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Rationale: This study was conducted primarily to determine the extent of the implementation of the new General Education Curriculum (GEC), in selected HEIs in CALABARZON Region: during the academic year 1999 – 2000: The Level of compliance, relevance and effectiveness in preparing college students in the pursuit of their chosen disciplines. Moreover, the study also illuminated the merits/strengths of the GEC, as well as the problems/weaknesses encountered in its implementation.

Statement of the Problem: There are six problems posed in this research:

(1) What is the level of compliance of HEIs in CALABARZON Region to theCHED Memo No. 59 S., 1996 in terms of goals: curriculum content; curriculum requirements, faculty qualification (academic and pedagogical
skills), physical facilities and instructional learning materials?; (1.1) Do the HEI differ in their level of compliance?; (1.1.a) What factors affect the level of compliance?; (2) What is the perception of the respondents on the relevance of the GEC vis-a-vis the pursuit of professional disciplines?; 2.a) Do the HEI differ in their level of perception of the relevance of the GEC?; (3) What factors affect the level of perceptions on the relevance of the GEC?; (4) What is the level of effectiveness of the GEC among HEIs in CALABARZON Region?; 4.1 What are the factors affecting the level of effectiveness of the GEC among the problems encountered by the respondents regarding the implementation of the GEC?; 4.2 Is there concordance in the perception of the problems encountered by the participating HEIs regarding the implementation of the General Education Curriculum (GEC)?; (5) What are the strengths and weaknesses of the GEC?;

Hypotheses: (1) There is no significant difference among HEIs in the perceived level of compliance to the GEC.; 1.1 There is no relationship among certain factors and the level of compliance.; (2) There is no significant difference among HEIs in their level of perception of relevance of the GEC.; 2.a There is no relationship among certain factors affecting the level of perception of relevance of the GEC.; (3) There is no significant difference among HEIs in the level of Effectiveness of the GEC.; 3.a There is no relationship among certain factors and the level of effectiveness.; (4) There are no significant differences on the problems encountered by the HEIs in the implementation of the GEC.
Methods and Procedure: To achieve the fundamental thrust of the study, the descriptive research design supported with documentary analysis was employed. Personal/Casual Interview and actual observation were also used to enrich and strengthen the information gathered.

Stratified proportionate sampling was used in the selection of respondents. A total of 823 respondents were involved in this undertaking, 10 administrators, 110 teachers, and 703 graduating students all from the College of Arts and Sciences.

The unit of analysis of this research was by Institution/HEI. There were five participating HEIs in the study chosen on the basis of four distinct criteria: 1) Accredited HEI; 2) Most populous in terms of student enrolment for academic year 1999-2000; 3) servicing at least five degree programs and 4) coeducational institution. These institutions were coded as: Higher Education Institution 1, Higher Education Institution 2, Higher Education Institution 3, Higher Education Institution 4 and Higher Education Institution 5.

A combination of descriptive and inferential statistics were used in the analysis and interpretation of data. ThMicrostat and Contemporary Statistics' statistical package were used to ensure accuracy and precision in the computation. Computed values were tested against .05 level of significance.

Findings: 1. In terms of level of compliance, the five HEIs complied very satisfactorily to the goals of the GEC (Average Weighted
Means: HEI 1 WM=8.09, SD 0.48; HEI 2 and HEI 3 had WM=8.02 and SD=0.48; HEI 4 WM=8.25, SD=0.28 and HEI 5 WM=7.85, SD=0.48; 100% compliance to curriculum content and requirements; Outstanding compliance to faculty academic qualifications and above average in pedagogical skills and commendable compliance to physical facilities and instructional learning materials.

1.1. Analysis of Variance showed that there were no significant differences found on the level of compliance (F=1.202 < 2.76) curriculum content and requirement, faculty qualification and pedagogical skills (F=0.000 < 3.48); physical facilities (F= 1.751 < 2.76) and instructional materials (F= 1.751 < 3.49).

2. Factors affecting level of compliance to the GEC: (a) Correlation coefficient between age and level of compliance was negligible r=0.000, t=0.784); (b) Correlation coefficient between population and level of compliance was negligible r=0.000, t=0.000; (c) Urban-ness and level of compliance, similarly was insignificant, r=0.000 to 0.586 and (d) Perceived prestige and level of compliance found negligible at t and r =0.000

2.1. Perception of the Relevance of the GEC: (A) Collectively the five HEIs found Language and Literature subject relevant with an average mean of HEI 1 (WM=8.38); HEI 2 (WM=8.38); HEI 3 (WM=8.38); HEI 4 (WM=8.03); and HEI 5 (WM=7.78); (B) Results showed that the five HEIs rated Mathematics and Natural Science relevant indicated by their means: HEI 1 (WM=8.03); HEI 2 (WM=7.74); HEI 3 (WM=7.95); HEI 4 (WM=8.48) and HEI 5 (WM=7.72); (C) Respondents from the five HEIs
responded that Humanities and Social Sciences was really relevant as shown by their weighted mean scores; HEI 1 (WM=8.10); HEI 2 (WM=8.04); HEI 3 (WM=8.04); and HEI 5 (WM=7.94) and Over-all mean perception 8.11. (D) Relevance of Mandated Subjects an over-all mean perception of 7.94 was recorded, signifying that the mandated subjects were relevant, the weighted means per school were as follows HEI 1 (8.41); HEI 2 (7.99); HEI 3 (7.74); HEI 4 (7.93); and HEI 5 (7.62).

2.2 There was significant difference in the perception of relevance of Language and Literature courses (F=6.606 >3.06), similarly with Mathematics and Natural Sciences (F=6.610 >3.06) and Mandated course (F=4.78 >3.06) while no significant difference was noted in Humanities and Social Sciences (F=2.482 >2.65). Summative perception of the relevance of the core areas revealed that HEI 1, HEI 2, and HEI 4 perceived the 3 core areas as Language and Literature, Humanities and Social Sciences and Mandated Courses were very relevant while for HEI 3 and HEI 5, it was only relevant. However, as a group, they averred that the core areas were very relevant in equipping the students with the competencies for specialization.

2.3. When Pearson's product moment of correlation was used population, age of the school, pedagogical skills, instructional materials were insignificant, it was only in the ecological setting of the HEIs where it was found significant.

3. Level of effectiveness: Over-all GPA of the five schools was 84.34, SD=3.17 verbally described as Satisfactory while the three factors such
as teacher factors, learning environment and institutional learning materials were affecting the relevance of the GEC to a great extent.

4. There are problems encountered by educators and students in the implementation of the GEC; For educators, excessive non-teaching duties and responsibilities; lack of funding for faculty development, budget for renovations, pressure brought about by CHED requirements and others. While the problems met by the students were overcrowded classes; need for additional facilities; test given by teachers were not congruent to what were taught to them and too many requirements for passing the course.

4.1 The result of the study found significant concordance or agreement in the problems met by both educators (administrators and teachers) and students.

5. The Factors contributory to the strengths of the GEC were competent mentors; adequate facilities; supportive administration; correct sequencing of courses and very adequate laboratories and lab equipment. As to the leading weaknesses-factors, canteen facilities, right schedule of classes and updated instructional materials and others.

Conclusions: 1) Accredited HEIs complied very satisfactorily to the goals of the GEC; 2) HEIs do not differ significantly in their level of compliance to CHED MEMO 59,S.,1996; 3) HEIs population, age of the school, faculty qualifications, ecological setting physical facilities and instructional materials cannot account for variation in the level of compliance to the GEC; 4) GEC is relevant in preparing college students
for specialization; 5) There is no congruence in the perception of relevance of Language and Literature, Mathematics and Natural Sciences and Mandated courses in providing foundations in the pursuit of professional disciplines; 6) the level of perception of relevance of the GEC is independent of school, teacher and student factors; 7) In general the GEC is effective; 8) The level of effectiveness is not predicted of differences in school teacher and student related variables; 9) There are problems encountered by HEIs in the implementation of the GEC, there is similarity in problems encountered by educators and students in the implementation; and 10) the GEC has its own strengths and weaknesses.

**Recommendations**

The study had the following recommendations:

1. To enhance further the commendable level of compliance to the GEC, the following can be considered by the administrators;

   A. Focus and redirect the targeted goals of the curriculum by exerting more efforts towards their attainment. Intensify the basic preparatory courses.

   B. Continuing professional education of the faculty members.
C. To raise the pedagogical competence of those servicing the GEC, deans and department chairs have to institute clinical and development modes of supervision.

D. Budget allocation should be proportional to the existing needs of the institution.

E. Learning resource centers should be continuously upgraded to respond to the current thrusts of education.

F. Book holdings of these HEIs have to be updated and standardized.

2. The five accredited HEIs in CALABARZON Region should sustain their commendable level of compliance to the CHED Memo No. 59, series of 1996, by periodically conducting an organizational audit in order to be cognizant of their deficiencies.

3. Deans and department chairs should exercise their instructional leadership functions to monitor the implementation of the core courses under the GEC.

4. The teaching of Mathematics and the Natural Sciences, as well as Language and Literature needs to be intensified.
5. The faculty and the students should be made aware of their complementary role in ensuring the level of effectiveness of the curriculum in preparing students in their fields of specialization.

6. Greater focus must be done on the following factors affecting the level of effectiveness of the GEC: updating teaching methodologies; enrichment of library and laboratory facilities; and updating textbooks and syllabi.

7. The number of teaching preparations must be reduced to at least three preparations only.

8. Budget allocation for faculty development must be prioritized.

9. Minimize excessive non-teaching duties and responsibilities for the mentors to concentrate more on the academic side of the curriculum.

10. Professors must help students relate lessons to actual life situations.

11. College teachers should be required to prepare examinations based on a table of specifications.

12. Mentors servicing the GEC should not sacrifice quality for quantity in the teaching of the course syllabi.

13. Students must be made to realize that learning is an enjoyable experience.
14. To enhance the strengths of the curriculum, the following factors should be seriously considered: competent mentors; adequate facilities; supportive administration and correct sequencing of courses.

15. There are factors in curriculum improvement that have significant bearing in the academic development of the individual: canteen facilities; right schedule of classes and updated instructional materials be given importance.

16. This pioneering study on the extent of the implementation of the GEC can be replicated in a different setting/venue, using other elements of the curriculum.

17. The General Education Curriculum or any curriculum in general must be evaluated regularly for its improvement and redirection.