

January 8, 2024

### REGIONAL MEMORANDUM PPRD-2024-005

#### RESULTS OF POLICY RESEARCH REVIEW STUDY ON PROGRESS MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF PPRD'S SPRING FLAGSHIP PROGRAM BASED ON KIRKPATRICK'S MODEL

To: Schools Division Superintendents

1. This has reference to Region Memorandum PPRD-2023-001 regarding "PPRD 2023 Research Agenda as Mechanism in the Development of Research-Enabled Innovations," wherein one of the research agenda to be undertaken for FY 2023 is originally proposed as "A Progress Monitoring and Evaluation of PPRD SPRING Flagship Program Towards an Enhanced Implementation." After firming-up the research directions of this study, it is then revised into "Progress Monitoring and Evaluation of PPRD's SPRING Flagship Program Based on Kirkpatrick's Model Towards Development of an Enhanced Implementation Framework."

2. This is to reiterate that this research undertaking is in line with the Policy, Planning & Research Division (PPRD) Operational Manual (OM) 2022, particularly on Policy Development Process with focus on the sub-processes on: "Policy Implementation and Review," which is anchored on "One DepEd, One QMS" strategic direction of DepEd CO.

3. Generally, this study has deemed to formulate an enhanced implementation framework as continuous improvement mechanism of the Policy, Planning and Research Division (PPRD) vis-à-vis its Key Result Areas (KRAs) as embedded in its Annual Implementation Plan (AIP) as part and parcel of the Six-Year Master Plan.

- 4. Specifically, it has sought answers to the following research objectives:
  - 4.1 Determine the progress in terms of the level of implementation of PPRD's SPRING Flagship Program vis-à-vis four component projects of the four Pillars and Enabling Mechanism on Governance of Basic Education: Pillar 1 on Access: Project RISE and ICE; Pillar 2 on Equity: Project ARIA; Pillar 3 on Quality: Project ASPIRE; Pillar 4 on Resiliency and Well-being: Project RESIST; and Enabling Mechanisms on Governance: Project FIRSTS.
  - 4.2 Determine *if there is significant difference between the evaluation of SDO and RO key personnel* towards the level of implementation of PPRD's SPRING Flagship Program vis-à-vis four component projects of the four Pillars and Enabling Mechanism on Governance of Basic Education.
  - 4.3 Identify the facilitating factors based on Kirkpatrick's Evaluation Model that improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the implementation of the varied project components of PPRD's SPRING Flagship Program.







4.4 Formulate an enhanced implementation framework as continuous improvement mechanism of the PPRD geared towards efficient and effective implementation of the project components of SPRING Flagship Program needing further improvement, based on the results of the study.

5. After conducting thorough analysis and interpretation of the quantitative and qualitative data gathered, this research undertaking has firmed-up the results of the study, which can be used by RFDs and SDOs as reference in conducting research evaluation of their respective flagship program. See attached *Enclosure 1* for your reference.

6. For further inquiries, you may reach Dr. Glenn A. Bisnar – PPRD Chief, through his email address at <u>glenn.bisnar@deped.gov.ph</u>.

7. For immediate dissemination and compliance of all concerned.

Enclosures: As stated References: Region Memorandum PPRD No. 2023-001; Region Memorandum PPRD-2023-077: DepEd Order No. 32, s. 2018; DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2022; DepEd Order No. 29, s. 2022 Allotment: None To be indicated in the Perpetual Index under the following Subjects: PROGRAM RESEARCH DATA

GAB/PPRD/RM – RESULTS OF POLICY RESEARCH REVIEW STUDY ON PROGRESS MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF PPRD'S SPRING FLAGSHIP PROGRAM BASED ON KIRKPATRICK'S MODEL 005/January 8, 2023





Enclosure 1 to Region Memorandum PPRD-2024-005

#### Progress Monitoring and Evaluation of PPRD's SPRING Flagship Program Based on Kirkpatrick's Model Towards Development of an Enhanced Implementation Framework

#### I. Rationale and Brief Background of the Study

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) plays a vital role in improving an organization. The International Labor Organization defined it as the process that allows policymakers and program managers to assess: how an intervention evolves over time (monitoring); how effectively a program was implemented and whether there are gaps between the planned and achieved results (evaluation); and whether the changes in well-being are due to the program and to the program alone (impact evaluation).

This study has reference to Region Memorandum PPRD No. 2023-001 regarding "PPRD 2023 Research Agenda as Mechanism in the Development of Research-Enabled Innovations," wherein one of the research agenda to be undertaken for Quarter 4 of FY 2023 is entitled, "Progress Monitoring and Evaluation of PPRD's SPRING (Strengthening data-driven Programs through Relevant, Inclusive & Nurturing Governance mechanisms) Flagship Program Towards an Enhanced Implementation)." This research undertaking is in line with the Policy, Planning & Research Division (PPRD) Operational Manual (OM) 2023, particularly on Policy Development Process with focus on the sub-processes on: "Policy Implementation and Review," which is anchored on "One DepEd, One QMS" strategic direction of DepEd CO.

The focus of this policy research review is to determine PPRD's level of implementation as embedded in its SPRING Flagship Program vis-a-vis the following regulatory and statutory legal bases:

- DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2022: Adoption of the Basic Education Development Plan 2030
- DepEd Order No. 29, s. 2022: Adoption of the Basic Education Monitoring and Evaluation Framework
- Republic Act No. 9155: "An Act Instituting a Framework of Governance for Basic Education, Establishing Authority and Accountability, Renaming the Department of Education, Culture and Sports as the Department of Education, and for Other Purposes"
- Republic Act No. 10533: "An Act Enhancing the Philippine Basic Education System by Strengthening its Curriculum and Increasing the Number of Years for Basic Education, Appropriating Funds Therefore and for Other Purposes

Aravossis (2015) posited the importance of the evaluation of investment projects leading to regional development which is the subject of major importance in decision-making and demonstrates the need for appropriate modeling resulting from the use of the economic criteria.





Likewise, Reynolds et. al. (2013) stressed out the essence of applying the principles in existing comprehensive monitoring and evaluation (M&E) frameworks to outline a systematic approach to the M&E integration. The approach is grounded by first defining the specific health challenges that integration is intended to affect.

In addition, Datahan (2020) in her study attempted to describe the practices of school principals in terms of outcome evaluation, on tracking intermediate results and on progress monitoring. It further aimed to identify the level of performance in schools monitoring, evaluation and adjustments in areas such as evaluating school performance; learner tracking; instructional supervision; tracking staff performance; managing resources; and monitoring SIP implementation.

Indeed, the important role of M&E is really indepensable. The literature reviewed conceptualized M&E as the basis of further understanding the key components of M&E and M&E systems as an important public management tool used to demonstrate results (Matshali, 2015).

Hence, in the context of PPRD's Flagship Program SPRING, this study would provide clearer directions on how to further improve its implementation towards better results of its deliverables.

### II. Research Goals and Objectives

Generally, this study has deemed to formulate an enhanced implementation framework as continuous improvement mechanism of the Policy, Planning and Research Division (PPRD) vis-à-vis its Key Result Areas (KRAs) as embedded in its Annual Implementation Plan (AIP) as part and parcel of the Six-Year Master Plan.

Specifically, it has sought answers to the following research objectives:

- 1. Determine the progress in terms of the level of implementation of PPRD's SPRING Flagship Program vis-à-vis four component projects of the four Pillars and Enabling Mechanism on Governance of Basic Education:
  - 1.1 Pillar 1 on Access: Project RISE and ICE;
  - 1.2 Pillar 2 on Equity: Project ARIA;
  - 1.3 Pillar 3 on Quality: Project ASPIRE;
  - 1.4 Pillar 4 on Resiliency and Well-being: Project RESIST; and
  - 1.5 Enabling Mechanisms on Governance: Project FIRSTS.
- 2. Determine *if there is significant difference between the evaluation of SDO and RO key personnel* towards the level of implementation of PPRD's SPRING Flagship Program vis-à-vis four component projects of the four Pillars and Enabling Mechanism on Governance of Basic Education.
- 3. Identify the facilitating factors based on Kirkpatrick's Evaluation Model that improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the implementation of the varied project components of PPRD's SPRING Flagship Program.







4. Formulate an enhanced implementation framework as continuous improvement mechanism of the PPRD geared towards efficient and effective implementation of the project components of SPRING Flagship Program needing further improvement, based on the results of the study.

This research study is anchored on the following Conceptual Framework using Input-Process-Output Model. See Figure 1 on the next page:

INPUT	PROCESS OUTPUT
<ul> <li>A. Level of Developmental Needs of Last Mile Schools on the following Aspects:</li> <li>* Pillar 1 on Access: Project RISE and ICE</li> <li>* Pillar 2 on Equity: Project ARIA</li> <li>* Pillar 3 on Quality: Project ASPIRE;</li> <li>* Pillar 4 on Resiliency and Well-being: Project RESIST</li> <li>* Enabling Mechanisms on Governance: Project FIRSTS</li> <li>B. Facilitating Factors based on Kirkpatrick's Evaluation Model for the improvement of Efficiency and Effectiveness of the Implementation of the varied Project Components of PPRD's SPRING Flagship Program</li> </ul>	Phase 1: Development of Research Directions of the StudyEnhanced Implementation of PPRD's SPRING (Strengthening data-drivenPhase 2: Formulation and Finalization of Research Proposal & Survey Questionnaireof PPRD's SPRING (Strengthening data-driven Program through OnlinePhase 3: Administration of Research Survey Questionnaire through Onlineof PPRD's SPRING (Strengthening 

### Figure 1: Conceptual Framework of the Study

### III. Research Methodology

This policy research review used Explanatory Sequential Research Design by utilizing Mixed Method. The following Figure 2: **Research Methodology Framework of the Study** provides the summary in terms of sampling technique, data gathering tools, data gathering technique, and data analysis technique:





### Department of Education

SOCCSKSARGEN REGION

<b>Research</b> Method <b>Explanatory Sequential Research Design</b> (Mixed Research Design)				
Sampling	Purposive Sampling: 127 Respondents (SDO -100, RO -			
Technique	27); 6 Participants (FGD)			
Data Gathering	Online Survey Questionnaire on "Progress M&E of PPRD's SPRING			
Tool	Flagship Program;" FGD Guide Protocol			
Data Gathering Technique	Online Survey using Google Sheet; FGD			
Data Analysis	Quantitative Data: Weighted Mean, t test			
Techniques	Qualitative: Generic Qualitative Data Analysis Technique			

Figure 2: Research Methodology Framework of the Study

### IV. Presentation, Analysis and Interpretation of Data

Based on the thorough analysis and interpretation of both quantitative and qualitative data, the following are the summary of results of the study:

### Table 1: Level of Implementation of PPRD's SPRING Flagship Program - Pillar1 on Access: Project RISE as Evaluated by RO & SDO Key Personnel

No.	Project Component Indicators	SDO Key Personnel n = 100		RO Key Personnel n = 27		<b>Overall Mean</b> n = 127	
		WM	Desc.	WM	Desc.	WM	Desc.
1	Research-enabled interventions dissemination of BERF and non- BERF researches' theme on Child Protection & Human Resource Development via Regional Research Congress	3.59	Very Good	3.51	Very Good	3.55	Very Good
2	Institutionalization of the regular conduct of policy review related to access	3.56	Very Good	3.54	Very Good	3.55	Very Good
3	<b>S</b> eeking TA to CO and firming- up mechanisms to resolve LIS issues and concerns	3.52	Very Good	3.45	Very Good	3.48	Very Good
4	<b>E</b> stablishing policy mechanism for multi-stakeholders' partnership to reach-out learners in GIDA areas and last miles schools	3.52	Very Good	3.41	Very Good	3.46	Very Good
Average Mean		3.55	Very Good	3.48	Very Good	3.51	Very Good

Generally, the overall mean in the level of implementation of Pillar 1 on Access: Project RISE is 3.51, described as Very Good (VG); the project components with the highest weighted mean of 3.55 (VG) are "Research-enabled interventions dissemination of BERF and non-BERF researches' theme on Child Protection &





SOCCSKSARGEN REGION

Human Resource Development via Regional Research Congress and Institutionalization of the regular conduct of policy review related to access;" while the bottom project component is "Establishing policy mechanism for multistakeholders' partnership to reach-out learners in GIDA areas and last miles schools" with the weighted mean of 3.46 (VG).

### Table 2: Level of Implementation of PPRD's SPRING Flagship Program - Pillar 1on Access: Project RISE as Evaluated based on Kirkpatrick's Model

Kirkpatrick's Model	Indicators
Level 1: Reaction	Commitment of PPRD's personnel learning from LAC Session to fully support project components of Project RISE
Level 2: Learning	Establishment of accountability mechanisms among PPRD personnel as basis to conduct policy research agenda and other interventions on access to resolve LIS issues & concerns & strengthen multi- <u>stakeholders</u> partnership for GIDA areas & Last Mile Schools
Level 3: Behavioral Change	* Provision of TA to SEPS for Planning & Research & BERF Recipients * Conduct research colloquium (Sarangani) & poster display (PPRD) to disseminate research findings by PPRD personnel
Level 4: Organizational Performance	* Institutionalization of culture of research among schools in 8 SDOs * Conduct of Regional Research Congress 2023 last Sept. 14-15, <u>2023</u> to disseminate BERF and non-BERF researches' theme on Child Protection & Human Resource Development

## Table 3: Level of Implementation of PPRD's SPRING Flagship Program - Pillar 1on Access: Project ICE as Evaluated by RO & SDO Key Personnel

No.	Project Component Indicators	SDO Key Personnel n = 100		RO Key Personnel n = 27		<b>Overall Mean</b> n = 127	
		WM	Desc.	WM	Desc.	WM	Desc.
1	Increasing schools through data- driven policy: with provision of health and sanitation facilities, to implement learners' mental health and psycho- social aspects, and with ideal learners to classroom ratio.	3.37	Very Good	3.38	Very Good	3.38	Very Good
2	<b>Conduct research-based policy:</b> for the establishment of CLCs in high demand areas, on continuously improving ALS M&E System, and on ALS external stakeholders' involvement in revitalizing ALS Program	3.41	Very Good	3.32	Very Good	3.36	Very Good
3	<b>Enforcement of policy mechanism:</b> for the establishment of secondary schools to areas with less access to secondary education, for close coordination between elementary and secondary schools to ensure effective transition of learners, and for effective bridging strategies to address learning gaps among secondary schools	3.56	Very Good	3.47	Very Good	3.51	Very Good
Ave	Average Mean		Very Good	3.39	Very Good	3.42	Very Good





Generally, the overall mean in the level of implementation of **Pillar 1 on Access: Project ICE** is **3.42**, described as **Very Good (VG)**; the project component with the highest weighted mean of 3.51 (VG) is "**Enforcement of policy mechanism:** for the establishment of secondary schools to areas with less access to secondary education, for close coordination between elementary and secondary schools to ensure effective transition of learners, and for effective bridging strategies to address learning gaps among secondary schools;" while the bottom project component is "**Conduct research-based policy:** for the establishment of CLCs in high demand areas, on continuously improving ALS M&E System, and on ALS external stakeholders' involvement in revitalizing ALS Program" with the weighted mean of **3.38 (VG)**.

### Table 4: Level of Implementation of PPRD's SPRING Flagship Program - Pillar 1on Access: Project ICE as Evaluated based on Kirkpatrick's Model

Kirkpatrick's Model	Indicators
Level 1: Reaction	Commitment of PPRD's personnel learning from LAC Session to fully support project components of Project ICE
Level 2: Learning	Establishment of accountability mechanisms among PPRD personnel as basis to conduct policy research agenda to <u>improve:</u> health & sanitation, ALS implementation, establishment of secondary schools, addressing learning gaps among secondary learners
Level 3: Behavioral Change	Conduct of research-based training programs for school heads of extension & annex schools (RM PPRD 2023-48, 53 & 56)
Level 4: Organizational Performance	* Availability of PMIS Funds as support for the training of 133 pax * Creation of GC as communication channel for provision of TA to all issues & concerns of SHs

### Table 5: Level of Implementation of PPRD's SPRING Flagship Program - Pillar 2on Equity: Project ARIA as Evaluated by RO & SDO Key Personnel

No.	Project Component Indicators	<b>SDO Key</b> <b>Personnel</b> n = 100		RO Key Personnel n = 27		<b>Overall Mean</b> n = 127	
		WM	Desc.	WM	Desc.	WM	Desc.
1	Accessibility of data sets by requesting partners (LGUs, Line and Government Agencies) through distribution of Region Profile	3.37	Very Good	3.31	Very Good	3.34	Very Good
2	<b>R</b> esearch-enabled interventions dissemination of BERF and non- BERF research findings on Child Protection & Human Resource Development via Regional Research Congress	3.63	Very Good	3.46	Very Good	3.54	Very Good
3	Institutionalization of the regular conduct of policy review related to equity (Inclusive Programs: SPEd, MG, FLO, ALS, MEP, IPEd)	3.37	Very Good	3.5	Very Good	3.44	Very Good
4	Annual provision to RO program holders & SDO top management of data on resources ratio against learners as basis for evidence- based interventions	3.56	Very Good	3.55	Very Good	3.55	Very Good
Ave	Average Mean		Very Good	3.46	Very Good	3.47	Very Good





SOCCSKSARGEN REGION

Generally, the overall mean in the level of implementation of **Pillar 2 on Equity: Project ARIA** is **3.47**, described as **Very Good (VG)**; the project component with the highest weighted mean of **3.55 (VG)** is "**A**nnual provision to RO program holders & SDO top management of data on resources ratio against learners as basis for evidence-based interventions;" while the bottom project component is "**A**ccessibility of data sets by requesting partners (LGUs, Line and Government Agencies) through distribution of Region Profile" with the weighted mean of **3.34 (VG)**.

### Table 6: Level of Implementation of PPRD's SPRING Flagship Program - Pillar 2on Equity: Project ARIA as Evaluated based on Kirkpatrick's Model

Kirkpatrick's Model	Indicators			
Level 1: Reaction	Commitment of PPRD's personnel learning from LAC Session to fully support project components of Project ARIA			
Level 2: Learning	ng Establishment of accountability mechanisms among PPRD personnel as basis to conduct policy research agenda to improve equity through programs on ALS, IPEd, MG			
Level 3: Behavioral Change	* Conduct of research-based training programs for school heads of extension & annex schools (RM PPRD 2023-48, 53 & 56) * Provision of data sets by requesting partners (LGUs, Line and Government Agencies) through distribution of Region Profile			
Level 4: Organizational Performance	* Firmed-up data on crucial resources as inputs to Annual Investment Program (AIP) * Involvement of program holders to fully institutionalize PMIS			

### Table 7: Level of Implementation of PPRD's SPRING Flagship Program - Pillar 3on Quality: Project ASPIRE as Evaluated by RO & SDO Key Personnel

No.	Project ComponentSDO Key PersonnelRO Key Personnel.Indicatorsn = 100n = 27		<b>Overall Mean</b> n = 127				
		WM	Desc.	WM	Desc.	WM	Desc.
1	Accelerating multi-stakeholders' involvement for the promotion of quality education for the minimization of external threats through a contextualized policy dissemination (Key Stages 1-4 & ALS)	3.56	Very Good	3.41	Very Good	3.48	Very Good
2	Strengthening partnership with external organizations to cross-train PPRD personnel and division counterparts on high level programming and strategic planning towards formulation of quality-related interventions (Key Stages 1-4 & ALS)	3.48	Very Good	3.56	Very Good	3.52	Very Good
3	Potential collaboration with external partners on research undertakings related to advancement of quality education (Key Stage 1- 4 & ALS)	3.56	Very Good	3.4	Very Good	3.48	Very Good
4	Institutionalization of the regular conduct of policy review related to quality (Key Stage 1-4 & ALS)	3.56	Very Good	3.46	Very Good	3.51	Very Good
5	Research-enabled interventions through dissemination of BERF and non-BERF research findings on "Teaching and Learning" via Regional Research Congress (Key Stages 1-4 & ALS)	3.56	Very Good	3.57	Very Good	3.56	Very Good
6	Establishing contextualized policy on strategic partnership with LGUs & NGOs to accelerate quality indicators of learners in the GIDA area and last miles schools (Key Stages 1-4 & ALS)	3.37	Very Good	3.43	Very Good	3.40	Very Good
Avera	age Mean	3.51	Very Good	3.47	Very Good	3.49	Very Good

Generally, the overall mean in the level of implementation of **Pillar 3 on Quality: Project ASPIRE** is **3.49**, described as **Very Good (VG)**; the project





SOCCSKSARGEN REGION

component with the highest weighted mean of 3.56 is "**R**esearch-enabled interventions through dissemination of BERF and non-BERF research findings on "Teaching and Learning" via Regional Research Congress (Key Stages 1-4 & ALS;" while the bottom project component is "**E**stablishing contextualized policy on strategic partnership with LGUs & NGOs to accelerate quality indicators of learners in the GIDA area and last miles schools (Key Stages 1-4 & ALS)" with the weighted mean of **3.40 (VG)**.

### Table 8: Level of Implementation of PPRD's SPRING Flagship Program - Pillar 3on Quality: Project ASPIRE as Evaluated based on Kirkpatrick's Model

Kirkpatrick's Model	Indicators
Level 1: Reaction	Commitment of PPRD's personnel learning from LAC Session to fully support project components of Project ASPIRE to: * Conduct Partnership Forum among stakeholders of last mile schools in GIDA areas * Intensify dissemination drive of the research findings of research among Last Mile Schools
Level 2: Learning	* Proper implementation of BERA in all governance level (Teaching & Learning) * Provision of TA on research to pre-service teachers
Level 3: Behavioral Change	Quality assurance of alignment of SUCs/HEIs thesis & dissertation through issuance of permit to conduct research
Level 4: Organizational Performance	Conduct of Regional Research Congress 2023 last Sept. 14-15, <u>2023</u> to disseminate BERF and non-BERF researches' theme on Teaching and Learning

#### Table 9: Level of Implementation of PPRD's SPRING Flagship Program - Pillar 4 on Resiliency & Well-being: Project RESIST as Evaluated by RO & SDO Key Personnel

No.	Project Component	<b>SDO Key</b> <b>Personnel</b> n = 100		RO Key Personnel n = 27		<b>Overall Mean</b> n = 127	
	Indicators	WM	Desc.	WM	Desc.	WM	Desc.
1	Research-enabled interventions through dissemination of BERF and non-BERF research findings in strengthening rights-based education through Inclusive Education, DRRM & GAD via Regional Research Congress	3.59	Very Good	3.51	Very Good	3.55	Very Good
2	<b>E</b> ngagement of stakeholders for the revitalization of organizational system for the promotion of CFSS via varied platforms through reinforcement policy	3.56	Very Good	3.49	Very Good	3.52	Very Good
3	Support System Research-based Policy via holistic interventions (Help desk, Online Guidance & Counseling, Peer Mentoring) to address issues affecting learners' well-being	3.41	Very Good	3.52	Very Good	3.46	Very Good
4	Institutionalization of the regular conduct of policy review related to resiliency and well-being to ensure that learners are safe and protected, and can protect themselves from risks and impacts from natural and human-induced hazards	3.44	Very Good	3.48	Very Good	3.46	Very Good
5	${\bf S}$ trengthening PMIS to strategically implement PPAs that support learners' well-being in GIDA areas and last miles schools	3.56	Very Good	3.54	Very Good	3.55	Very Good
6	<b>T</b> echnical Assistance provision in conducting Action Research (AR) regarding issues affecting learners' physical, mental, and emotional fortitude to cope with various challenges in life	3.52	Very Good	3.47	Very Good	3.49	Very Good
Ave	Average Mean		Very Good	3.50	Very Good	3.51	Very Good

Generally, the overall mean in the level of implementation of **Pillar 4 on Resiliency & Well-being: Project RESIST** is **3.51**, described as **Very Good (VG)**; the project components with the highest weighted mean of 3.55 (VG) are "**R**esearch-





SOCCSKSARGEN REGION

enabled interventions through dissemination of BERF and non-BERF research findings in strengthening rights-based education through Inclusive Education, DRRM & GAD via Regional Research Congress, and Strengthening PMIS to strategically implement PPAs that support learners' well-being in GIDA areas and last miles schools;" while the bottom project components are "Support System Researchbased Policy via holistic interventions (Help desk, Online Guidance & Counseling, Peer Mentoring) to address issues affecting learners' well-being and Institutionalization of the regular conduct of policy review related to resiliency and well-being to ensure that learners are safe and protected, and can protect themselves from risks and impacts from natural and human-induced hazards" with the weighted mean of 3.46 (VG).

#### Table 10: Level of Implementation of PPRD's SPRING Flagship Program - Pillar 4 on Resiliency & Well-being: Project RESIST as Evaluated based on Kirkpatrick's Model

Kirkpatrick's Model	Indicators
Level 1: Reaction	Commitment of PPRD's personnel learning from LAC Session to fully support project components of Project RESIST to: * Formulate "Online Guidance and Peer Mentoring Framework in Addressing Issues Affecting Learners' Well-being" * Issue research-based policy on "Regional Guidelines in Establishing Help Desk for the Improvement of Learners' Mental Health"
Level 2: Learning	Proper implementation of BERA in all governance level on Inclusive Education, DRRM & GAD
Level 3: Behavioral Change	Implementation of PMIS to strengthen IPED, Madrasah, ELLN, SPED, FLO, SBFP & DRRM to GIDA areas
Level 4: Organizational Performance	Conduct of Regional Research Congress 2023 last Sept. 14-15, <u>2023</u> to disseminate BERF and non-BERF researches' theme on Inclusive Education, DRRM & GAD

# Table 11: Level of Implementation of PPRD's SPRING Flagship Program – Enabling Mechanisms on Governance: Project FIRSTS as Evaluated by RO & SDO Key Personnel

No.	Project Component	SDO Key Personnel n = 100		RO Key Personnel n = 27		<b>Overall Mean</b> n = 127	
	Indicators		Desc.	WM	Desc.	WM	Desc.
1	Full institutionalization in the regular conduct of Orientation Workshop on DO 40 s. 2016 for School Heads with schools having no School ID or not yet fully independent	3.52	Very Good	3.49	Very Good	3.50	Very Good
2	Institutionalization of Quarterly LAC Session on PITS (Policy Review, ICT-based Enabled Research System, Technology-based Statistical Research Analysis and Strategic Planning in the Formulation of AIP, RDIP & BED 2] and Quarterly Performance Review System through QuaMETASEA Framework	3.59	Very Good	3.54	Very Good	3.57	Very Good
3	Research-enabled interventions through dissemination of BERF and non-BERF research findings on Governance on Ideal learning environment and adequate learning resources via Regional Research Congress	3.44	Very Good	3.52	Very Good	3.48	Very Good
4	Strengthening conduct of Strategic, Medium-term and Operational Planning cum PMIS at all governance levels	3.52	Very Good	3.51	Very Good	3.51	Very Good
5	Technical Assistance to RO personnel & SDO counterparts on planning and budgeting, data management, research management and policy review related to management and governance through stakeholders' collaboration	3.48	Very Good	3.51	Very Good	3.50	Ver <del>y</del> Good
6	System approach in formulating research-based policy for the enhancement and strengthening of public-private complementarity	3.44	Very Good	3.51	Very Good	3.48	Very Good
Average Mean		3.50	Very Good	3.51	Very Good	3.51	Very Good

Table 12: Level of Implementation of PPRD's SPRING Flagship Program – Enabling Mechanisms on Governance: Project FIRSTS as Evaluated based on Kirkpatrick's Model





### Department of Education

SOCCSKSARGEN REGION

Kirkpatrick's Model	Indicators				
Level 1: Reaction	Commitment of PPRD's personnel learning from LAC Session to fully support project components of Project FIRST by: conducting policy research on "System Approach in Strengthening public-private complementarity"				
Level 2: Learning	PPRD personnel willing to learn Statistical Research Analysis (Weighted Mean, t-test, ANOVA, Cronbach Alpha) during LAC Sessions				
Level 3: Behavioral Change	Regular conduct of LAC Session focused on PITS (Policy Review, ICT-based Enabled Research System, Technology-based Statistical Research Analysis and Strategic Planning)				
Level 4: Organizational Performance	Conduct of Regional Research Congress 2023 last Sept. 14-15, <u>2023</u> to disseminate BERF and non-BERF researches' theme on Governance				

### Table 13: Significance Difference in the Level of Implementation of PPRD'sSPRING Flagship Programs as Evaluated by RO & SDO Key Personnel

SPRING Program Project Components	df	t-test	t-critical	Decision
Project RISE	8	2.5958796126598	2.30600413520417	Null hypothesis: Rejected
Project ICE	8	1.07808333506976	2.449691185114497	Null hypothesis: Accepted
Project ARIA	8	0.408069063324568	2.44691185114497	Null hypothesis: Accepted
Project ASPIRE	8	1.10557109555807	2.44691185114497	Null hypothesis: Accepted
Project RESIST	8	0.404194102358646	2.17881282966723	Null hypothesis: Accepted
Project FIRSTS	8	-0.660631221854713	2.17881282966723	Null hypothesis: Accepted

Under Project RISE, since the t stat value (2.59587496126598) is higher than the t critical value (2.30600413520417), therefore the null hypothesis is rejected. Hence, there is significant difference between the RO and SDO personnel's evaluation in the Implementation of PPRD's SPRING Flagship Program - Pillar 1 on Access: Project RISE. This apparently implies that in this aspect, both groups of respondents have slight varied perception of evaluation; hence, this component of SPRING Flagship Program needs to be given special attention in terms of strategy modification.

Meanwhile, under Projects ICE, ARIA, ASPIRE, RESIST, and FIRSTS, since the t-stat values are consistently lower than the t-critical values, therefore the null hypothesis is accepted. Hence, there is no significant difference between the RO and SDO personnel's evaluation in the implementation of such projects of PPRD's SPRING Flagship Program. This apparently implies that since both groups of evaluators manifested almost same level of perception as regards PPRD's implementation of; hence, these projects need to be sustained.

Based on the in-depth analyses of both quantitative and qualitative data of the study, the study was able to developed the following enhanced implementation framework as continuous improvement mechanism of the PPRD geared towards efficient and effective implementation of the project components of SPRING Flagship Program, as shown below:





Department of Education

SOCCSKSARGEN REGION

Enhanced Implementation PRIME Framework of PPRD's SPRING Flagship Program							
SPRING Flagship Program Project Components per Pillar			Kirkpatrick's Evaluation Model: Organizational Level Practices		Priority Project's Component Needing Enhancement		
Access	Project RISE	* Conduct of Regional Res	ulture of research in 8 SDOs search Congress to disseminate BERF and non- on Child Protection & Human Resource		Establishing policy mechanism for multi-stakeholders' partnership to reach-out learners in GIDA areas and last miles schools		
	Project ICE		* Research-based Training Program on PMIS for PPA holders * Creation of GC as communication channel for provision of TA to all issues & concerns of SHs		Conduct research-based policy for the establishment of CLCs in high demand areas, on continuously improving ALS M&E System, and on ALS external stakeholders' involvement in revitalizing ALS Program		
Equity Project ARIA		Investment Program (AIP	* Firmed-up data on crucial resources as inputs to Annual Investment Program (AIP) * Involvement of program holders to fully institutionalize PMIS		Accessibility of data sets by requesting partners (LGUs, Line and Government Agencies) through distribution of Region Profile		
Quality Project ASPIRE			Conduct of Regional Research Congress 2023 to disseminate BERF and non-BERF researches' theme on Teaching and Learning		Establishing contextualized policy on strategic partnership with LGUS & NGOs to accelerate quality indicators of learners in the GIDA area and last miles schools (Key Stages 1-4 & ALS)		
Resiliency & Well-being	Project	Conduct of Regional Re	Conduct of Regional Research Congress to disseminate BERF and non-BERF researches' theme on Inclusive Education, DRRM & GAD		Support System Research-based Policy via holistic interventions (Help desk, Online Guidance & Counseling, Peer Mentoring) to address issues affecting learners' well-being		
	RESIST				Institutionalization of the regular conduct of policy review related to resiliency and well-being to ensure that learners are safe and protected, and can protect themselves from risks and impacts from natural and human-induced hazards		
Enabling Mechanisms on	0 1 3		Conduct of Regional Research Congress to disseminate BERF and non- BERF researches' theme on Governance		Research-enabled interventions through dissemination of BERF and non- BERF research findings on Governance on ideal learning environment and adequate learning resources via Regional Research Congress		
Governance					System approach in formulating research-based policy for the enhancement and strengthening of public-private complementarity		
partnership intensification for strate learners in GIDA & Last Mile reque		Revitalizing distribution rategies of Region Profile to questing partners (LGUs & ine Government Agencies)	Improved contextualized policy on strategic partnership with LGUs & NGOs to accelerate quality indicators in GIDA areas & Last Mile schools	to resil holisti Online (	reaming policy review related liency & well-being through c interventions (Help desk, Juidance & Counseling, Peer Mentoring & DRRM)	Enhanced research-enabled interventions through improved learning environment & strengthened public-private complementarity	

Figure 3: Enhanced Implementation PRIME Framework of PPRD's SPRING Flagship Program

### V. Summary of Findings, Conclusion and Recommendation

### A. Summary of Findings

Based on the data presented, the following are the summary of findings:

- 1. The overall mean in the level of implementation of Pillar 1 on Access: Project RISE is 3.51, described as Very Good (VG); the project components with the highest weighted mean of 3.55 (VG) are "research-enabled interventions dissemination of BERF and non-BERF researches' theme on Child Protection & Human Resource Development via Regional Research Congress and institutionalization of the regular conduct of policy review related to access;" while the bottom project component is "establishing policy mechanism for multi-stakeholders' partnership to reach-out learners in GIDA areas and last miles schools" with the weighted mean of 3.46 (VG).
- 2. Since the t stat value (2.59587496126598) is higher than the t critical value (2.30600413520417), therefore the null hypothesis is rejected. Hence, there is significant difference between the RO and SDO personnel's evaluation in the Implementation of PPRD's SPRING Flagship Program Pillar 1 on Access: Project RISE. This apparently implies that in this aspect both groups of respondents have slight varied perception of evaluation; hence, this component of SPRING Flagship Program needs to be given special attention in terms of strategy modification.







- All levels of Kirkpatrick's Evaluation Model have been institutionalized under Pillar 1 on Access: Project RISE, with the following notable practices for Level 4: Organizational Performance: institutionalization of culture of research among schools in 8 SDOs and conduct of Regional Research Congress to disseminate BERF and non-BERF researches' theme on Child Protection & Human Resource Development.
- 4. Generally, the overall mean in the level of implementation of Pillar 1 on Access: Project ICE is 3.42, described as Very Good (VG); the project component with the highest weighted mean of 3.51 (VG) is "enforcement of policy mechanism: for the establishment of secondary schools to areas with less access to secondary education, for close coordination between elementary and secondary schools to ensure effective transition of learners, and for effective bridging strategies to address learning gaps among secondary schools;" while the bottom project component is "conduct research-based policy: for the establishment of CLCs in high demand areas, on continuously improving ALS M&E System, and on ALS external stakeholders' involvement in revitalizing ALS Program" with the weighted mean of 3.38 (VG).
- 5. Since the t stat value (1.07808333506976) is lower than the t critical value (2.44691185114497), therefore the null hypothesis is accepted. Hence, there is no significant difference between the RO and SDO personnel's evaluation in the Implementation of PPRD's SPRING Flagship Program Pillar 1 on Access: Project ICE. This implies apparently that in this aspect both group of evaluators manifested almost same level of perception as regards PPRD's implementation of Project ICE; hence, this shall be sustained.
- 6. All levels of Kirkpatrick's Evaluation Model have been institutionalized under Pillar 1 on Access: Project ICE, with the following notable practices for Level 4: Organizational Performance: availability of PMIS funds as support for the training of 133 participants, and creation of GC as communication channel for provision of TA to all issues & concerns of SHs.
- 7. Generally, the overall mean in the level of implementation of Pillar 2 on Equity: Project ARIA is 3.47, described as Very Good (VG); the project component with the highest weighted mean of 3.55 (VG) is "annual provision to RO program holders & SDO top management of data on resources ratio against learners as basis for evidence-based interventions"; while the bottom project component is "accessibility of data sets by requesting partners (LGUs, Line and Government Agencies) through distribution of Region Profile" with the weighted mean of 3.34 (VG).
- 8. Since the t stat value (0.408069063334568) is lower than the t critical value (2.30600413520417), therefore the null hypothesis is accepted. Hence, there is no significant difference between the RO and SDO personnel's evaluation in the Implementation of PPRD's SPRING Flagship Program Pillar 2 on Equity:





Project ARIA. This implies apparently that in this aspect both group of evaluators manifested almost same level of perception as regards PPRD's implementation of Project ARIA; hence, this shall be sustained.

- 9. All levels of Kirkpatrick's Evaluation Model have been institutionalized under Pillar 2 on Equity: Project ARIA, with the following notable practices for Level 4: Organizational Performance: firmed-up data on crucial resources as inputs to Annual Investment Program (AIP), and involvement of program holders to fully institutionalize PMIS.
- 10. Generally, the overall mean in the level of implementation of Pillar 3 on Quality: Project ASPIRE is 3.49, described as Very Good (VG); the project component with the highest weighted mean of 3.56 is "research-enabled interventions through dissemination of BERF and non-BERF research findings on "Teaching and Learning" via Regional Research Congress (Key Stages 1-4 & ALS;" while the bottom project component is "establishing contextualized policy on strategic partnership with LGUs & NGOs to accelerate quality indicators of learners in the GIDA area and last miles schools (Key Stages 1-4 & ALS)" with the weighted mean of 3.40 (VG).
- 11. Since the t stat value (1.10557109555807) is lower than the t critical value (2.17881282966723), therefore the null hypothesis is accepted. Hence, there is no significant difference between the RO and SDO personnel's evaluation in the Implementation of PPRD's SPRING Flagship Program Pillar 3 on Quality: Project ASPIRE. This apparently implies that in this aspect, both groups of evaluators manifested almost same level of perception as regards PPRD's implementation of Project ASPIRE; hence, this shall be sustained.
- All levels of Kirkpatrick's Evaluation Model have been institutionalized under Pillar 3 on Quality: Project ASPIRE, with the following notable practice for Level 4: Organizational Performance: conduct of Regional Research Congress 2023 last Sept. 14-15, 2023 to disseminate BERF and non-BERF researches' theme on Teaching and Learning.
- 13. Generally, the overall mean in the level of implementation of Pillar 4 on Resiliency & Well-being: Project RESIST is 3.51, described as Very Good (VG); the project components with the highest weighted mean of 3.55 (VG) are "research-enabled interventions through dissemination of BERF and non-BERF research findings in strengthening rights-based education through Inclusive Education, DRRM & GAD via Regional Research Congress, and Strengthening PMIS to strategically implement PPAs that support learners' well-being in GIDA areas and last miles schools;" while the bottom project components are "support System Research-based Policy via holistic interventions (Help desk, Online Guidance & Counseling, Peer Mentoring) to address issues affecting learners' well-being and Institutionalization of the regular conduct of policy review related to resiliency and well-being to ensure that learners are safe and protected, and can protect themselves from risks







and impacts from natural and human-induced hazards" with the weighted mean of 3.46 (VG).

- 14. Since the t stat value (0.404194102358646) is lower than the t critical value (2.17881282966723), therefore the null hypothesis is accepted. Hence, there is no significant difference between the RO and SDO personnel's evaluation in the Implementation of PPRD's SPRING Flagship Program Pillar 4 on Resiliency & Well-being: Project RESIST. This apparently implies that in this aspect, both groups of evaluators manifested almost same level of perception as regards PPRD's implementation of Project RESIST; hence, this shall be sustained.
- 15. All levels of Kirkpatrick's Evaluation Model have been institutionalized under Pillar 4 on Resiliency & Well-being: Project RESIST, with the following notable practice for Level 4: Organizational Performance: conduct of Regional Research Congress 2023 last Sept. 14-15, 2023 to disseminate BERF and non-BERF researches' theme on Inclusive Education, DRRM & GAD.
- 16. Generally, the overall mean in the level of implementation of Enabling Mechanisms on Governance: Project FIRSTS is 3.51, described as Very Good (VG); the project component with the highest weighted mean of 2.57 (VG) is "institutionalization of Quarterly LAC Session on PITS (Policy Review, ICT-based Enabled Research System, Technology-based Statistical Research Analysis and Strategic Planning in the Formulation of AIP, RDIP & BED 2) and Quarterly Performance Review System through QuaMETASEA Framework;" while the bottom project component are "research-enabled interventions through dissemination of BERF and non-BERF research findings on Governance on ideal learning environment and adequate learning resources via Regional Research Congress and system approach in formulating research-based policy for the enhancement and strengthening of public-private complementarity" with the weighted mean of 3.48 (VG).
- 17. Since the t stat value (-0.660631221854713) is lower than the t critical value (2.17881282966723), therefore the null hypothesis is accepted. Hence, there is no significant difference between the RO and SDO personnel's evaluation in the Implementation of PPRD's SPRING Flagship Program Enabling Mechanisms on Governance: Project FIRSTS. This implies apparently that in this aspect, both groups of evaluators manifested almost same level of perception as regards PPRD's implementation of Project FIRSTS; hence, this shall be sustained.
- 18. All levels of Kirkpatrick's Evaluation Model have been institutionalized under Enabling Mechanisms on Governance: Project FIRSTS, with the following notable practice for Level 4: Organizational Performance: conduct of Regional Research Congress 2023 last Sept. 14-15, 2023 to disseminate BERF and non-BERF researches' theme on Governance.





SOCCSKSARGEN REGION

19. The "Enhanced Implementation PRIME Framework of PPRD's SPRING Flagship Program" focuses on improving priority project components needing enhancement through the following strategic interventions: **P**olicy mechanisms on partnership intensification for learners in GIDA & Last Mile schools & ALS CLCs enhancement; Revitalizing distribution strategies of Region Profile to requesting partners (LGUs, Line and Government Agencies); Improved contextualized policy on strategic partnership with LGUs & NGOs to accelerate quality indicators in the GIDA area and last miles schools; **M**ainstreaming policy review related to resiliency and well-being through holistic interventions (Help desk, Online Guidance, Counseling, Peer Mentoring, DRRM); and **E**nhanced research-enabled interventions through an improved learning environment strengthened public-private & complementarity.

#### **B.** Conclusion

Based on the in-depth analysis of the quantitative and qualitative data presented, it can be drawn that the *"Enhanced Implementation PRIME Framework of PPRD's SPRING Flagship Program*" shall focus on improving priority project components needing enhancement through the following strategic interventions:

**P**olicy mechanisms on partnership intensification for learners in GIDA & Last Mile schools & ALS CLCs enhancement

**R**evitalizing distribution strategies of Region Profile to requesting partners (LGUs, Line and Government Agencies)

Improved contextualized policy on strategic partnership with LGUs & NGOs to accelerate quality indicators in the GIDA area and last miles schools

Mainstreaming policy review related to resiliency and well-being through holistic interventions (Help desk, Online Guidance, Counseling, Peer Mentoring, DRRM)

**E**nhanced research-enabled interventions through an improved learning environment & strengthened public-private complementarity

#### C. Recommendations

Based on the summary of findings and conclusion, the following are hereby recommended:

1. For the Regional Office to enforce the strategic directions dubbed as "*Enhanced Implementation PRIME Framework of PPRD's SPRING Flagship Program*," as major output of the study incorporating the proposed Terms of Reference (ToR) of the following RFDs:





### Department of Education

SOCCSKSARGEN REGION

- **Policy, Planning & Research Division (PPRD):** Leads in the formulation of the operationalization of the proposed five (5) innovative strategic directions.
- **Curriculum Learning Management Division (CLMD):** Finds alignment for the maximization of the research-based intervention in line with its Banner Project LINGAP.
- **Human Resource Development Division (HRDD):** Provides technical assistance in the development of training modules in the major component that deals with learning and development.
- **Quality Assurance Division (QAD):** Conducts M&E on the four major phases of this policy research review undertaking.
- Field Technical Assistance (FTAD): Takes charge in providing possible technical assistance mechanisms to fully implement its five (5) innovative strategic directions.
- Administrative Division (AD) & Finance Division (FD): Takes charge in the administrative aspects of this research-based intervention.
- Education Support Services Division (ESSD): Provides educational support services in the effective implementation of the "Enhanced Implementation PRIME Framework of PPRD's SPRING Flagship Program."

2. Formulate a brief policy recommendation, based on the results of the study vis-àvis QMS deliverables on Policy Formulation particularly on sub-processes on "Policy Implementation and Review."

3. For PPRD to develop implementation mechanisms of the following five (5) innovative strategic directions as major outputs of the study:

- **P**olicy mechanisms on partnership intensification for learners in GIDA & Last Mile schools & ALS CLCs enhancement
- **R**evitalizing distribution strategies of Region Profile to requesting partners (LGUs, Line and Government Agencies)
- Improved contextualized policy on strategic partnership with LGUs & NGOs to accelerate quality indicators in the GIDA area and last miles schools
- Mainstreaming policy review related to resiliency and well-being through holistic interventions (Help desk, Online Guidance, Counseling, Peer Mentoring, DRRM)
- **E**nhanced research-enabled interventions through an improved learning environment & strengthened public-private complementarity.

4. For all School Division Offices (SDOs) to utilize the research findings of this study as a blueprint in conducting progress monitoring and evaluation of their respective Flagship Programs.

5. For PPRD to further explore the following research agenda as offshoots of this research undertaking for implementation this FY 2024:





SOCCSKSARGEN REGION

Research Agenda	Proponents		
1. Utilization of Completed BERF Researches FY 2022 - 2023: Innovative Interventions, Major Challenges & Strategic Directions	Blessy Joie P. Barnuevo		
2. Community Learning Centers (CLCs) in Region XII: Bottlenecks, Creative Solutions and Technical Assistance Framework	<u>Revaldo</u> S. Gallardo		
3. A Proposed Regional Guidelines in Establishing Online Help Desk Guidance Counselling Program for the Improvement of Learners' Mental Health	Osop Pangilamun		
4. Validation of Session Guides in Strengthening Public-Private Complementarity towards Enhanced Governance of Basic Education among Last Mile Schools	Ulysses S. <u>Laruya</u>		
5. Machiavellian Leadership and Curriculum Management Practices and Performance of Secondary School Heads in SOCCSKSARGEN Region (adopted research study)	Dr. Glenn A. Bisnar		
6. Strengthening Complementarity Between Public and Private Schools in SOCCSKSARGEN: Current Innovations, Recurring Bottlenecks, Strategic Interventions			
7. A Proposed Needs-Based Training Program on PMIS Institutionalization for Implementing Units of SOCCSKSRAGEN Region	Lovely Z. Ramos		

### **VI. References**

- Aravossis, F. K. (2015). Literature Review on Monitoring and Evaluation of Projects Leading to Regional Development Proceedings of the 5<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Environmental Management, Engineering, Planning & Economics, Mykonos island, Greece, 14 – 18/06/2015.
- Datahan, P. J. (2020) School Monitoring Evaluation and Adjustment in Public Secondary Schools: Practices and Performance of Administrators. Journal of World Englishes and Educational Practices (JWEEP) ISSN: 2707 -7586 Website: www.jweep.org.
- DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2022: Adoption of the Basic Education Development Plan 2030.
- DepEd Order No. 29, s. 2022: Adoption of the Basic Education Monitoring and Evaluation Framework.
- Harper-Young, K. (2018). "The Impact of Progress Monitoring Structures on Student<br/>Achievement" (2018). Dissertations. 301.<br/>https://digitalcommons.nl.edu/diss/301.
- Mtshali, Z. (2015). A review of the monitoring and evaluation system to monitor the implementation of early childhood development within Gauteng Department of Health. oai:scholar.sun.ac.za:10019.1/97897.
- Ndungu, B. W. et. al. (2015). Influence of Monitoring and Evaluation by Principals on Effective Teaching and Learning in Public Secondary Schools in Githunguri District. Journal of Education and Practice www.iiste.org ISSN 2222-1735 (Paper) ISSN 2222-288X (Online) Vol.6, No.9, 2015.







- Niyivuga, B. et. al. (2019). Monitoring and Evaluation Practices and Academic Staff Motivation: Implications in Higher Education Within Rwanda Context. Retrieved at https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019829564 on January 3, 2024.
- Peschon, D. (2020). Feedback and the Effects on Progress Monitoring. Master's Theses & Capstone Projects. 217. https://nwcommons.nwciowa.edu/ education\_masters/217.
- Republic Act No. 9155: "An Act Instituting a Framework of Governance for Basic Education, Establishing Authority and Accountability, Renaming the Department of Education, Culture and Sports as the Department of Education, and for Other Purposes."
- Republic Act No. 10533: "An Act Enhancing the Philippine Basic Education System by Strengthening its Curriculum and Increasing the Number of Years for Basic Education, Appropriating Funds Therefore and for Other Purposes.
- Reynolds, H. W. & Sutherland, E. G. (2013). A Systematic Approach to the Planning, Implementation, Monitoring, and Evaluation of Integrated Health Services. BMC Health Services Research 13, Article Number:168 (2013).

