

Implementation of Gulayan Sa Paaralan Program (GPP) in All Public Schools in San Nicolas District

Carlos M. Rosales

Teacher III, Department of Education, San Nicolas National High School, Batangas, Philippines

Abstract: This study will assess the status of the implementation of the Gulayan sa Paaralan Program in all public schools of San Nicolas District, Division of Batangas for the School Year 2017 – 2018. The findings of this study will be the basis for the crafting of an action plan to further improve the implementation of the GPP in all public elementary and secondary schools of San Nicolas District. The researcher employed the descriptive method of research and the questionnaire was the main instrument in gathering the data. The respondents of the study were the 11 school heads and 133 teachers who were teaching for five years and up in public elementary and secondary schools of San Nicolas District, Division of Batangas during school year 2016-2017. Frequency, percentage, ranking, weighted mean, coefficient of correlation and t – test of significance were applied in the treatment of the analyzed and interpreted data.

Keywords: Gulayan Sa Paaralan Program

1. Introduction

1. Teaching is the noblest profession. Educators are bound not only to mold the youth morally and academically, but also obligated to initiate programs and or projects to develop the learners to become the future leaders of motherland. However, teachers are being prevented by social problem to deliver the most basic but quality learning because in education, a well-nourished, healthy body is essential in developing the children's mental and physical development. It is indeed very important for children to have proper nutrition so that they will learn better in school.
2. In fact in the Philippines today, malnutrition is one of the most unabated health problems among public school students. Studies have shown that there are many children who come to school on an empty stomach. Learning is severely affected when students are hungry. Hunger affects the physical and mental development of children. This results to absenteeism, poor school performance and eventual dropping out, as stressed by Bro. Armin A. Luistro, the DepEd Secretary.
3. Recently, the Department of Education (DepEd) disclosed that 562,262 pupils in kindergarten and elementary levels (Grades 1-6) enrolled in public school this year have been considered "severely wasted" based on nutritional status reports as of August 31, 2012. The Health and Nutrition

Center (HNC) said, it could only feed 42,372 school children or 7.54 percent of the identified severely malnourished pupils in 1,010 public elementary schools in 25 provinces in the country.

4. To help the national government and other agencies tasked to alleviate the masses from hunger and poverty, in July 27, 2007, DepEd Memorandum No. 293 s. 2007 (www.deped.gov.ph) otherwise known as Gulayan sa Paaralan Program (GPP) was conceived and currently being implemented by the Department of Education. It sought to intensify its school-based food and nutrition program to address the "hunger and malnutrition problems which hamper children in pursuing education. The project aimed to promote self-help food production activities and inculcate among children the importance of agriculture as a life support system.
5. Gulayan sa Paaralan Program intends also to feed the school children with the school produce (gulay and rootcrops) taking into consideration the result of the Nutritional Status Survey made by the teachers. It is indeed very important to have good nutrition in order to have good learning. Research about learning told that poor health and hunger hinder the child's quest for knowledge and skills though how good the teacher is. It's time for the teachers now to help pupils achieve high level of performance, let's plant more crops and vegetables in the school.
6. However, it seems that GPP was not clearly disseminated to all the school administrators especially in far flung areas as both teachers and school heads focus their energy to other programs of the DepEd such as BrigadaEskwela, Teachers' Month Celebration, Disaster Preparedness, Gender and Development, Sports Competition and among others.
7. In such premise, the researcher was motivated to conduct the current study in order to assess the status of the implementation of the GPP in all public schools both elementary and secondary in San Nicolas District, Division of Batangas for the School Year 2016 – 2017. For this was my passion since then. In this study, the researcher will focus on the objectives, activities, benefits, management support, processes and problems encountered in the implementation of GPP.

Table 1
 Distribution of Respondents by Schools

Schools		Address	No. and Percentage of Respondents			
			Teachers	School Heads	Sub Total	Percentage
1	Abelo Elementary School	Abelo, San Nicolas	1	1	2	1.39
2	Balete Elementary School	Balete, San Nicolas	10	1	11	7.64
3	Bancoro Elementary School	Bancoro, San Nicolas	9	1	10	6.94
4	Bangin Elementary School	Bangin, San Nicolas	8	1	9	6.25
5	Calangay Elementary School	Calangay, San Nicolas	13	1	14	9.72
6	Hipit Elementary School	Hipit, San Nicolas	1	1	2	1.39
7	Maabud Elementary School	Maabud South, San Nicolas	10	1	11	7.64
8	Maabud NHS	Maabud South, San Nicolas	30	1	31	21.53
9	Munlawin Elementary School	Munlawin, San Nicolas	9	1	10	7.64
10	San Nicolas Central School	Poblacion, San Nicolas	23	1	24	16.67
11	San Nicolas NHS	Calangay, San Nicolas	20	1	21	14.58
12	Sinturisan Elementary School	Sinturisan, San Nicolas	8	1	9	6.25
TOTAL			142	12	156	100

Table 2
 Distribution of Respondents According to Demographic Profile

Demographic Profile	Teachers		Administrators		TOTAL	
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Age						
60 years and above	13	10	1	9	14	10
50 – 59	19	14	3	27	22	15
40 – 49	27	20	6	55	33	23
30 – 39	41	31	1	9	42	29
20 – 29	33	25	0	0	33	23
TOTAL	133	100	11	100	144	100
Civil Status	F	P	F	P	F	P
Single	43	32	0	0	43	30
Married	83	62	10	91	93	65
Separated	3	2	1	9	4	3
Widow/er	4	3	0	0	4	3
TOTAL	133	100	11	100	144	100
Designation/ Position	F	P	F	P	F	P
Teacher I	57	43	0	0	57	40
Teacher II	23	17	0	0	23	16
Teacher III	38	29	0	0	38	26
Master Teacher I	9	7	0	0	9	6
Master Teacher II	6	5	0	0	6	4
OIC/TIC	0	0	1	9	1	1
HT I	0	0	1	9	1	1
HT II	0	0	0	0	0	0
HT III	0	0	3	27	3	2
Principal I	0	0	4	36	4	3
Principal II	0	0	2	18	2	1
TOTAL	133	100	11	100	144	100
Educational Attainment	F	P	F	P	F	P
Bachelors' Degree	75	56	1	9	76	53
MA Units	48	36	7	64	55	38
MA Graduate	7	5	2	18	9	6
With Doctoral Units	3	2	1	9	4	3
Doctorate Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	133	100	11	100	144	100
Gender	F	P	F	P	F	P
Female	119	89	10	91	129	90
Male	14	11	1	9	15	10
TOTAL	133	100	11	100	144	100
Length of Experience as Teacher or School Administrator	F	P	F	P	F	P
30 Years and above	17	13	1	9	18	13
20 – 29 Years	29	22	4	36	33	23
10 – 19 Years	46	35	4	36	50	35
5 – 9 Years	41	31	2	18	43	30
TOTAL	133	100	11	100	144	100

Table 3
Objectives of the GPP

No.	Indicators	Teachers			School Administrators			Average		
		WM	VI	R	WM	VI	R	WM	VI	R
1	Establish and maintain school garden as ready food basket/source of vegetables, etc., in sustaining supplementary feeding	2.77	ME	4	3.53	GE	2	3.15	ME	4
2	Inculcate among learners the values of gardening, good health and nutrition, Love of Labor and Caring for others.	3.12	ME	3	3.33	ME	3	3.23	ME	3
3	Produce vegetables, etc., in the schools that are rich resource of protein, vitamins, and minerals and eventually increase vegetable consumption and improve Learner's Nutrition	2.46	ME	5	3.30	ME	4	2.88	ME	5
4	Promote vegetables, cereals, root crop production in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools	2.17	ME	6	3.17	ME	6	2.67	ME	6
5	Serve laboratory for Learners	4.42	GE	1	3.20	ME	5	3.81	GE	2
6	Showcase small-scale food production mode	3.99	GE	2	4.12	GE	1	4.06	GE	1
Average Weighted Mean		3.16	ME		3.44	ME		3.30	ME	

Table 4
Activities of Implementing GPP

No.	Indicators	Teachers			School Administrators			Average		
		WM	VI	R	WM	VI	R	WM	VI	R
1	Advocacy Campaign	3.12	ME	3	3.81	GE	3	3.47	ME	3
2	Establishment and Maintenance School Gardens	3.13	ME	1	4.52	GE	1	3.83	ME	1
3	Partnership with Stakeholders	3.08	ME	5	3.50	GE	5	3.29	ME	5
4	Program Evaluation	3.12	E	3	3.84	GE	2	3.48	ME	2
5	Sustainability Mechanism	2.62	ME	6	3.43	ME	6	3.03	GE	6
6	Utilization of Garden Yields/Proceeds	3.12	ME	3	3.73	GE	4	3.43	ME	4
Average Weighted Mean		3.03	ME		3.81	GE		3.42	ME	

Table 5
Management Support in the Implementation of GPP

No.	Indicators	Teachers			School Administrators			Average		
		WM	VI	R	WM	VI	R	WM	VI	R
1	Allot space for the GPP	4.84	VGE	1	4.58	VGE	1	4.71	VGE	1
2	Close monitoring and evaluation of the GPP.	3.71	GE	6	3.67	GE	7	3.39	ME	9
3	Conduct conference to disseminate information.	3.36	ME	10	4.36	GE	3	3.86	GE	5
4	Coordinate with the LGU for possible donation.	3.64	GE	9	3.24	ME	10	3.44	GE	8
5	Enhance SIP with emphasis on the implementation of GPP.	3.67	GE	7	3.50	GE	9	3.59	GE	7
6	Include GPP in the writing of the CIP.	4.43	GE	3	3.96	GE	6	4.20	GE	10
7	Plan school-based training on GPP.	4.37	GE	4	4.57	VGE	2	4.47	GE	2
8	Request fund to purchase materials needed.	3.60	GE	8	4.34	GE	4	3.97	GE	4
9	Send teachers to attend trainings and seminars about GPP.	4.07	GE	5	3.57	GE	8	3.82	GE	6
10	Solicit fund from alumni and other stakeholders.	4.52	VGE	2	4.29	GE	5	4.41	GE	3
Average Weighted Mean		4.02	GE		3.95	GE		3.98	GE	

Table 6
Benefits of GPP

No.	Indicators	Teachers			School Administrators			Average		
		WM	VI	R	WM	VI	R	WM	VI	R
1	Encourage leadership among teachers and students.	3.93	GE	8	4.33	GE	3	4.13	GE	5
2	Improve learner's health and nutritional status.	4.21	GE	4	4.33	GE	3	4.27	GE	3
3	Improve learners' performance by having balanced diet.	3.54	GE	10	3.67	GE	8	3.61	GE	10
4	Inculcate among learners the value of gardening.	4.33	GE	2	3.83	GE	6	4.08	GE	6
5	Maximize the use of vacant lots/space in school.	4.14	GE	5.5	4.33	GE	3	4.24	GE	4
6	Motivate teachers to develop the love of labor and gardening.	4.27	GE	3	4.50	VGE	1	4.39	GE	1
7	Promote food security in school and community.	4.14	GE	5.5	3.80	GE	7	3.97	GE	7
8	Promote vegetable production for school feeding purposes.	3.79	GE	9	3.64	GE	9	3.72	GE	9
9	Serve as training for students.	4.05	GE	7	3.56	GE	10	3.81	GE	8
10	Stimulate creativity among teachers and students.	4.42	GE	1	4.24	GE	5	4.33	GE	2
Average Weighted Mean		4.08	GE		4.02	GE		4.05	GE	

Table 7
 Problems Encountered by the Schools in the Implementation of GPP

No.	Indicators	Teachers			School Administrators			Average		
		WM	VI	R	WM	VI	R	WM	VI	R
1	Inadequate garden tools to be used in the garden.	4.23	GE	2.5	4.05	GE	8	4.14	GE	6
2	Insufficient fund to purchase the materials and equipment needed.	4.15	GE	6	4.21	GE	4	4.18	GE	5
3	Insufficient water supply.	4.27	GE	2	4.25	GE	3	4.26	GE	2
4	Lack of cooperation from the stakeholders.	4.05	GE	9.5	4.13	GE	5.5	4.09	GE	8
5	Lack of dedication and commitment of teachers.	4.14	GE	7	4.03	GE	9	4.09	GE	8
6	Low production due to sterile land	4.35	GE	1	4.11	GE	7	4.23	GE	4
7	Poor monitoring and evaluation of the garden.	4.23	GE	2.5	4.48	GE	1	4.36	GE	1
8	Unavailability of space for the implementation of GulayansaPaaralan.	4.18	GE	5	4.32	GE	2	4.25	GE	3
9	Unawareness of the children on the importance of the garden.	4.10	GE	8	4.02	GE	10	4.06	GE	10
10	Weak support from the community and other stakeholders.	4.05	GE	9.5	4.13	GE	5.5	4.09	GE	8
Average Weighted Mean		4.18	GE		4.17	GE		4.17	GE	

Table 8
 Summary of the Implementation of GPP in Elementary and Secondary Schools of San Nicolas District

No.	Indicators	Teachers			School Administrators			Average		
		WM	VI	R	WM	VI	R	WM	VI	R
1	Objectives of GPP	3.16	ME	4	3.44	ME	5	3.30	ME	5
2	Process of Implementing GPP	3.03	ME	5	3.81	GE	4	3.42	ME	4
3	Management Support in the Implementation of GPP	4.02	GE	3	3.95	GE	3	3.98	GE	3
4	Benefits of GPP	4.08	GE	2	4.02	GE	2	4.05	GE	2
5	Problems encountered by the schools in the implementation of GPP	4.18	GE	1	4.17	GE	1	4.17	GE	1
Overall Weighted Mean		3.69	GE		3.88	GE		3.78	GE	

Table 9
 Values Manifested in the Implementation of the Implementation of GPP

No.	Indicators	Teachers			School Administrators			Average		
		WM	VI	R	WM	VI	R	WM	VI	R
1	Care the environment and protect the natural resources.	4.29	M	4	4.50	HM	3	4.40	M	2
2	Emphasize the importance of dignity and love for work through trainings and seminars.	4.43	M	3	4.24	M	5	4.34	M	3
3	Exhibit leadership and sense of responsibility.	3.57	M	7	4.57	HM	2	4.07	M	5
4	Give importance to food production in the mitigation of hunger.	4.50	HM	2	4.64	HM	1	4.57	HM	1
5	Promote the spirit of bayanihan among teachers and stakeholders	4.07	M	5	3.87	M	4	3.97	M	6.5
6	Show concern to the welfare of others.	3.95	M	6	4.29	M	4	4.12	M	4
7	Show respect and love for work.	4.86	HM	1	3.07	M	7	3.97	M	6.5
Average Weighted Mean		42.4	M		4.17	M		4.20	M	

Table 10
 Differences Between the Assessments of the Teachers and School Administrators on the Implementation of the GPP in All Public Elementary and Secondary Schools of San Nicolas District

Variables	AWM	Computed T - value	Level	Decision
Teachers	3.88	.6882	Not Significant	Accepted
Administrators	3.69			

df = 8 t at 0.05 = 2.306 t at 0.01 = 1.860

2. Conclusion

This paper presented an overview on implementation of Gulayan Sa Paaralan Program (GPP) in all public schools in San Nicolas District.

References

- [1] Calmorin, Laurentina P. and Calmorin, Melchor A. Methods of Research and Thesis Writing. Quezon City: Rex Printing Company, Inc. 2000.
- [2] Darch, Craig B. and Kame'enui, Edward J., Instructional Classroom Management: A Proactive Approach to Behavior Management. Second Edition, West Virginia University Press, 2004.
- [3] Leithwood, T. D. G. M., International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration Part 2. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kulwer Academic Publishers, 1996.
- [4] Tejero, Erlinda G., Thesis and Dissertation Writing: A Modular Approach, Mandaluyong City: National Book Store, 2004.
- [5] Zulueta, F. A. & Perez, J. R. Methods of Research Thesis Writing and Applied Statistics. Navotas City: Navotas Press, 2010.
- [6] Adrogué, Cecilia and Orlicki, María Eugenia, (n. d.), Do In-School Feeding Programs Have Impact on Academic Performance and Dropouts? The Case of Public Argentine Schools, Retrieved April 30, 2015 from
- [7] Alexander, J. & D. Hendren, (1998), Bexar County Master Gardener Classroom Garden Research Project: Final Report. San Antonio, Texas, Retrieved April 30, 2015.
- [8] Bush, T (n. d.), Educational Leadership and Management: Theory, Policy, and Practice, South African Journal of Education. Vol. 27 (3). Retrieved February 20, 2013
- [9] DepEd Implements "Gulayan Sa Paaralan" Program (2008), Philippine School News, Retrieved April 30, 2015
- [10] Emyreystinambacan's Blog, just another WordPress.com site, Retrieved April 30, 2015 from <https://emyreystinambacan.wordpress.com/doon-po-sa-amin-may-gulayan-sa-paaralan/>
- [11] Festin, Imelda C., Teacher - 1 Palangon Elementary School (2013), The Importance of Gulayan sa Paaralan, BICOLMAIL in TOP STORIES, Retrieved April 30, 2015

-
- [12] Manila Bulletin Editorial (2011), Vegetable Gardens to Help Improve Nutrition of Public School Children, Manila Bulletin, Retrieved November 21, 2012 from <http://www.mb.com.ph/articles/>
- [13] Manila Bulletin Editorial (2012), Awareness Vegetables in the Filipino Diet, Manila Bulletin, Retrieved September 28, 2012
- [14] Sporer, A.B. & Pringle, K.R. (2011). How to Grow a School: A Complete Guide for Parents and Teachers. Retrieved February 20, 2013 from Mother Earth Living Journals/Periodicals
- [15] Ahmed, A. U., "Assessing the Performance of Conditional Cash Transfer Programs for Girls and Boys in Primary and Secondary Schools in Bangladesh", Project Report Prepared for the World Bank, Washington, D. C., International Food Policy Research Institute, 2004.
- [16] Advisories, Manuals, Modules, Orders and Memoranda DepEd Memorandum No. 293 s. 2007
- [17] Department of Agriculture Administrative Order No. 15 s. 2011
- [18] Benedicto, Cora R., "The Gulayan Sa Paaralan Project in Nabunturan: A Phenomenological Study", Master's Thesis, Assumption College of Nabunturan, Nabunturan, Compostela Valley Province, 2013,
- [19] Effectiveness of GulayansaPaaralan Program in Tambo Elementary School, Lanao Del Norte, Philippines (2014), Mindanao State University, Marawi City, 2014.
- [20] Foeken, Dick, Owuor, Samuel O. and Alice M. Mwangi, (2010), School Farming for School Feeding: Experiences from Nakuru, Kenya, African Studies Centre, The Netherlands, Department of Geography and Environmental Studies, University of Nairobi, Applied Nutrition Program, Department of Food Science, Nutrition and Technology, University of Nairobi, 2010.
- [21] Stone Hearth News (2012), US Government Funds School Community Gardens and Garden-Based Learning Opportunities, Retrieved February 21, 2013.
- [22] Foeken, Dick and Samuel O. Owuor, "Farming as a Livelihood Source for the Urban Poor of Nakuru, Kenya", Geoforum, Vol. 39, No. 6, Elsevier, Maryland Heights/Kidlington, pp. 1978-1990, 2008.