activity to deepen the social consciousness and responsibility of the students with preference to the marginalized sectors of the society.</p>
<p>7. The following were perceived by the respondents as the hindering factors in the implementation of the GASTPE program:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Refusal of the public high school principals to declare “aisle” students. b. Lack of parental support on the other needs of the grantees c. The amount of subsidy is only for tuition fees d. The grantees are not poor the fact that they can pay for the top-ups. 	<p>16. DepEd as the managing agency may check each public high school principal in terms of its capacity to accommodate students for them to declare aisle students if in case. Thus achieving the objective of decongesting the public high schools. 17. There is a need for the School Administrators to conduct an orientation to parents and to the ESC grantee students to inform them of the guidelines of the GASTPE program and to make them realize that education is a collaborative effort of the parents, teachers and the students. In the same way the school through its Guidance and Counseling Department may organize a Good and Responsible Parenthood Seminar to let the parents understand their duties and obligation to their students. 18. The school may come up with student profiling to determine the less fortunate among the students for the school to create a special program address to the situation.</p>

The facilitating factors were: GASTPE has improved the school quality and maintained financial viability of private secondary schools; improved the standard of the school; ESC subsidy is cost effective; helps the teachers to stay in school for long; makes secondary education accessible to all students.

The following were considered as hindering factors: refusal of public school principals to declare “aisles students” hinders the purpose of decongestion; lack of parental support; the grantees are not poor the fact that the can pay for the top-ups hence preventing others who are less privilege to enroll; distance of home from school; lack of financial resources to defray other expenses in schooling; and less improvement in the delivery of program services.

The contribution of the GASTPE program was also sought considering support to facilities and assistance to teaching and learning. Eight indicators for support to facilities were considered wherein the highest mean is on the provision of electric fans per classrooms. Science and T.L.E. laboratories are equipped with the necessary fixtures, tools and equipment and the beneficiary school's campus has improved belonged to the top three indicators. On the other hand, the indicator getting the lowest mean are on the construction of additional classroom; the provision of athletic and playground facilities and the replacement of defective chairs and purchase of new and additional chairs.

Eight indicators were also considered as to the contribution of GASTPE program in terms of assistance to teaching and learning. The indicator with the highest mean is on the teachers' training and seminars are financed by the school followed by the organization and enhancement activities and programs are taken care of by the school and allocation of budget for students' support activities. On the other hand, the indicators with lowest mean are on the purchase of updated teaching and learning materials followed by purchase of new equipment in preparation for the senior high school; and purchase of additional computers, Science and TLE tools and equipment. The over-all rating for the contribution of the GASTPE program in terms of assistance to teaching and learning is 2.65 which means that the program has meet what is expected.

The hypothesis that there is no significant difference on the perceptions of the four groups of respondents considering the contribution of the GASTPE program to the beneficiary schools was tested using the One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). The test shows that the computed F-value of 1.6256 is less than the critical F-value of 2.9466 at 0.05 level of significance with degrees of freedom of 3 and 28.

The performance indicators which are considered in the study are seen to be increasing especially that of Agusan del Norte Division whereas that of Butuan City are erratic. This could be attributed to the fact that most of the residents are more mobile and itinerant compared to those who are in the municipalities in general.

CONCLUSION

The contribution of GASTPE program in terms of support to facilities and assistance to teaching and learning did not exceed as to what is expected per objectives of the program. This could be attributed to the findings that the construction of more classrooms is given less priority instead, the purchase of some facilities was given importance like electric fans per classrooms.

The implementation of the GASTPE program has met considerable impediments like the refusal of the public elementary school principals to declare aisle students though some of its objectives are met.

In some way, the GASTPE program has contributed to the schools' performance indicators such as enrolment rate, cohort survival rate, participation rate and completion rate as indicated in the previous discussion. Thus, the program has evolved into a useful mechanism that enables students to enroll in private schools as cited by a World Bank study (2011).

RECOMMENDATIONS

Likewise, sanctions for schools not compliant to the minimum standards as contained in the guidelines for this program can be also considered. This will gradually move schools to a performance- based scheme or approach based on program objectives.

Embolden administrators of beneficiary schools to strengthen and reinforce the expenditure of the 70-20-10 scheme for the use of GASTPE subsidy where 70 will go to the salary of teachers, 20 for school improvement and 10 for return of investment. In this way private schools will be able to increase at least a little bit of their holding power to teachers as well as make some renovations or construction of classrooms instead of just providing small classroom projects like purchase of electric fans.

There is a need to formulate an Instructional Program Coherence Policy on the part of the implementing agencies of GASTPE to augment the academic achievement of the students thus the objective of the program achieved.

LITERATURE CITED

DepEd Order No. 31, s. 2010. Policies and Guidelines on the Implementation of Education Service Contracting, education Voucher System and Grant of Salary

Subsidy to ESC Teachers in Private Secondary Education for School Year 20102011.

DepEd Order No. 31, s. 2011 Policies and Guidelines in the Implementation of Government Assistance to Students and Teachers in Private Education School Year 2011-2012

DpEd Order No. 116, s. 2009. Guidelines on the Grant of Teacher Salary Subsidy for the Education Service Contracting Program of the Government Assistance to Students and Teachers in Private Education for School Year 2009 2010.

Jeffares, S.; Sullivan, H. & Boivard, T. (2009). " Beyond the Contracts: The Challenge of Evaluating The Performance of Public-Private Partnerships. Paper for the 13th IRSPM Conference, April, Copenhagen, Denmark

La Roque, N. (2008). Public-Private Partnerships in Basic Education: An International Review, CfBT Education Trust. CfBT copyright.

PHILIPPINES Private Provision, Public Purpose. A Review of the Government's Education Service Contracting Program (2011). The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / The World Bank.

Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA). (2000). School Factors Related to Quality and Equity. Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development. Public-Private Partnership in Education. Webworldbank.org.

PhilStar Global (2029). Project DORP: Catches Dropping Out Students. Retrieved at www.philstar.com/education-and-home

Verspoor, Adrienne M. (2008). The Power of Partnership Working Together for Secondary Education In Sub-Saharan Africa.