

Republika ng Pilipinas
(Republic of the Philippines)
MINISTRI NG EDUKASYON, KULTURA AT ISPORTS
(MINISTRY OF EDUCATION, CULTURE AND SPORTS)
Manila

October 1, 1984

MEMORANDUM
No. 168, s. 1984

EVALUATION OF THE BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

To: Bureau Directors
Regional Directors
Schools Superintendents
Presidents, State Colleges and Universities
Heads of Private Schools, Colleges and Universities
Vocational School Superintendents/Administrators/Principals

1. The Ministry of Education, Culture and Sports has commissioned the Linguistic Society of the Philippines to conduct an evaluation of the Bilingual Education Program in the last ten years - 1974-1984. This evaluation is in implementation of one of the recommendations in the 1983 Educators' Congress. This evaluation is funded in part by PRODED and other funding sources.
2. The study will cover two or more school divisions per region indicated in Inclosure No. 1 to this Memorandum. Data for certain schools in the divisions indicated would be required by the study team.
3. Attached, as Inclosure No. 2, is a form to be accomplished by the city/provincial divisions listed in Inclosure No. 1 and submitted by the regional office. Instructions given at the back of the form should be carefully read and observed.
4. It is desired that a responsible official in the regional office in each provincial/city division be assigned to take charge of coordinating activities in the region related to this study including the accomplishment and submission of required data or information.
5. An informational material indicating the objectives of this study, the phases and procedures, is also inclosed with this Memorandum as Inclosure No. 3, for the information of the field.
6. In order to facilitate flow of correspondence and the conduct of the evaluation, this Office hereby authorizes the President and or Executive Secretary of the Linguistic Society of the Philippines to correspond directly with regional directors, city and provincial superintendents.
7. The cooperation of all concerned is enjoined to make this study worthwhile.

(SGD.) JAIME C. LAYA
Minister

Incls.:

As stated

References:

Department Order: No. 25, s. 1974; No. 50, s. 1975

Allotment: 1-2-3-4--(D.O. 1-76)

al

nd

Inclosure No. 1 to MECS Memorandum No. 168, s. 1984

PROVINCES AND CITIES FOR TESTING OF PUPILS AND TEACHERS

Superintendents of the following cities and provinces are requested to furnish data on excellent and poor elementary and secondary public and private schools in their provinces/cities. Use the form inclosed with this MECS Memorandum (Inclosure No. 2) for the purpose.

Region	Province/City	Ethnolinguistic Region
NCR	Manila - San Juan Quezon City - Pazañaque	Tagalog Melting Pot
I	Ilocos Norte Mt. Province Pangasinan Benguet	Ilocano 'pure' Ilocano with Zankanay/Bontoc Pangasinan 'pure' Ibaloi and Ilocano
II	Isabela Nueva Vizcaya Batanes	Ilocano with minor language; large influx of Ilocano immigrants
III	Tarlac Pampanga	Pampangan 'pure'
IV	Laguna Occidental/Oriental Mindoro Palawan	Tagalog 'pure' Tagalog with minor language; some Tagalog immigrants
V	Comarines Sur Catanduanes	Bikol 'pure'
VI	Binilo Antique	Hiligaynon 'pure' Kinaraya
VII	Cebu Cebu City	Cebuano 'pure'
VIII	Samar Leyte	Waray 'pure'
IX	Zamboanga del Norte Zamboanga City Sulu/Jolo Basilan	Chavacano/Cebuano Tausug/Sama
X	Bukidnon Agusan del Norte Cagayan de Oro	Manobo Cebuano Cebuano/other languages
XI	Davao Surigao del Sur Davao City	Cebuano Cebuano Melting pot
XII	North Cotabato Maguindanao Lanao del Sur	Cebuano/ also other languages Maguindanao Maranao

on

ish in three copies. Send to
Linguistic Society of the Philippines
Regional Director, MECS
City/Provincial Superintendent

016

Name of Director

Name of Liaison Officer
for Region

No. of teachers in school	Main native language spoken by pupils	Other major Philippine language spoken by locality	Name of Principal or head
------------------------------------	---	--	---------------------------------

INSTRUCTIONS

Column 1 - List elementary schools first. List schools according to the following characteristics:

- 3 excellent public elementary schools
- 3 excellent private elementary schools
- 3 poor public elementary schools
- 3 poor private elementary schools

- 3 excellent public secondary schools
- 3 excellent private secondary schools
- 3 poor public secondary schools
- 3 poor private secondary schools

Note that in the case of private schools, elementary and secondary schools may be under one school.

Column 2 - Schools should have a spread of location, capital of the province as far away as possible from capital + either north or south or east or west
barrio schools

Column 3 - Write EX for Excellent; PR for Poor

Column 4 - Write 'Pub' for public and 'Pri' for private

Column 5 - Indicate distance from national highway to the school in kilometers

Column 6 - For central schools write population of municipality
For barrio schools, population of barrio

Column 7 - Give total enrolment of the school - grades 1 - 6;
all four years of the secondary school

Column 8 - Give total number of teachers in school including principal

Column 9 - If several native languages (dialects) are spoken, give the main or most important one spoken by the majority of pupils

Column 10 - Give the most important other Philippine language spoken in the locality not native to the place for example Ilocano in Isabela where Ibanag may be the native language or Cebuano where other native languages are spoken

Column 11 - Name and title of the principal or head of the school

Read also the detail on this study contained in MECS Memo No. 168, s. 1964.

EVALUATION OF THE BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

I. BACKGROUND

On June 19, 1974, the Department of Education and Culture issued Department Order No. 25, series 1974 mandating the use of English and Filipino as media of instruction according to a set timetable. The purpose of the policy was to create 'the Filipino bilingual, competent in both Filipino and English', domains were divided into an English domain (English Communication Arts, Mathematics, Science) and a Filipino domain (all other subjects), beginning in Grade One for Tagalog-speaking areas in 1974-1975 and beginning in Grade One (or sooner) for non-Tagalog-speaking areas in 1978-1979. By 1981-1982, the shift of media was to begin in high schools. And by the end of 1983-1984, graduates were supposed to be tested in Filipino or English for their professions. No definite time-table or program for tertiary level institutions was proscribed, although the subjects where Filipino could be used as medium of instruction were listed under Department Order No. 50 series 1975.

II. NEED FOR A FORMAL EVALUATION

Even without baseline data, some form of evaluation of academic achievement in English and in Filipino (Communication Arts) and in content in English and in Filipino (Science and Mathematics in English; Social Studies in Filipino) is needed to gauge where Filipino students are at this stage and to provide baseline data for later use in future evaluation (e.g. ten years after 1984).

During the Educational Executives' Congresses sponsored by the Ministry of Education, Culture and Sports in the summer of 1983 and the early part of 1984, the urgent need for such a formal evaluation was unanimously voiced by the congress participants and recommended as one of the summative resolutions of both assemblies.

III. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY/EVALUATION; SOME CONSIDERATA

To gather data and insights on the bilingual education program during the period 1974-1984 useful for reformulating policy and programs on the use and role of Filipino and English in education and other domains of Philippine government and society. Pupils and students in the exit stages grade 4, grade 6, and 4th year high school will be tested in 17 ethnolinguistic regions. All the 13 political regions, 10 major languages, the most important minor languages will be represented. In-depth studies on the activities, roles of colleges and universities, government ministries and agencies, and learned societies will be made. Institutional (school) profiles based on the milieu will be secured for understanding process of bilingual education. A detailed report, useful for decision makers and implementations will be rendered.

In evaluating the results of the Bilingual Education Program (hereinafter referred to as the BEP) the following are desirable:

1. Evaluation must take ethnolinguistic differences into account; even the initial policy stipulated a more extended period of implementation in non-Tagalog areas. However, the division between Tagalog and non-Tagalogs is perhaps not deep enough to handle the differences. Moreover, one must take into account the implementation of the policy in private schools and in public schools, where differences exist. Finally, the location of these institutions, whether in Metro Manila or outside of Metro Manila, and if outside of Metro Manila, whether in a rural or an urban area, must be taken into account as the indications are that the location does make a difference in implementation and in results.

In evaluating achievement in the entire country, what is important is not so much the size of the sample but its representative character. It is more important to analyze a representative sample in depth, attempt to pinpoint the achievements of the sample, and to investigate the reasons (intervening variables) for the present results rather than to gather large samples of aggregated data without in-depth analysis and above all without an investigation into possible reasons (and not merely the BEP) for current achievement (or lack of it) among Filipino students.

nt

in

e)

log-

all
d in
or
3
0,

it in

aded
for

!

ess
ies.

e of

ted.
nt
ool)
ual
ll

REP),

=.
I .
alicate'
ementa-
dist.
of it,
on

io
unt

tr:

tr:

The first part will gather data on academic achievement of representative groups of pupils and students from a number of school types (through purposive sampling) in the following subjects:

English Communication Arts
 Mathematics in English
 Science in English
 Filipino Communication Arts
 Social Studies in Filipino

Data will be gathered from the three main exit stages of the school system:

Grade Four, Grade Six, and Grade Ten (Fourth Year High School)

The pupils are to be tested using existing instruments developed by the Center for Educational Measurement (CEM), an affiliate of the Fund for Assistance to Private Education (FAPE). The tests are to be administered by the CEM through its nationwide network.

Data on teachers

In addition, data on the teachers of these students will be needed, namely: their over-all knowledge of science, mathematics, social studies (depending on the subject which they teach). Likewise their attitudes towards the languages of instruction shall be measured. In addition, a general intelligence test will be given to these teacher factors which have to be considered in assessing achievement. Visitation of these teachers to note characteristics as teachers and as communicators and the quality of classroom instruction will be needed.

School Profiles

An institutional profile of the schools where the tests will be conducted is needed to gauge the organizational and academic climate in the schools so as to be able to obtain intervening variables besides EXPOSURE to a LANGUAGE (the BEP). Personnel with expertise in gathering data for institutional profiles will be engaged to do this.

Source of Sample: Ethnolinguistic regions

It will not be possible (in fact not desirable nor even scientific) to test all schools in all provinces and cities. However, the sampling will have all regions represented, speakers of all major language including two up and coming formerly considered minor languages but now accorded the status of major languages in terms of spread and population, i.e., Maguindanao and Maranao, represented, most of the minor languages with some of the biggest population also represented. The geographic areas where the three most important 'influencing' languages, namely Ilocano in northern Luzon, Cebuano in the Visayas and northern, western and southern Mindanao, and Hiligaynon to some extent, will also be represented. For this purpose, seventeen ethnolinguistic regions in the thirteen political regions of the Philippines have been selected as fairly representative of the Philippine areas where the teaching of Filipino and English may be sampled.

Sources of Sample: ethnolinguistic regions

The provinces and cities listed in Inclosure No. 1 to this MECS Memorandum have been selected on the basis of the foregoing consideration as the sites of the schools to be used for the first part of the study, i.e., the testing of grade 4, grades 6, and 4th year high school students.

Excellent and Poor public and private schools

As a basis for determining the final list of schools to be used in the study, the superintendents of the foregoing provinces are requested to submit data on schools having the following characteristics in the enclosed form DATA ON SCHOOLS FOR THE EVALUATION OF THE BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAM. The form contains complete instructions and space for the data needed.

s

al

t

three poor private secondary schools

The list of schools should contain at least those considered the best and the poorest in the city or province. These schools are those at the extreme end of the classification. Surely, schools cannot all be excellent nor can they all be very poor and neither can all the schools in the city or province be considered average. Judgment, therefore, on the schools will be by province or city standards. These may be based on quantitative data available, if any, and/or the impressions of the school officials, principally division supervisors, of the city or province.

Responsible school officials as liaison for this study

Each and every city/provincial division mentioned in paragraph above shall have a responsible senior school official designated by the respective city/provincial superintendent to act as liaison officer with MECS and the Linguistic Society of the Philippines on all matters pertaining to this evaluation-research project. Likewise, a liaison officer for the region shall be designated by each MECS regional director. The names of these liaison officers shall be indicated in the form enclosed in this memorandum. The liaison officers shall see to it that all the necessary arrangements for conducting the evaluation successfully are made. Their duties and responsibilities in connection with this research shall continue up to the completion of the project.

To whom to send data and correspondence

Because of time constraint, it is requested that the data called for in this memorandum be sent as early as possible but not later than October 31, 1984 direct to:

The Executive Secretary
Linguistic Society of the Philippines
De La Salle University
Taft Avenue, Manila

Part 2. In-Depth Studies on Various Agencies and Institutions

The second component of the evaluation will be qualitative in-depth studies to be commissioned on a contract basis. These studies will either be bibliographic in nature or will demand secondary analysis of data already gathered, with appropriate original data gathering. There are three big topics, namely:

1. Implementation of the BRF by Secondary Schools, Colleges and Universities

Evaluation of the implementation of the bilingual education policy based on the objectives as enunciated in Department Order No. 25, s. 1974 and Department Order No. 50, s. 1975.

The goals and the time tables and their accomplishment.

Implementation by levels and according to institutions and agencies:

Tertiary - Selected universities and colleges from the Philippine Association of Colleges and Universities (PACU), Catholic Education Association of the Philippines (CEAP), Philippine Association of State Colleges and Universities (PASUC), Association of Christian Schools and Colleges (ACSC), Philippine Association of Private Schools, Colleges, and Universities (PAPSCU), various other associations of vocational and technical colleges

Secondary schools - representative institutions, both public and private in the 17 ethnolinguistic regions

The study will answer questions such as:
What should have been accomplished? What was actually accomplished?
To what degree? Who were expected to furnish the initiative and leadership at each level? What were the perceptions of the people

.B
ed
rds.

E
hical
private

les
n

2. Agents or supportive institutions of bilingual education policy implementation and monitoring

What have been the roles (active/passive/indifferent/adversary) of the following in the monitoring and implementation of the Bilingual Education policy (i.e., that the Filipino people shall be competent in both English and Filipino).

Ministry of Education, Culture, and Sports, MECS Administrators (Regional Directors, Superintendents, supervisors and principals), Institute of National Language, the eighteen ministries (finance, local governments, human settlements, etc.) and the support ministries (Media Affairs, Budget and Management, Science and Technology, etc.), Professional Regulations Commission, Civil Service Commission, the judiciary, Office of the President; the press and mass media, other support agencies; parents and the community; civic and other organizations.

The De La Salle University Research Center will be commissioned to do this topic.

3. Scholarly contributions to Bilingual Education

Policy formulation, programming, implementation and evaluation. What have been the contributions of language teachers, planners, linguists, learned societies Language Education Council, Philippine Association for Language Teaching, College English Teachers' Association, Linguistic Society of the Philippines, Pambansang Samahan ng Linggwistikang Pilipino, and many others, to program policies formulation, programming, implementation, and evaluation? In the light of the ten-year experience what insights (and hindsight) do we have on running a bilingual education program?

The Language Study Center of the Philippine Normal College will be commissioned to do this topic.

V. TIME TABLE

The tentative schedule of the study is as follows:

Preliminary arrangements between the Ministry of Education, Culture and Sports and the Linguistic Society of the Philippines and other agencies	July-September 1984
Submission of BEP Form I (Inclosure # 2 to LSP)	before November 15, 1984
Commissioned studies	October 1984-March 1985
Testing of pupils and teachers; gathering of institutional profiles	October 1984-January 1985
Analysis and preliminary write-up	February-March 1985
Informal presentation of findings to MECS	April 1985
Formal presentation of findings at the Educational Executives' Congress in Baguio	May 1985
Writing, editing, and printing (publication) of the final report for distribution	June-August 1985
Distribution of copies of the report to interested parties (price of publication to be announced)	September 1985

VI. ROLE OF THE LINGUISTIC SOCIETY OF THE PHILIPPINES

The MECS commissioned the Linguistic Society of the Philippines (hereinafter LSP) (through its President, Dr. Bonifacio P. Sibayan, and its Executive Secretary Brother Andrew Gonzalez, PSC) to organize and coordinate a research team to conduct an evaluation of the BEP during the past ten years, i.e., from 1974 to 1984. The entering grade one pupils during the school year 1974-1975 graduated from high school last March 1984.

In addition to organizing the research and coordinating the evaluation process, the Linguistic Society of the Philippines has been requested to design the research for the evaluation. This office has approved the research design.

The LSP has engaged the services of various agencies and persons with the necessary expertise to help carry out the evaluation. Among these agencies, research groups and scholar-researchers are the following:

- *The Center for Educational Measurement (CEM)
- *The De La Salle University Research Center
- *The Research Center and the Language Study Center of the Philippine Normal College
- *Fr. Jose Arong, OMI, Notre Dame College, statistician
- *Various individual educators with training and expertise in appraising institutional profiles. A list of these educators and the geographical areas each appraiser will cover, will be issued to the field later.

ter
ary,
duct
he

ogram,
arch

