Assessing basic education service delivery in the Philippines: Highlights from findings regarding teachers

The Philippines Public Education Expenditure Tracking and Quantitative Service Delivery Study
Study aims and approach

- Public spending tracking and quantitative service delivery survey
- Project design in consultation with key stakeholders (DepEd, DBM, NEDA, ANSA and academics)
- Key issues:
  - Resource flow, management and control
  - Existence, use and financing of inputs at school
  - Equity
  - School performance and resources

Breakdown of the Department of Education (DepEd) budget, 2015

- Teacher salaries, 62%
- Basic education facilities, 17%
- School MOOE, 4%
- Other DepEd spending, 16%
- Teacher training resources, 1%
Survey description

- Nationally representative excl. ARMM
- Sampling approach developed with international expert
- Survey implemented in 2014 Q4
- Extensive quality control at each level and 30% of questionnaires rechecked
- Data cleaning in first half of 2015
Key findings and policy directions
Teacher deployment has improved but signs of inefficiency in teacher allocation

- 123,000 (24% of stock) new teachers hired between 2011 and 2014. Average STR fell from:
  - 41:1 to 36:1 - elementary
  - 37:1 to 27:1 – high school

- but STRs still high compared to regional comparators and other lower-middle income countries (e.g. 31:1 in elementary)

Key findings

Teachers
Teacher deployment has improved but signs of inefficiency in teacher allocation

Based on DepEd standards, around 29% of elementary schools and 37% of high schools still have teacher shortages.

No standards but school principals suggest shortage of subject specialist teachers (Filipino, Makabayan).

New teacher allocations broadly in line with need.
Teacher absenteeism rates are low

Primary/elementary teacher absenteeism rates in selected countries, various years

- Surprise visits but at the beginning of the day
- Elementary (8%) and High School (6%) teacher absenteeism rates low
- Absenteeism for unofficial reasons very low but absenteeism for carrying out official duties relatively high
Big improvements in hiring process but significant delays still exist

- Significant reductions in the time taken to hire and deploy teachers
- In 2013, average time between DepEd division office receiving new posts to filling positions – 5 months
- In 2007, similar analysis showed average time was 18 months
- But about one-third of new teacher positions in SY 2013-14 unfilled at end of 2014
  - Partly related to delays in hiring process
  - But also final step in getting teachers into schools (verifying paperwork etc.)
- Significant inconsistencies/poor reporting in the recording of fund flows for new teachers between DBM region and DepEd Division offices
- Transfers rarely used (<2%) although key tool for dealing with weak teacher distribution

Key findings

Percentage of teacher posts allotted in 2013 where teachers were not in post by the final quarter of 2014

- Kindergarten: 30%
- Elementary: 20%
- High School: 30%
Key findings

Teachers’ performance on content knowledge assessments was poor

Percentage of questions answered correctly by the median teacher, 2014

- Subject based content assessment on K-12 curriculum – RCTQ PNU
- Detailed analysis shows that teachers possessed some knowledge but lacked higher order problem-solving skills needed to teach effectively
- New teachers did not perform significantly better or worse than more experienced teachers
- Results from teacher strengths and needs assessment show that teachers not very aware of their own deficiencies
Professional development is inadequate

• Most teachers receive some kind of in-service training but:
  ✓ Duration is shorter than other countries
  ✓ Often 'mass training' in school or DepEd office
  ✓ Outside experts rarely used
  ✓ Training not aligned with school or teacher needs

• ‘More and better in-service training’ was 2nd most frequent response by high school teachers when asked what they need to improve their teaching

• Common for principals to observe classroom teaching but little support for subject knowledge - mostly support for teaching practice

• Significant increase in funds for training but only 50% of funds downloaded to region and division offices

• Delays in downloading result in low utilization rates
  ✓ fewer than 15% of regional offices received their allotment by end of first quarter.
  ✓ 20% of divisions did not receive cash allocation for HRTD funds even after allotment released

• Bulk of funds accounted for but limited information on what regional and division offices use training funds for
• Teacher deployment improved but is still inefficient
• Teacher absenteeism rates are low
• Big improvements in hiring process but still significant delays
• Professional development is inadequate
• Teachers’ performance on knowledge assessments was poor
## Summary policy suggestions

### Key findings

**Teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Policy suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Further improvements in teacher distribution are needed** | • Further develop guidelines/norms for school-level teaching needs, particularly for subject-specific teachers in high schools  
• Monitor the distribution of teachers more closely to ensure efficiency and develop and implement the Human Resource Information System (HRIS)  
• Revise teacher transfer policy to make it a more effective tool to improve teacher distribution |
| **Hiring and deployment systems need to be strengthened** | • Strengthen the accountability of regional and divisional offices for carrying out processes in a timely way  
• Improve monitoring to ensure hiring timelines are met and that teachers are in post at the beginning of the school year  
• Improve coordination between the DBM and DepEd regional offices |
| **High teacher absenteeism in highly urbanized cities** | • Increase the authority of DepEd division offices and schools to deal with absenteeism  
• Link teachers’ attendance to their career development and performance bonuses  
• Explore the potential for increasing community involvement in monitoring teacher attendance |
• Full report
• A set of education notes:
  ✓ Education Note 1: Increasing Investment to Improve Basic Education Outcomes
  ✓ Education Note 2: Assessing Systems for Hiring and Deploying Teachers
  ✓ Education Note 3: Developing a Proficient and Motivated Teacher Workforce
  ✓ Education Note 4: Building Better Learning Environments
  ✓ Education Note 5: Assessing School-based Management
  ✓ Education Note 6: Providing Schools with Adequate Resources to Deliver Quality Education
  ✓ Education Note 7: Assessing the Role Played by Local Government in Supporting Basic Education
  ✓ Education Note 8: Understanding the Drivers of Public School Performance and Efficiency
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Availability of key facilities has improved but classroom deficits remain

Key findings

Infrastructure

Indicators of classroom quality from direct classroom observation

- Significant progress in addressing backlog of classroom construction. Between 2010 and 2013, 81,000 new classrooms built

- Student classroom ratio (SCR) fell from:
  - 46:1 to 43:1 in elementary schools
  - 64:1 to 47:1 in high schools

- Majority of schools have SCRs that meet DepEd norms (45:1 – 55:1) but 24% of elementary and 30% of big high schools in HUCs have SCRs in excess

- Around 1 in 7 existing classrooms are classified by DepEd as condemnable/condemned and others in poor state of repair

- Nearly 40% of high schools and 20% of elementary schools do not have enough toilets according to DepEd norms (50:1)

- School facilities in HUCs and other cities tend to be under more stress than municipal schools
Public infrastructure improvement projects suffer from poor implementation

- In 2014, PHP 45 billion (US$ 965 million) for infrastructure (16% of baseline spend) but utilization rate is low (64%)
- Allocations broadly in line with need but 30% of projects went to elementary schools that had SCRs below norms
- Low utilization partly due to:
  ✓ Delays in transferring project lists and funds
  ✓ Project implementation difficulties
- Project difficulties lead to low completion rates and dissatisfaction at the school level:
  ✓ Around a fifth of projects are reported as incomplete
  ✓ 40% of projects in 2013 rated as unsatisfactory by schools
- Large discrepancies in tracking elementary school projects:
  ✓ Schools only confirmed half of the projects recorded by DepEd/DPWH
  ✓ but 25% of projects reported at schools could not be found in DepEd/DPWH records
  ✓ Content of projects also differed even when schools verified project had took place

Common problems faced by DPWH in implementing school infrastructure projects, 2014

- Insufficient funds for hauling
- Site availability
- Impractical uniform pricing
- Attracting contract bidders
- Insufficient DPWH staff
- Late receipt of project list
- Specifications too rigid
- Political intervention

Key findings

Infrastructure
Limited discretionary funding at the school level

Composition of all school funding, 2013/14 school year (PHP 000s)

- Over 80% of school funding devoted to teacher and staff salaries
- Less than 15% of school revenue is available to schools to use for operational expenses and support improvement plans
- Over 80% of funds come from national government (70%-83% of discretionary funds)
- DepEd discretionary funds channelled through school MOOE and SBM grants
- Significant disparities in discretionary funding between schools serving wealthy and poor students
  - Wealthiest 20% of students attend schools that have on average 50% more non-MOOE discretionary funding
Significant portion of MOOE allocations do not reach
schools

- School MOOE appropriations increased significantly since 2011
  - Elementary – PHP 317 (US$ 7) to PHP 566 (US$ 13)
  - High school – PHP 731 (US$ 16) to PHP 948 (US$ 21)
- But recent work suggest that allocation needs to more than double to meet DepEd norms
- Formula used for MOOE funding but actual allocation often different
- Lack of knowledge of formula in division offices, schools and among parents
- Only 77% of total allocations for MOOE reached schools in 2013
  - equivalent to PHP 1.8 billion (US$ 39 mill) of total MOOE appropriation
- Over 60% of division offices held onto some MOOE despite obligation to download in full
  - Used retained funds to procure items on schools behalf

Key findings
School funding and management

Share of original MOOE allocation downloaded and received, 2013

- Central MOOE allocation: 100%
- MOOE downloaded to schools by division: 84%
- MOOE received by schools from division: 77%
Schools face significant difficulties in using MOOE funds

- 70% of schools unable to use all of the MOOE funds they receive because:
  - Difficulties in meeting reporting requirements
  - Insufficient time
  - Difficult to identify suppliers

- Difficulties result in significant delays in submitting liquidation reports
  - Over half of liquidation reports in elementary schools and two-thirds in high schools are submitted late

- and delays/cancelling of further MOOE advances

- Managing and accounting for funds by schools is onerous
Transparency and accountability for fund use is relatively weak at the school level

- Transparency – regulations obligate schools to maintain a transparency board but fewer than 60% of schools had board displaying MOOE information

- Majority of schools rate themselves at the lowest level of implementing school based management

- School level accountability through School Governing Council (SGC) and Parents Teacher Association is generally weak

- Limited involvement of parents in school decision making
  - Only 13% of elementary schools received input from SGCs on MOOE use

- Parental awareness of school level institutions, processes and performance is low
  - Most schools have an SGC but few parents are aware
  - Fewer than half of parents were aware of school improvement plan (SIP)
  - Fewer than half of parents had seen the school report card or received a report on their own child

- Social accountability initiatives have limited coverage
  - Only 20% of high school principals aware of ‘Check My School’ and only 10% had received a visit in the last 2 years
Local government funding to basic education - low, declining and unequal

- Local government support to basic education small and declining
  - PHP 14.3 billion (US$ 310 million) in 2014.
  - 6% of total public spending on basic
  - PHP 744 (US$ 16) per basic education student
  - Large unspent surplus of SEF

- Large regional and school level inequalities
  - Wealthier regions have higher LGU spending
  - NCR accounts for 44% of all LGU spending despite having only 10% of basic education students
  - LGU spending reinforces inequality at the ES level

- Fewer than 50% of schools receive direct LGU funding and support is very small (<5%) and mostly in-kind

- Only 58% of total LGU funding accounted for at school level.

- No consistent reporting on what remaining funds spent on (teacher allowances and utility payment possible)

- Reflects large inconsistencies and poor reporting
  - 24% of elementary schools reported no LGU funding despite LGU reporting support

Composition of annual school funding in schools reporting direct LGU support (PHP 000s), 2013/14

- DepEd
- Barangay
- Local school boards
- Other
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy directions</th>
<th>Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase public spending on education</td>
<td>• Despite significant improvements infrastructure and teacher shortages remain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• More school level discretionary and professional development funding needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve allocation through better planning</td>
<td>• Introduce medium term planning (2-3 years) for key resource inputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increase role of division/district offices and schools in planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give schools greater authority and simplify reporting</td>
<td>• Give greater authority to schools during implementation (e.g. infrastructure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Simplify reporting requirements for MOOE through grant approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve transparency of fund allocation and resource use</td>
<td>• Developing simple reporting formats and bolster incentives (e.g. LGU seal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Introduce and widely disseminate a set of school standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen role of school governing councils/ PTAs</td>
<td>• Increase authority of SGC in oversight of school planning and resource use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Raise awareness of SGC role and provide support/training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address funding and quality inequalities</td>
<td>• Focus on ‘schools under stress’ to address poor learning environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Introduce equity component into division and school funding formulas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>