

ASSESSMENT DISPARITY ON SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL (SHS) CURRICULUM IMPLEMENTATION

LORLAINE R. DACANAY

*Talisay City National High School
+639661448550 / ldacanay@gmail.com*

SHANNA A. ORACION

*Mohon National High School
+639225201318 / shana.oracion@deped.gov.ph*

JOEBANIE A. BASE

*Borromeo Brothers Elementary School
+639661448550 / joebanie.base@deped.gov.ph*

Department of Education – Division of Talisay City
Rizal St. Talisay City, Cebu, 6045 Philippines

Corresponding Author:

LORLAINE R. DACANAY

*Talisay City National High School
+639661448550 / ldacanay@gmail.com
Talisay City National High School
Rizal St. Talisay City, Cebu Philippines*

Sponsoring Information:

Department of Education -
Basic Education Research Fund (BERF)

ABSTRACT

The study aims to assess the Senior High School (SHS) curriculum implementation of the Department of Education – Division of Talisay City in the school year 2018-2019. The findings of the study will be the bases for proposed improvements (1) What is the level of agreement among the students, stakeholders and education authorities before and after the SHS curriculum implementation? (2) Is there a significant change in the level of agreement among the curricular entities before and after the SHS curriculum implementation? (3) How do students, stakeholders and education authorities perceive the current SHS curriculum implementation? (4) Is there a significant difference in the perceptions among the students, stakeholders and education authorities in the current SHS curriculum implementation? The study is a quantitative approach employing descriptive cross-sectional, evaluative survey design. McNemar's [Change] Test Analysis of Variance (ANOVA or F-test) if the data is normal otherwise Welch or Brown-Forsythe Tests would be used. The implementation has several rooms for improvement on the acquisition of facilities and skilled teachers. Nonetheless, the assessment of the students who are the primary clients of the educational reform is satisfactory compared to the external stakeholders and educational authorities' assessment on senior high school implementation in Talisay City Division.

Keywords: Assessment, Curriculum Implementation, Curriculum Enhancement Senior High School, Department of Education, Philippines, Asia

1. INTRODUCTION

Enactment of the Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013” or RA 10533, the program has aims to promote students to work (*trabaho*), to venture in business (*negosyo*), and to enter college or university (*kolehiyo*) (Reynald, 2018; Magno, 2016) students, teachers, school personnel, parents, industry partners and educational authorities need to assess whether the curriculum really served its purpose the way it had been intended to serve. Assessing Senior High School (SHS) curriculum after having produced the first batch of graduates in April 2018 is an initial step to monitor its gradual effect of the Philippine educational landscape.

National and local news have shown negative clamors of parents and students (Bevins & Price, 2015) prior to the implementation of SHS curriculum ranging from the perceived unpreparedness of the Department of Education to embark on curricular shift, to the apparent additional two year additional expenses in students’ basic education requirements, the curriculum was implemented in full swing in 2016. Even in the first year of implementation, the negative perceptions did not die out. Gradually, the parents’ and students’ bawling has slowly faded as time progresses. The researchers assume that there is a change in the perception of the parents, students and stakeholders. In line with this, the Department has already been seeing progress by producing the first batch of graduates in 2018.

However, there has never been any attempt to revisit the students, parents, educators and stakeholders’ merits to the curricular change. It is timely to assess whether there has ever been a change of perceptions. SWOT analysis of Bevins and Price (2015) reveals that parents’ criticism and low political funding were threats that need to be addressed for the school to succeed.

Terms and nomenclature ascribing SHS curriculum have been proliferating in the newsletters, updates and interviews of authorities. These terms have been collated and used as terms in assessing the curriculum itself. In a research instrument developed, there are fourteen terms that have been included in the semantic differential tool to evaluate curriculum implementation (Dacanay, Panares & Cutamora, 2018). The terms are preparedness, comprehensibility, easiness, completeness, organization, excellence, sufficiency, systematization, timeliness, simplicity, alignment, integration, precision and clarity. Knowing how the stakeholders’ views on the effectiveness of the curriculum implementation, the data can be a benchmark to further simplify, alter and improve the curriculum. Winning the confidence of the stakeholders, industry partners, and parents is substantial to the sustainability of the educational innovations of the curriculum planners. After all, the school has to encompass the opinion of the community members to give relevant education to the learners.

There have been several studies that assess SHS curriculum. However, their focus is on the diagnostic assessment of students (Lapeña, O’Hara & Panganiban, 2018); assessment schemes for placement, college readiness, competencies, career (Magno, 2016); assessment of learning (Manabat, 2014); program results assessment (NEDA, 2013); exit assessment for students (Mateo, 2018); and program soundness assessment (ADB, 2018). This study is primarily addressing the gap of knowledge on the differing views of the entities involved in the SHS curriculum implementation. Initial data have been reported before the implementation of the curriculum. This study assumes that in several ways, the entities have changed their views and have identified ways to improve the curriculum. This information is necessary to better develop the curriculum.

Research Questions

The study aims to assess the Senior High School (SHS) curriculum implementation of the Department of Education – Division of Talisay City in the school year 2018-2019. The findings of the study will be the bases for proposed improvements.

1. What is the level of agreement among the students, stakeholders and education authorities before and after the SHS curriculum implementation?
2. Is there a significant change in the level of agreement among the curricular entities before and after the SHS curriculum implementation?
3. How do students, stakeholders and education authorities perceive the current SHS curriculum implementation?
4. Is there a significant difference in the perceptions among the students, stakeholders and education authorities in the current SHS curriculum implementation?

2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

2.1 Design. The study is a quantitative approach employing descriptive cross-sectional, evaluative survey design. Descriptive studies are exploratory in nature. Cross-sectional studies are observational in nature which analyzes the data from a subset of a population at a specific point in time. Survey method is appropriate to cut across varied respondents. Getting a wide array of perceptions from different groups of entities need a survey tool that captures the responses efficiently. Evaluative design is employed because the aim of the study is to assess the curriculum. However, the study is mainly an assessment as the curriculum is newly implemented that does not warrant internally valid data to subsume the efficacy of the implementation.

2.2 Sampling. The respondents are students, teachers, school personnel, parents, industry partners and education authorities of Talisay City Division. Using G*power tool to determine the sample size, the alpha error probability is already set at 0.05 or 0.95 power (1- β error probability). McNemar's [Change] Test requires 134 samples to have 0.9505 actual power. Analysis of Variance, on the other hand, requires 369 samples to achieve 0.9503 actual power. The input parameters are set at .4 effect size f ; α error probability at 0.05; 0.95 power (1- β error probability); numerator df 80; and number of groups to 3. These parameters are set to minimize noncentrality parameter at 59.04 with critical F 1.313.

When the number of respondents is determined, the researchers will employ random sampling technique. Although the respondents are randomly selected, the researchers opt to represent the three districts of the division. The districts cannot be clustered if that is the purpose because the spread of the stakeholders particularly the industry partners vary in number across the three districts.

For the inclusion criteria, the participants must be students of Senior High School or has been a *student* when SHS was implemented. For the *stakeholders*, they comprise of parents who have sent their children to SHS, and business or industry partners who have been recipients of trainees of the SHS immersion subject, or who has employed products of SHS. SHS teachers, principals of schools with integrated SHS; and other authorities who have been involved in the SHS implementation comprise *education authorities*.

2.3 Data Collection Instrument. The instrument to be used is a research tool developed to measure perceptions on SHS curriculum implementation (Dacanay, Panares & Cutamora, 2018). The instrument is a semantic differential appraising the preparedness, comprehensibility, easiness, completeness, organization, excellence, sufficiency, systematization, timeliness, simplicity, alignment, integration, precision and clarity of the curriculum in the lens of the students, stakeholders (parents, industry partners), and education authority (teachers, school heads and supervisors). The instrument has undergone content, construct, face validity tests and reliability test with Cronbach's alpha .938 which index means that the instrument measures very consistent results.

Modification is done in the demographic profiling and change of perceptions questions to answer the study's research questions. Adding some qualitative questions also give explanations to quantitative data. Another addendum is the experts' suggestions that the semantic pairs be provided with a statement to contextualize the assessment. The tool is validated again and still get a favorable rating of over 93.4% agreement among the experts.

2.4 Data Collection Instrument. The researchers need to present the proposal to the approving authority (principal, superintendent and the regional office (RO)). They will then process needed documents for the initiation of the project. Target schools will be identified as soon as the paper gets approval; with the help of the school administrators, the researchers can identify who the students will be, who the stakeholders are and when their available time will be; and who the education authorities will be as the respondents of the study.

The three researchers will hand in the survey questionnaire to the three groups through the help of field researchers who will be oriented with the undertaking. Data collection will be done as soon as the respondents are done answering the tool.

Data will be managed through a hired encoder using applications that best store the data. Code book is prepared in order to sort the collected data. Once data is collected, stored and sorted completely, data cleansing will be done. In due course, the data is ready to be subjected to any statistical tool and software.

2.5 Plan for Data Analysis

In answering the level of agreement among the groups of concerned parties in the educations system, *weighted mean* is used with *simple percentages*. Data presentation employs tabular and graphical formats. To test the change of perceptions before and after the implementation, *McNemar's [Change] test* is suitable to measure if there is positive or negative change. This gives an indication for further recommendations to curriculum designers and implementers.

To answer how the groups of concerned parties perceive the current curriculum, weighted mean is also used per indicator. Since the instrument is a semantic differential, graphical format using the main instrument's interface would be presented to show the trend of responses per paired antonymous terms.

To test whether there is a significant difference in the perceptions among the students, stakeholders and education authorities in the current SHS curriculum implementation, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA or F-test) would be used. The means of the three groups are compared to know whether they have similar or differing views on the implementation so the recommendations to be made are group specific. When the data is found to be not normal, non-parametric equivalent would be employed such as Welch or Brown-Forsythe Tests.

3. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 Agreement among Entities

The respondents were asked on their agreement with the proposed implementation of adding two (2) more years in the basic education. Retrospective thinking was used in recalling their stance on SHS implementation before 2016. Reflective thinking was used in giving their stance on the current SHS implementation after 2016. Table 1 presents the responses of the entities whether they agree or disagree on the implementation.

Table 1: Agreement among Entities before and after SHS Implementation

		After Implementation		Total	
		No	Yes		
Before Implementat ion	No	Count	57	237	294
		% within Before Implementation	19.4%	80.6%	100.0%
		% within After Implementation	76.0%	62.0%	64.1%
	Yes	Count	17	145	163
		% within Before Implementation	10.4%	89.0%	100.0%
		% within After Implementation	22.7%	38.0%	35.5%
Total	Count	75	382	459	
	% within Before Implementation	16.3%	83.2%	100.0%	
	% within After Implementation	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Note. n= 459

Among the 459 respondents, there were 57 who said *No*, and 145 who said *Yes* to the issue; and their stance remained unchanged before and after the implementation. However, among 459 respondents, 237 of them have changed their stance from *No* to *Yes*; and 17 respondents who said *Yes* before have changed their stance to *No* after the program has been implemented. This is similar to the study conducted by Natsir, Yusuf and Nasution (2018) that it is but natural for people to react on the change of curriculum.

Totally, those who said *Yes* were five times as much as those who said *No* to the implementation. This implies that despite the disputes and countless reasons of the respondents, the need to shift the educational system to include two (2) more years in the basic education is necessary. It can be noted from the textual data that the respondents who refuted to the implementation have varied reasons. These reasons can make or break the implementation; but implementors cannot just discount the stakeholders' perceptions. Stakeholders are important in implementing any innovation in schools (Turcotte & Hamel, n.d.).

For the students, *time* is added in their educational experience. They wanted to go directly to college and would not be wasting time in their Senior High years. Second reason is *money*. Straightforwardly, time added entails additional expenses. There are several things to be bought and payments to be made in order complete senior high. Students either sympathize or pity their parents' peril of having to pay much on their

education. The third reason is on the *curriculum*. Others said that the courses were redundant as they go to college; they would be taking the same. The courses are hard and stressful. Academically speaking, the implementation was strict. The fourth reason of saying no was on their *lack of knowledge and understanding* of what the curriculum was. After the implementation, the students still disagreed with the program on the grounds that they were not studying their strand. Other subjects were not necessary on their chosen strands. This caused stress because the courses were confusing as they also wasted their time. Canezo (2016) has revealed in his cross-sectional survey that students find the implementation of an educational reform satisfactory. This is because the students find something new in the curriculum. The perception on novelty provides excitement for the students.

For the stake holders, recurring themes on *money, time, lack of awareness, unpreparedness, eagerness to send children to college* and *being unfair* with the previous cohorts emerge. The parents were well aware that the public high schools were not ready to have the program implemented. Partly, they wanted their children to start their career paths early. Getting college degrees at an early age was seen as advantageous on their part. They envied the previous group of high school graduates who were not affected by the implementation as they spent less time and money on their basic education. After the implementation, they were unwavering with their stance. Extra money and time spent and delayed graduation made them tired. Facilities and job opportunities abroad, were insufficient. Other schools that have shifting classes were more preferred than schools having a whole day class. This is still consistent with the study of Canezo (2016) that the ones not consuming a new form of educational system react negatively. Unlike the students, stakeholders find the new implemented system unsatisfactory.

For the educational authorities, lengthened years, burden, additional expenses emerge as their primary reasons. Second, they saw that the teachers lack training; facilities, equipment, materials, resources were not ready. After the implementation, they still saw similar problems mentioned above. The implementation was obviously forced. To them, universities and colleges were able to produce professionals before without even undergoing Senior High School. This is consistent with Canezo (2016) that students satisfactorily rate the newly implemented educational reform; yet, the educational authorities and stakeholders find the reform unsatisfactory.

Nevertheless, there are those who really agreed with the SHS implementation. For the students, their reasons vary from acquisition of more knowledge, practical skills, learning, capabilities and experience to either prepare them in college or to be globally competitive. This is in preparation for their future when they graduate. SHS was advantageous in finding friends and opportunities. With shortened classes, it benefits them in studying more. After the implementation, their agreement was rooted on the belief that it would open opportunities for them to find jobs locally and internationally especially to those who could not afford college education. It could also improve speaking, writing, effective, and practical skills since they have more time to develop and mold themselves in preparation for college and career. The program also allowed and guided the students to choose their strand. The curriculum was challenging but they got teachers who would help them learn more. The change of perception was due to a better understanding of the curriculum since it has been implemented. They felt that it should continue as it would be unfair for them if discontinued.

For the External Stakeholders, the implementation was only for the goodness of their children to acquire knowledge, skills, experience, and learning in preparation to their college degrees. After the implementation, comprehensive knowledge, improved studies, enhanced and advanced skills are instruments to college. They witnessed how their children became passionate about their studies. Whenever their children cannot go to college, SHS opens opportunities to prepare them for work. There was no way this program could be discontinued as this had already been started.

For the educational authorities, the program made the basic education complete. The students became competitive in finding a job, as they acquire skills, experience, and learning. If the students graduate at 16, they are not of legal age yet to land a job. Hence, the implementation was necessary so that Philippine Educational system for ASEAN compliance, and international alignment in the 21st century education. The plan to adapt change in education was long overdue. The teachers had visibly equipped themselves to give better education to have less out-of school. After the implementation, the teachers and principals saw the progressive and positive changes among the students. They became mature; they gained more knowledge,

skills, competence; and they enhanced their talents. Despite the challenges such as unavailability of classrooms, shops, the teachers managed to prepare students for employment. The implementation could be seen as for compliance, but it was necessary to standardize Philippine education.

The findings are contrary to VanderJagt's (2013) study when he said that parents, teachers, administrators and students may not necessarily differ. However, it is in a way reveal the same findings. As revealed in their reasons, students, external stakeholders and educational authorities show concerns. VanderJagt (2013) only focused on the policy development and planning. With the concerns aired out by students, external stakeholders and educational authorities, directed enhancement plan is needed.

3.2 Agreement Disparity on SHS Curriculum Implementation

Numeric and verbal data show the difference between the agreement among the students, stakeholders and educational authorities. Apparently, there are those who said "no" and "yes" before and after the implementation. However, it cannot be statistically stated that the difference among those who change their perceptions was significant. Hence in table 2, McNemar's test encapsulates the change of perceptions.

The hypothesis which states that *there is no significant change on the agreement of the entities on Senior High School implementation* is rejected. The alpha 0.05 giving the researcher 95% confidence interval is greater than the McNemar's test p-value (.000).

Table 2: Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	123.250 ^a	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	20.841	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	8.338	1	.004
McNemar-Bowker Test	192.551	3	.000

Note. n= 459 a. 5 cells (55.6%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .01.

Hence, there is a significant change of the number of respondents who initially said "No" to the program before the implementation; and ultimately said "Yes" after the implementation. It is safe to say that the students, the parents, industry partners, community, teachers, principals and supervisors of Talisay City division have become positive that the program renders better change in the Philippine educational landscape.

Among the 455 respondents excluding those who gave no response, there were 290 who disagreed on the program before the implementation; but the value drastically dropped to 82 after the implementation. Before the implementation, 168 respondents who agreed with the program but, this number extensively increased to 374 after the implementation. The number of those who said yes increased as there was a positive perceptual change among the entities being surveyed. Tafara (2015) has revealed in his study that community members are peripheral players are important in curriculum implementation. Hence, this study is conducted to involve community members in school reforms.

3.3 Entities' Perception on SHS curriculum implementation

The perceptions on the basic education provided by the Department of Education, curriculum and its content, facilities, course offerings, implementation, administrator's knowledge, curriculum change, outcome, and procedure are determined. This is shown in table 3. The perceptions of the three entities on the 14 indicators are almost similar.

They are rated from *somewhat* to *much* depending on the areas being described. The students and stakeholders alike rated the *contents of the curriculum* are "somewhat easy" (6.65 and 6.99) respectively; and all others are "much implemented" depending on the area. The educational authorities described the *Department of Education is somewhat Prepared* (6.02); *the contents of the curriculum are somewhat Easy* (6.31); *Facilities are somewhat Sufficient* (5.73); *Implementation of SHS is Somewhat Timely* (6.98); and

Implementation procedure is somewhat Simple (6.69). All other areas are rated “much implemented,” depending on the areas being described.

Table 3: Entities’ perceptions on SHS Curriculum

	<i>Students</i>	<i>Stakeholders</i>	<i>Education Authorities</i>
Basic education with SHS is _____.	8.73 (<i>Much Complete</i>)	8.73 (<i>Much Complete</i>)	8.80 (<i>Much Complete</i>)
The Department of Education is _____.	8.01 (<i>Much Prepared</i>)	7.53 (<i>Much Prepared</i>)	6.02 (<i>Somewhat Prepared</i>)
The curriculum is _____.	8.47 (<i>Much Organized</i>)	7.79 (<i>Much Organized</i>)	7.42 (<i>Much Organized</i>)
The contents of the curriculum are _____.	6.65 (<i>Somewhat Easy</i>)	6.99 (<i>Somewhat Easy</i>)	6.31 (<i>Somewhat Easy</i>)
Teachers have _____ mastery of content.	8.44 (<i>Much Excellent</i>)	7.67 (<i>Much Excellent</i>)	7.62 (<i>Much Excellent</i>)
Facilities are _____.	7.88 (<i>Much Sufficient</i>)	7.28 (<i>Much Sufficient</i>)	5.73 (<i>Somewhat Sufficient</i>)
Course offerings are _____.	8.42 (<i>Much Systematic</i>)	7.94 (<i>Much Systematic</i>)	7.29 (<i>Much Systematic</i>)
Implementation of SHS is _____.	7.79 (<i>Much Timely</i>)	7.31 (<i>Much Timely</i>)	6.98 (<i>Somewhat Timely</i>)
Administrators have _____ knowledge	8.40 (<i>Much Comprehensive</i>)	7.65 (<i>Much Comprehensive</i>)	7.32 (<i>Much Comprehensive</i>)
Subject areas are _____.	8.17 (<i>Much Integrated</i>)	7.30 (<i>Much Integrated</i>)	7.95 (<i>Much Integrated</i>)
Curriculum change is _____.	7.78 (<i>Much Precise</i>)	7.30 (<i>Much Precise</i>)	7.59 (<i>Much Precise</i>)
Curriculum outcome is _____.	8.05 (<i>Much Clear</i>)	7.35 (<i>Much Clear</i>)	7.41 (<i>Much Clearer</i>)
Implementation procedure is _____.	7.09 (<i>Much Simple</i>)	7.12 (<i>Much Simple</i>)	6.69 (<i>Somewhat Simple</i>)
Curriculum change is _____ globally.	8.19 (<i>Much Aligned</i>)	7.74 (<i>Much Aligned</i>)	8.37 (<i>Much Aligned</i>)
OVERALL	8.005 (<i>Much Implemented</i>)	7.55 (<i>Much Implemented</i>)	7.25 (<i>Much Implemented</i>)

Note.

n= 275

n= 121

n= 76

Legend:

9.01-11.00 Very Much; 7.01-9.00 Much; 5.01-7.00 Somewhat; 3.01-5.00 Less; 1.00-3.00 Not

Being in the field who understands the curriculum implementation, the educational authorities who include the teachers, principals, and supervisors have expected much from the curriculum compared to the students and stakeholders such as the parents, community members and industry partners. Overall, the three groups of entities have shared similar perceptions on the fourteen (14) items or areas of assessing the implementation. The items are rated *much implemented*. Hence, the almost perfect implementation is along the way. Little to more effort should be done to satisfy the clients, the stakeholders and the service providers.

3.4 Perception Disparity among the entities on SHS curriculum implementation

Testing the difference on the perceptions of the students, external stakeholders, and educational authorities on SHS curriculum implementation was designed to be subjected to Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). There are three (3) assumptions that need to be ensured before performing a parametric test such as ANOVA: test of normality, test of homogeneity of variances, and independence.

To test the assumption of normality, the researchers subject the data to Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Saphiro-Wilk test. Table 4 presents the result that rejects the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between the actual data and the normal data distribution. Both Kolmogorov- Smirnov and Saphiro Wilk tests reveal similar results that the actual data is not normally distributed.

Table 4: Tests of Normality

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov			Shapiro-Wilk			Skewness	Kurtosis
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	Statistic
Items	.046	472	.020	.978	472	.000	-.537	.309

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

In the same table, descriptive statistics explore the skewness and kurtosis of the data. As a rule, skewness and kurtosis must be close to zero and within the limits -2 to $+2$ to be considered acceptable to prove normal univariate distribution. Kurtosis defines how heavily the tails of a distribution differ from the tails of a normal distribution. The distribution contains extreme values. The statistic values reveal to be far away from zero, hence the first assumption of normality is violated.

To test the homogeneity of variances, Levene's test was conducted. This assumption must be met in order to be confident that the samples have equal departures from normality. Table 5 reveals the result that there is a significant difference between the variance of the actual data and the normally distributed data. Hence, the second assumption is violated.

To check the assumption of Independence, the researchers revisit the design and found that the segregation between the students who are considered the clientele; the stakeholders who are the external evaluators; and the educational authorities who are the service providers. They are three different groups who have used differing lens in viewing the curriculum implementation. The assumption of independence is not validated.

Table 5: Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
19.765	2	469	.000

Two out of the three assumptions are violated. The data is not normally distributed; and its variances are not equal. Thus, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) is not suitable to be used. The researchers decide to use its non-parametric test on the equality of means Welch and Brown-Forsythe statistic for robust results.

Table 6: Robust Tests of Equality of Means

	Statistic ^a	df1	df2	Sig.	Decision	Findings
Welch	16.648	2	181.026	.000	Reject H_0	<i>There is significant difference</i>
Brown-Forsythe	16.326	2	253.495	.000	Reject H_0	<i>There is significant difference</i>

Asymptotically F distributed.

The statistical values after conducting Welch and Brown-Forsythe reveal that there is a significant difference among the three groups. Hence, the entities in education have disparity in viewing the educational landscape

Tukey Honest Significant Difference (HSD) is a post hoc test to know how the groups differ when the test of variance reveals their significant difference. Comparing the data, the students' perception is significantly different compared to the stakeholders and education authorities' perception. External Stakeholders' perception is not significantly different from the educational authorities' perceptions. Hence, it is only the students who have perceptual disparity compared to the other entities.

The students' mean of ratings of the perception on the 14 indicators (8.005) is way too different from the stakeholders' perception (7.55) and educational authorities' perception (7.25). From the descriptive results, the researchers draw their attention on the least rated indicators as they are the target points for enhancement.

(I) Group	(J) Group	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	Interpretation
<i>Students</i>	<i>External Stakeholders</i>	1.00519*	.18394	.000	Significantly Different
	<i>Education Authority</i>	.77861*	.21851	.001	Significantly Different
<i>External Stakeholders</i>	<i>Students</i>	-1.00519*	.18394	.000	Significantly Different
	<i>Education Authority</i>	-.22659	.24679	.629	No significant difference
<i>Education Authority</i>	<i>Students</i>	-.77861*	.21851	.001	Significantly Different
	<i>External Stakeholders</i>	.22659	.24679	.629	No significant difference

Table 7: Post Hoc Multiple Comparisons

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

For the students, the contents of the curriculum are somewhat easy. Knowing that the competencies in the last two years of basic education are just continuing from their junior years in the spiral education, the students find the contents of the senior high school subject areas not too easy. In this case, the researchers' advocacy is to develop a diagnostic test. The test must comprise all the competencies of all the subject areas to identify problem areas of the students before starting the classes. The result must be communicated to the subject teachers handling the group of students.

The stakeholders also rated the contents of the curriculum as somewhat easy. The parents saw how their sons and daughters became studious and earnest in doing their assigned tasks. Open communication with the parents would be helpful in dealing with students' difficulty in the lessons. There is no difficult task for someone who attends the classes regularly. Pending assigned tasks and performances make the learning tedious.

The educational authorities also found the contents of the curriculum as somewhat easy. On their end, they know that average students have the difficulty in comprehending the contents of the curriculum. They cannot modify the competencies, but they can simplify the activities. Second, they view the Department of Education as somewhat prepared. From the field's experience, they know what is lacking. However, they manage to give the best learning experience despite their knowledge that the department is only somewhat prepared. Third, they think that the facilities are somewhat sufficient. They carried on with their teaching even without the needed facilities. Practical skills are less mastered as they have less sufficient resources. Fourth, they saw that the implementation of SHS was somewhat timely. Some educational authorities view the SHS implementation as the answer to the call of changing the educational system to be globally competitive. However, there were some who saw the prematurely implemented curriculum taking its toll on the students, stakeholders and the teachers too. Fifth, they perceive that the implementation procedure is somewhat simple.

WHAT STUDENTS SAY ABOUT THE CURRICULUM IMPLEMENTATION

Verbal data had been sought to complement the findings. Strengths and weaknesses of the curriculum have to be cited in order to qualify the ratings. The students find the curriculum to be:

Capable of improving learning. The students find the curriculum to be organized and focused because the lessons are aligned with the track. There are different course offerings in the curriculum and each one is giving reporting experiences, learning, programs, and activities, to improve knowledge performance, skills, competence and talents. In fact, they mentioned GAS, ABM strands and Earth Science, reading and writing discussions. The strong point is that the teaching force is helpful for the students to become educated. They also impose discipline among the students.

Prepare students for college. The students agree that adding two more years give them more time to think, to know thesis, to deliver reports before they graduate and go to college.

Prepare for employment. The students believe that the SHS curriculum give them more opportunity and be prepared for future. They eye on being financially independent as the curriculum prepared them for their career path. TVL courses make the students competent global competition through immersion experience.

Develop one's attitude. Being in SHS, the students learn how to strive hard, conquer their fear, be more confident, to be disciplined, to maintain hard work, to trust in one's self and to have trust in one's self. The curriculum allows the students to work with varied groups. It is enjoyable because they gain friends hard.

However, the curriculum is not without flaws. The students found the implementation unprepared in most areas. Firstly, the schools **lack facilities**. There are only a few to no equipment STEM tools, laboratories, toilets, books, aircon, library, wifi connection, materials, classroom, computers, chairs, buildings, appliances, canteen, electric fan, utilities, electronic supplies, and fence. spaces because the land area is too small.

Secondly, the schools **lack proper maintenance**. There is no proper solid waste disposal and management. Maintaining cleanliness has always been a problem because of overpopulation. Rules on cleanliness and garbage disposal is not properly implemented. The schools lack water supply hence, the toilets are unkempt.

Thirdly, **the teaching force** must be strengthened. There are a few of the students who did not like the discussion of the teachers. A handful of the students also find the teachers strict and impose the importance of maintaining grades. However, other students really like stricter way of teaching especially in major subjects especially in electronics. This scenario happens because of the lack of teachers in the major subjects. Teachers teach subjects that are not their expertise. This could be the reason that the teachers cannot expound on the topics. Yet, the students also say that teachers go beyond and deep teaching in the strand.

Fourthly, **students' behavior** is also another thing to be improved. Students should acquire self-confidence, time management, financial literacy, self-study skills, cooperation and collaboration skills, learning pace, and stress management. The students admit that there are lazy students who could not keep track with many requirements from different subject areas. They also suggest that students be respectful.

Lastly, **curriculum content** should be sound. They are hopeful that all schools have the same subject offerings. It has been a problem with transferees when they need to enroll in lower grade subjects because of subjects not taken from the previous school. In these subjects the following skills could have been established: practical research skills, communication skills, reading and writing skills, confidence, cooperation, understanding. The following is also the suggestions of the students. One, offering of sports strand to hone other skills of the students which are not academic. Two, curriculum should involve families. Three, intermittent lessons should be minimized. There are classes that are postponed because of several activities. Four, lessons should have not been stressful. Senior high school subjects have been very tedious for the students to comply. Five, on-the-job training as part of the curriculum should be strictly monitored like the duration of immersion. The students are sad that the promise of addressing poverty through the implementation of Senior High School is not met.

WHAT EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS SAY ABOUT THE CURRICULUM IMPLEMENTATION

The stakeholders find the curriculum to be helpful in teaching the students to become knowledgeable and skillful. The learnings give opportunities for the students to work or go to college. Activities and programs make the students to be globally competitive.

Nevertheless, the stakeholders found the following areas **deficient**: activities, class room, security, toilet, utilities, water, road access, facilities, equipment, tools, number of teachers, chairs, books, appliances, technologies, library academic areas. This even gets worse when the school is located in the rural area.

Secondly, the stakeholders need the **families to be involved** in school activities. Parents could have better understood the objectives of the programs and activities in school if they are made aware of them.

Thirdly, the stakeholders want the *subjects to be more integrated*. The projects and requirements are disparate making the students tired with compliance. The final output could be unified to have an integrated assessment, hence, lessening the burden of the students.

Fourth, the stakeholders view *teachers' training as essential* especially if they are teaching subjects not their field of expertise. The additional two years for high school students to complete basic education is already making their learning droning. They suggest that their children had better go to college.

WHAT EDUCATIONAL AUTHORITIES SAY ABOUT THE CURRICULUM IMPLEMENTATION

The educational authorities found the curriculum to be helping the learners *acquire skills and knowledge* to be globally competitive. It helps them get employed because the courses are aligned, precise, clear, organized and timely.

The skills *address community needs* which prepare students for entrepreneurship. The subjects are new and significant for the students to choose career path. For instance, TVL course and subjects help them to be job-ready. The competencies taught are aligned with foreign curriculum and global education.

The teachers are *helping one another* in innovating ideas. Despite the challenges they face in teaching, teachers are able to guide the students in their career paths. Teachers aim for quality education to be productive because of their clarity of focus since the teachers are experts in their own field.

Nonetheless, the educational authorities found loopholes in the implementation. Firstly, the facilities, materials, books, equipment, laboratories, shops, resources, infrastructure, tools, technology are *deficient*. TVL-DepEd-TESDA should have aligned facilities. Often, the schools have not been compliant with the requirements set by TESDA. shops are not conducive to learning because of the insufficient space.

Secondly, the *utilities* need to be provided. There are not enough comfort rooms and waste disposal bins making the school stinky and dirty. These should be provided to maintain the conduciveness of the learning environment.

Thirdly, there are more competencies that one can question the *appropriateness of the subjects offered*. Teachers for TVL are much more needed because there are only a few knowledgeable teachers to teach the subjects. The exodus of teachers lessens the number of the teaching force too for reasons that are outside the bounds of this study. Appropriate assessment of the competencies is also a problem.

Fourthly, *students' attitude* has posed a problem in the learning process. It is difficult to teach someone who is not willing to learn. Self-discipline is not evident to some students. This must be enhanced among the students.

The curriculum implemented in Talisay City Division is congruent with the Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013" or RA 10533. The program has aims to promote students to work (*trabaho*), to venture in business (*negosyo*), and to enter college or university (*kolehiyo*) (Reynald, 2018; Magno, 2016).

The Department of Education (2016) enumerates the success indicators. From the findings, there is no problem with giving slots to all grade 10 finishers; but the number of classrooms is lacking. Program tracks and strand offerings are varied in bigger schools but the small schools only offer limited strands. Hence, from the clamors of the students, they get to enroll in strands that are not of their interest. The schools must provide qualified teaching staffs; but, the students and teachers claim that there is a need to have more teachers to teach the major subjects. Provision of contextualized and up to date textbooks and learning materials is not evident. Students and teachers claim that there are no books and materials provided; so, the contents taught from one school are different from the other schools. There are no established partnerships that supplement and complement DepEd provision. In fact, parents suggest that they get to be involved in the activities and programs of the school.

Lagudas (2016) and DepEd (2016) stipulate that internal and external assessments need to be done to see the dynamics on curriculum localization, immersion, employment opportunities, resources, teacher training and scholarships. In this study, those areas are addressed, only that the implementation is a little bit laxed. In fact, Bevins and Price (2015) said that the Philippines should adopt the framework of the world class performing countries but must be embedded with ASEAN values and culture. However, the study of Sarmiento and Orale (2016) said that Philippines' reason of implementing Senior High is the same with that of the USA and Japan. His contention that choosing a TVL track creates a stigma among the students is not evident in the findings of the study. The students like the TVL track to be enhanced especially on acquiring

resources, hiring skilled teachers and develop immersion or work-based learning. Acosta and Acosta (2016) and Brodeth (n.d.) mentioned that resources and facilities are not ready when there is a shift of curriculum. Tabora (2014) indicated serious problems with the k-12 Senior High School in the press briefing. Their findings still hold true up until the conduct of this study. One thing that is not imminent in this assessment is the outcome measures as stipulated in UNESO (2005); Lagudas, (2016); Department of Education (2016).

4. CONCLUSION

Based on the findings that there is a significant perceptual change from saying no initially to saying yes ultimately, the implementation has been giving the students, stakeholders, and education authorities, awareness of what the curriculum is about. Despite not being ready, the officials force the implementation on installment basis. The likelihood of the entities' full acceptance of the program is imminent. Hence, there is a use of implementing it earlier like that in 2016.

Another finding is the disparity of the students' assessment of the curriculum implementation compared to those of the external stakeholders and educational authorities. Students have seen the goodness of the curriculum as they rated the items more highly compared to how the stakeholders and educational authorities rated the same items. It can be gleaned that stakeholders and educational authorities have expected so much that they never take time to listen to the majority of the students who are recipients of the curriculum contents.

In this study, the implementation has several rooms for improvement; yet, the assessment of the students who are the primary clients of the educational reform is satisfactory. Clamors of the stakeholders and educational authorities can be minimized if the educational outcomes are imminent in the students' manifestation of knowledge, skills and attitudes in their chosen field.

5. REFERENCES

- Acosta, I. C., Acosta, A. S. (2016). Teachers' Perceptions on Senior High School Readiness of Higher Education Institutions in the Philippines. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 4(10): 2435-2450, DOI: 10.13189/ujer.2016.041024
- Asian Development Bank (2018). Program Soundness Assessment. Retrieved from <https://www.adb.org>4509-002>
- Amuche, C. I. & Kukwi, I. J. (2013). An Assessment of Stakeholders' Perception of the Implementation of Universal Basic Education in North-Central Geo-Political Zone of Nigeria. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 4(3), 158-167
- Bevins, S. & Price, G. (2015). The Introduction of the New Curriculum and Senior High School System in the Philippines : report of the consultation exercise undertaken in November 2015.
- Brodeth, D. (n.d.) Planning for K To 12. Taft Consulting Group.
- Canezo, V. C. Jr. (2016). Awareness, Preparedness and Needs of the K to 12 Senior High School Modeling Implementation. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 4 (7), 328-334.
- Chen, C. T. (2012). Development and Evaluation of Senior High School Courses on Emerging Technology: A Case Study of a Course on Virtual Reality. *TOJET: The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, 11 (1), 46-59.
- Dacanay, L., Panares, Z. & Cutamora, J. (2018). Measuring Perceptions on Senior high School (SHS) Curriculum Implementation. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 6 (3), 249-258.
- Department of Education (2016). Senior High School Planning. Internal and External Assessment .
- Department of Education (2016). Workshop on Senior High School Implementation Planning .
- Government of the Philippines-National Economic and Development Authority. (2013). Program Results Assessment. Philippine Medium Term Development Plan 2011–2016 Midterm Update. Manila.
- Magno, C. (2016). Assessment Schemes in the Senior High School in the Philippine Basic Education. *Educational Measurement and Evaluation Review*, 7 (66-87).
- Manabat, J. A. (2014). Report on Assessment of learning. Presentation. Retrieved from <https://www.slideshare.net/mobile/jwlmanabat/report-in-assessment-of-learning-senior-high-school-k12>
- Natsir, Y., Yusuf, Y. Q. *, Nasution, U. F. (2018). The Rise and Fall of Curriculum 2013: Insights on the Attitude Assessment from Practicing Teachers. *SHS Web of Conferences*, 42, 00010. <https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/20184200010>
- Mateo, J. (2018, Feb 18). DepEd to assess SHS graduates. *The Philippine Star*. Retrieved from <https://www.pressreader.com/philippines/the-philippine-star/20180215>

- NEDA, (2013). Program Results Assessment. Government of the Philippines: Philippine Medium Term Development Plan 2011-2016.
- Reynald, J. (2018). K to 12 Trabaho, Negosyo, Kolehiyo: Sa K to 12 Kaya Mo!. Retrieved from <https://johnreynald.wordpress.com> on October 7, 2018
- Sarmiento, D. H. & Orale, R. L. (2016). Senior High School Curriculum in the Philippines, USA, and Japan. *Journal of Academic Research*, 1, (3), 12-23.
- Tabora, S. J. (2014). Serious problems with the k-12 Senior High School. Retrieved from <https://www.google.com/amp/s/taborasj.wordpress.com/2014/02/18/serious-problems-with-the-k-12-senior-high-school-curriculum/amp/>
- Tafara, M. (2015). "Community Participation in Curriculum Implementation In Zimbabwean Primary Schools." *Dissertation*. University of South Africa.
- Turcotte, S. Hamel, C. (n.d.) Necessary conditions to implement innovation in remote networked schools: The stakeholders' perceptions.
- UNESO (2005). Measuring Educational Quality by Means of Indicators. unpublished paper
- U. S. Department of Health and Human Services (n.d.). Readiness assessment & Developing project aims
- VanderJagt, D. D. (2013). "Student Thoughts and Perceptions on Curriculum Reform." *Dissertations*. 154. <http://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations/154>