

Review and Assessment of the Students Grants-in-Aid Program for Poverty Alleviation (SGP-PA)

Aniceto Orbeta, Jr., Senior Research Fellow
Denise Valerie Silfverberg, Consultant



Philippine Institute for Development Studies
Surian sa mga Pag-aaral Pangkaunlaran ng Pilipinas

Outline

Background

Research issues and objectives

Methodology

Findings

Policy implications

Background

Program Objectives

Poverty alleviation through “increase in the number of graduates in higher education among poor households” and “get these graduates employed in high valued added occupations” (CMO No.09-s2012, Annex C)

Background

Features of the Program

- Beneficiaries from Pantawid Pamilya households
- Full-financing
 - 60,000 per academic year
 - Tuition: 20,000 (10,000 per semester)
 - Living Allowance: 35,000 (3,500 per month)
 - Textbooks and instructional materials: 5,000 (2,500 per semester)
- Enrollment in CHED priority degree programs
- Eligibility limited to select SUCs (top regional SUCs in the first batch) and more SUCs in the second batch
- Joint project of DSWD, CHED, DOLE, SUCs.

Background

Program Implementation

- SGP-PA
 - Academic year 2012-2013
 - 4,041 beneficiaries
 - 35 top regional SUCs

- ESGP-PA (E-Expanded)
 - 36,412 beneficiaries added in AY 2014-2015
 - 112 SUCs

Research Objectives

Immediate: Understand operational issues

Longer-term: Measure impact

Methodology

Research Design

- Compare grantees with their peers
- Document interventions done by SUCs for the beneficiaries
- Document operational issues

Data Collection

- Data on grantees and their peers
- Narratives on intervention
- Narratives on operational issues

Engage a research team in the SUCs

- Data collection of entrance exam scores, grades
- Documentation of interventions done for the beneficiaries
- Documentation of implementation issues
- Co-write the SUC report

Methodology (cont.)

Originally intended to engage 8 SGP-PA SUCs and 8 ESGP-PA SUCs

Due to delays, was able to include in the analysis only 4 SGP-PA SUCs and 6 ESGP-PA SUCs

Data Generated

Wave	Data Submissions
SGP-PA	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Profile data of grantees and peers• Entrance exam scores of grantees and peers• Semestral grades for grantees and peers for AY 2012-2013 and AY 2013-2014
ESGP-PA	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Profile data of grantees and peers• Entrance exam scores of grantees and peers• Semestral grades for grantees and peers for the AY 2014-2015

Findings - Profiles

SGP-PA	ESGP-PA
More female grantees than peers (%) (61 vs 53)	More female grantees than peers (67 vs 59)
Grantees are older than their peers (years) (20 vs 17)	Grantees still older than peers but age difference is smaller (18 vs 17)
More of grantees attended public HS (%) (92 vs 77)	More grantees attended public HS but difference is smaller (95 vs 92)
Ave annual per capita income of grantees lowers (pesos) (4,489 vs 18,870)	Average annual income of grantees is still lower but difference is smaller (7,061 vs 14,402)
Family size of grantees is larger (9 vs 6)	Family size of grantees is larger (7 vs 6)
Grantees are out of school longer (years) (2 vs 1)	No difference in gap between HS and college

Findings – Entrance Exam Scores

SGP-PA	ESGP-PA
Grantees have lower score (34.54 vs 41.15)	Grantees have higher score (58.08 vs 53.76)

Disadvantage of SGP-PA grantees is both in socioeconomic background and academic preparation

Disadvantage of ESGP-PA grantees is on in socioeconomic background

Findings – Academic Performance Simple Comparisons

SGP-PA	ESGP-PA
Catch up with peers in the first semester of second year in Math and Science but not in English	Grantees ahead of peers in English but are behind in math

Findings – Academic performance (multivariate analysis)

Controlling for socioeconomic characteristics, grantees perform not as good as their peers only in the first year for all banner subjects (Math, Science, and English). In the second year, the grantees are either performing at par with peers (Math) or better (Science, English)

Findings – Role of Entrance Exams (multivariate analysis)

Entrance exam scores is shown to be a positively correlated with academic performance in all subjects and statistically significant. In addition, its coefficient did not change much with the inclusion of socioeconomic variables in the model.

Findings – Services provided to grantees

Academic

- Tutorial and remedial classes
- Review classes for those undergoing removal exams
- Peer mentoring

Social

- Counseling and monitoring for problems related to bullying
- Counseling for behavioral problems (absenteeism, tardiness, violation of school and dorm policies)
- Social activities to help grantees adjust to university life
- Financial literacy seminars

Basic necessities

- Dormitories and boarding houses, SUCs serving as guarantors

Health services

- Provision of assistance to grantees who are ill or get into accidents
- Coverage offered by the school insurance

Findings – Implementation Issues

- Delayed release of funds
- No budget allocation for summer courses, OJTs, national competency exams, field trips, and thesis
- Late provision of list of grantees to SUCs made it difficult to stick to admission policies
- Medical and laboratory tests were waived as a requirement – grantees with undiagnosed illnesses
- Need for extra staff to handle the program; for some SUCs, this could not be done due to insufficient budget

Summary and Policy implications

1. With appropriate interventions, well selected students with poor socioeconomic back ground are able to perform as good as their peers
2. The importance of full-financing in student financial assistance programs, particularly, those intended for students from poor households
3. Entrance exams results are highly correlated with academic performance; hence, need to be included as an eligibility requirement
4. Importance of a well-thought out program monitoring data for rigorously assessing critical program features



Philippine Institute for Development Studies
Surian sa mga Pag-aaral Pangkaunlaran ng Pilipinas

Service through
policy research

Thank You

WEBSITE: www.pids.gov.ph

FACEBOOK: facebook.com/PIDS.PH

TWITTER: twitter.com/PIDS_PH

EMAIL: youremail@mail.pids.gov.ph

SGP-PA SUCs included in the analysis

	HEI Name	No. of SGP-PA Grantees
1	Davao del Norte State College (DNSC)	204
2	Southern Philippines Agri-Business and Marine and Aquatic School of Technology (SPAMAST)	123
3	Mindanao University of Science and Technology (MUST)	204
4	West Visayas State University (WVSU)	246

ESGP-PA SUCs included in the analysis

	HEI NAME	No. of ESGP-PA Grantees
1	Capiz State University (CAPSU)	863
2	Carlos Hilado Memorial State College (CHMSC)	119
3	Guimaras State College (GSC)	93
4	West Visayas State University (WVSU)	527
5	Surigao del Sur State University (SDSSU)	582
6	Visayas State University	259

OLS results for **first year** academic achievement

Dependent variable	Mathematics						Science				English			
	Model 2		Model 4		Model 2		Model 4		Model 2		Model 4			
Independent variables	Coeff.	SE	Coeff.	SE	Coeff.	SE	Coeff.	SE	Coeff.	SE	Coeff.	SE		
Entrance exam score	0.04 ***	0.02	0.06 ***	0.01	0.06 ***	0.00	0.10 ***	0.01	0.05 ***	0.00	0.04 ***	0.01		
Grantee	0.22	0.17	-0.78 **	0.33	-0.24	0.21	-0.86 **	0.37	-0.16	0.16	-0.72 **	0.28		
Age			0.11	0.08			0.42 ***	0.10			-0.24 ***	0.07		
Log of HH income			0.34 **	0.18			1.07 ***	0.22			0.46 ***	0.15		
Married			-0.70	2.12			2.25	2.43			0.28	1.94		
Female			0.40	0.34			0.86 **	0.40			1.58 ***	0.29		
Father had at least some HS			0.06	0.35			0.33	0.37			0.67 **	0.30		
Mother had at least some HS			0.37	0.38			0.49 *	0.41			0.39	0.32		
Gap between HS and college			-0.10	0.10			-0.36 ***	0.12			0.16 *	0.09		
SUC			-0.49 ***	0.14			0.73 ***	0.14			0.36 ***	0.11		
Program wave	0.37 *	0.22	2.32 ***	0.39	-2.84 ***	0.39	-2.43 ***	0.46	-0.95 ***	0.22	-1.03 ***	0.36		
Constant	80.41 ***	0.43	73.66 ***	2.90	86.11 ***	0.78	61.94 ***	3.43	84.64 ***	0.41	82.24 ***	2.48		
No. of observations	3519		1028		2581		635		4069		384			
Adj. R-squared	0.0273		0.0901		0.0621		0.2202		0.0365		0.213			

OLS results for second year academic achievement

Dependent variable	Mathematics				Science				English			
	Model 2		Model 4		Model 2		Model 4		Model 2		Model 4	
Independent variables	Coeff.	SE	Coeff.	SE	Coeff.	SE	Coeff.	SE	Coeff.	SE	Coeff.	SE
Entrance exam score	0.10 ***	0.02	0.13 ***	0.04	0.07 *	0.04	0.37 ***	0.09	0.16 **	0.1	0.21 ***	0.07
Grantee	0.78	0.52	0.57	0.79	0.24	1.1	5.72 **	2.45	1.58	1.3	3.75 **	1.59
Age			0.29 **	0.12			0.05	0.23			-0.18	0.22
Log of HH income			-0.67 **	0.41			-0.47	0.59			-0.47	0.46
Married			-1.94	4.50			0.00 (omitted)				2.39	3.09
Female			0.76	0.60			-0.33	0.88			2.45 ***	0.80
Father had at least some HS			-0.44	0.70			-0.94	1.22			0.62	1.09
Mother had at least some HS			-0.90	0.70			0.39	1.27			0.38	1.10
Gap between HS and college			-0.11	0.16			0.02	0.31			-0.26	0.28
SUC			0.00 (omitted)				0.00 (omitted)				0.00 (omitted)	
Constant	80.41 ***	0.4	78.12 ***	5.03	80.59 ***	1.9	67.50 ***	9.11	79.9 ***	3.2	82.90 ***	7.31
No. of observations	335		184		116		63		129		120	
Adj. R-squared	0.079		0.1547		0.0174		0.1904		0.0443		0.1428	