KOREAN JOURNAL OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTICS

Faculty and Students' Evaluation of K to 12 English Curriculum in a Philippine Countryside University

Erwin L. Purcia (University of Antique) **Lewelyn H. Merida** (University of Eastern Philippines)

Erwin L. Purcia
Associate Professor, College of Teacher Education, University of Antique, Sibalom, Antique, Philippines
Tel. No. +63908810747
erwin.purcia@antiquespride.edu.ph

Lewelyn H. Merida
Assistant Professor IV, College of Arts and Communication, University of Eastern Philippines, Catarman, Northern Samar, Philippines
Tel. No. +639292867954
lewelynmerida@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

Purcia, E. and L. Merida. (2021). Faculty and students' evaluation of K to 12 English curriculum in a Philippine countryside university. *Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics* 21, 1045-1059.

The purpose of this study is to evaluate the K to 12 Basic English Curriculum implemented by the Department of Education, Philippines. Utilizing descriptive-evaluative design with a validated researcher-made questionnaire administered among faculty members and Grade 11 students in the countryside university in the Philippines-University of Eastern Philippines-System, results revealed that the curriculum is moderately implemented. This means that the government lacks support to institutions in the countryside in order to effectively provide all resources needed by students to ensure that effective language learning takes place. The lack of instructional materials and other resources significantly hamper students' language learning opportunities.

KEYWORDS
K to 12 Basic English Curriculum, evaluation, English program, countryside university

1. Introduction

In its consideration of the Tertiary Education Readiness Standards, the Department of Education (DepEd) has embedded Basic Coursework from universities and colleges into senior high school compulsory subjects in the pursuit of school reform that include expanded curriculum from K to 12 (CEB Resolution No. 298-2011). It has also opened the door for postsecondary learning to modify the current General Education curriculum (CHED CMO No. 20 s. 2013).

After almost six years of its implementation, the Basic English Curriculum for Senior High School needs to be evaluated. The status of the English Curriculum has to be assessed to determine its appropriateness to the local context. Are content and skills arranged so that they build on one another and align with the general sequence of language and cognitive development? Are the English teaching strategies appropriate for reaching both the specified outcomes and objectives? These are just few examples of questions only an evaluation study could answer. These are also some of the reasons why the researchers decided to conduct this study. Evaluating the Basic English Curriculum in the context of the University of Eastern Philippines-System, a countryside university in the Global South which ultimately just receives mandate from national offices on what to implement without engaging in a grassroot analysis if such program is effective or not, could determine the preparedness of the students for the English Program in higher education.

Thus, this study was conducted to evaluate the implementation of the Basic English curriculum by the faculty and students of the University of Eastern Philippines in learning the English language. Specifically, this aimed to:

1. determine the instructional materials used by English teachers;
2. determine the problems encountered by the teachers in the English Curriculum;
3. evaluate the Basic English Curriculum by the faculty and students in terms of:
   3.1   objectives,
   3.2   organization,
   3.3   content,
   3.4   teaching Strategies,
   3.5   student Learning Activities,
   3.6   standards,
   3.7   assessment,
   3.8   alignment with School Mission,
   3.9   completeness or Scope.

2. Related Literature

There are results of research on faculty profile which have been made as basis for the formulation of theories and principles that define the appropriate behaviors of effective and ineffective faculty especially in crafting instructional materials, problems they encounter in teaching and how they are involved in the evaluation of the curriculum they intend to translate.

2.1 Instructional Materials

Instructional resources, particularly textbooks, serve as the foundation of classroom instruction, according to Galvez-Tan (2007). The availability of textbooks in public schools has significantly improved, both at the primary and secondary levels. This is mostly owing to multilateral support from international for primary textbooks, the Asian Development Bank for upper reference books, and the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) for textbook paper. Although the textbook-to-student ratio was about 5 to 1 ten years ago, now it has eventually hit balance, for each government school student obtaining one full set of school books and the accompanying teacher's guidebook.

On the other hand, there still appears to be some room for improvement in the quality of the textbook contents, particularly in the elementary grades, where some mismatch between textbook contents and sequencing on the other hand, and minimum learning competencies on the other hand, seem to exist.

Teachers are encouraged to employ a variety of instructional materials under the 2002 Basic Education Curriculum (BEC). Learning Competencies and Scope and Sequence by Learning Area; DepEd Approved Textbooks and Teacher's Manuals; Nonformal Education (NFE) Accreditation and Equivalence Learning Materials; Prototype Lesson Plans; Teacher-Developed Instructional Materials; Cultural Artifacts and other indigenous materials available in the Community; and Information and Communication Technology (ICT), where available.

2.2 Teacher-Related Difficulty

Surafel (2002) found that the largest class sizes, insufficient background knowledge of students, scarcity of textbooks, absence/scarcity of additional materials, and exam practice were among the most prevalent issues English language teachers had while attempting to adopt the strategy. Teachers' impressions of educational challenges in Ethiopia, in his article, has recognized the following issues: overcrowded classes, a lack of teaching materials, heavy teaching loads, and so on. He went on to say that educators' attitudes are yet another cause of problems in Ethiopia's education system.

2.3 Criteria for English Program Evaluation

The goal of an effective English program guide, according to Sanders (1994), would be to prioritize as well as integrate any works of teachers. As a consequence, the project outline must contain anything other than a list of what can be covered. It's critical to consider more than simply the material while evaluating a program. For establishing the parameters to be employed in an assessment method, Sanders proposes the following criteria: "In order to answer relevant program questions, the information acquired should be comprehensive in scope while also being sympathetic to the plight and objectives of customers and other authorized stakeholders." The factors that should be employed while constructing a program assessment instrument have been the subject of extensive research. Educators have offered dozens of other standards as an outcome of the study. Eleven parameters identified as perhaps the most widely utilized for designing and implementing curriculum outlines, thus they were used to assess courses throughout this investigation.

Organization or Sequence. Organization or sequence is the first criteria. A curriculum is cohesive, according to Hook, Bishop and Hook (2007), if each grade level has a developmentally appropriate number of topics and these

topics follow a clear pattern with ideas building on background understanding. English (2000) stresses the importance of a time frame in the learning material that indicates a period of options, instead of a specific number of days or intervals, which should be spent on every concept, ability, or course of learning, in order to help create continuity. This is especially helpful for inexperienced teachers, since the time indication helps them determine how much focus should be placed on various ideas and how long certain units should take to teach. Curriculum mapping has recently been popular, as it ensures that teachers present subject matter and skills in a consistent order, allowing for cross-content connections. Interdisciplinary research has been found to aid in the development of a well-rounded education (Seed 2005).

Objectives. A second common requisite in curriculum evaluation is the objectives. Education goals serve as the main criterion for curriculum planning, according to his Objectives Model, and student evaluation is based on outcome achievement. A curriculum document should include stated targets that define the type of behavior, the circumstances, and the methods for evaluating not if the objective was already met. Cognitive outcomes are student acts that reflect what they've learned, according to English (2000). Hewitt (2006) agrees, stating that student actuations as stated in an objective should be manifesting, and student assessment, both formative and summative, must be measured by achievement of the objectives.

Content. The most visible component of a curriculum is content, which is why it is a commonly accepted criterion for evaluation. As a result of the drive toward state standards in the late 1990s, states were granted the power to mandate curriculum, and much of the contemporary research comes from state education departments. School curriculum, as Department of Education (2020) puts it, schools should challenge students of all ability levels while providing key information and skills in each core area. Finally, material must allow for the teaching of content in a setting that is beneficial to learners, according to Brown (2005). Because language learning is so important in English, curriculum material must include all linguistic features of language and research to be studied (Sewell 2008). These learning tasks should be relevant to students' interests and beliefs because they become more meaningful when emphasized (Sewell 2008).

Teaching Strategies. The fourth most popular criterion for curricular evaluation is the incorporation of instructional methodologies, which is closely linked to objectives. The most effective factor in boosting student achievement, according to Marzano, Pickering, and Pollock (2001), is a caring, competent, and qualified teacher who employs current instructional tactics to engage pupils. As a result, good teaching methods are an important part of the curriculum. Rather of describing content purely in terms of content, English (2000) suggests that "work tasks" for the teacher must be accomplished in order to attain the curriculum targets. Aguirre (2015) cited teaching styles as a component in the successful implementation of the K-12 program in Northern Samar in a local study. Teaching techniques are a vital signal in teaching spiral curriculum, according to the study.

Instructional Materials. Teaching materials and other sources must also engage students in integrating instructional practices, and no curriculum evaluation should neglect examining educational content. There are many other "tried and true" literary choices in upper English (such as Romeo and Juliet) which will form a part of nearly every educational curriculum. Teachers, particularly English teachers, are devoted to their textbooks and know what information "works" with students, according to English (2000). According to Tomlinson (2009), resources must allow students of all skill levels to use them effectively in order to retain not just instructor but also student motivation. Parents should be able to access materials as well, thanks to the rising usage of electronic

copies of textbooks and other materials (Borja 2008). Student texts should be suitable in terms of readability and complexity, with possibilities for remediation and enrichment. Finally, Sanico (2014) found that in order for students to be motivated and attain academic goals, textbooks and other materials must engage them. The author concluded in her assessment of a K-12 program in Lope de Vega that no curriculum review should overlook evaluating instructional materials due to their critical role in program implementation.

Student Learning Activities. Teaching and learning exercises are the product of a complex of teaching methodologies and teaching materials, and they are important parts of curricula (Poetter et al. 2007). The Department of Education (2020) emphasizes the engagement of students to various learning tasks in order to catapult effective implementation of the curriculum. This shows that a wide range of learning activities are required to implement the curriculum and should be included in the curriculum assessment tool. All other academic undrrtakings are sugegsted by Marzano, Pickering, and Pollock (2011) to engage students in every learning task. Students need to enjoin learning various tasks that develop their knowledge and skills anchored from the objectives as stipulated in the curriculum (Tomlinson 2009). Finally, The Balanced Curriculum model developed by Squires (2004) specifies significant learning activities students must carry out so to muster mastery of skills, ideas, and standards.

Standards. The contemporary academic campaign, known as No Child Left Behind (NCLB), requires states to set criteria and to test all public-school pupils using a comprehensive review. Many schools based their English and language arts requirements on National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE, 2008) national standards, and yet many institutions changed their curriculum to conform to the rules (DepEd 2020). NCTE (2008) has also specified the numerous English/language arts criteria that students need possess in order to be 21st Century Literacies ready.

Further, Wiggins and McTighe (2009), advocates defining objectives based on standards, t creating assessments, and finally selecting materials based on standards. The process of determining student's scholarly performance and impositions of policies and standards in the evaluation of the school's curriculum is the primary dictum of their advocacy.

Assessment. Another popular criterion for curriculum review is assessment evaluation, which is closely tied to assessing a curriculum document's compliance with state standards. According to Wiggins (2008), evaluation should give students with clear performance goals, helpful feedback, and ways to develop toward academic success, regardless of ability. Thus, according to English (2000), assessments should only be chosen and integrated into the curriculum if they accurately reflect the desired outcomes; "a grade derived from the test is considered an acceptable indicator of the exact level of students' learning" (p. 38). Kelley (2004) acknowledges how, in today's modern criteria of school system, evaluation is the principal dataset for assessing and improving school programs, in addition to evaluating students. A strong curriculum, on the other hand, incorporates numerous methods of evaluating students and institutions, rather than relying solely on standardized test scores. Traditional paper and pencil tests should be supplemented with other forms of evaluation, such as authentic and performance assessments. A variety of assessment types must be balanced throughout the curriculum (Wiggins 2004).

Alignment With School Philosophy. Curriculum evaluation considers whether or not a curriculum aligns with a school's mission or philosophy. In a study of six high schools with diverse demographics conducted by Lee, Smerdon, Alfeld-Liro, and Brown (2000), private and public, large and small, urban and rural schools all considered the school mission in their curriculum and course offerings. According to Griffith (2009), the purpose

is mainly based on the requirements of individuals and the community, and equating educational aims, subject matter, pedagogical approaches, and materials with the school's philosophy are necessitated to guarantee that the authored and instated coursework conveys the school's values.

Completeness or Scope. The final criterion for curriculum evaluation is completeness or scope. Sanders and Nafziger (1976) were two of the first curricularists to identify the necessity to assure that the spectrum of data cover all essential parts of that specific part of the curriculum during the 1970s learning and evaluation trend. More recently, research by Assel et al. (2007) and Hook, Bishop, and Hook (2007) have emphasized the need of analyzing the scope of a curriculum. To ensure proper coverage, Ediger (1995) suggests giving careful thought to what should be stressed in each lesson and unit, as well as how much time should be dedicated to each topic. Finally, according to Ediger (1995), the range of knowledge should encompass all significant features of a course. Year level proper breadth and depth, and amount of content offered focusing on the presentation are other essential variables to consider when evaluating the scope of a course's curriculum (Hewitt 2006). The scope of the curriculum is evaluated to ensure that the information is covered adequately and at a pace that is manageable for students.

3. **Methodology**

The descriptive-evaluative design was used to accomplish the objectives of this study. Primarily, this study evaluated the implementation of the basic English curriculum by the faculty and students of the university. There were a total of two hundred-fifty (250) Grade 11 student-respondents involved in this study who have the actual experience of the implementation of the curriculum. As the onset of the Senior High School Program, these students concretize a first-had experience on how the processes and projects under program are implemented. These students were completers from the original four (4) years of basic education yet because of the promulgation of the Senior High School law, they need to undergo two additional years to complete the basic education program. Thus, their involvement in this probe as first-hand clients of the program substantially provided accurate data and widest perspectives in order to ensure effective implementation of the basic English curriculum in the country in general and in the university in particular.

Further, the population of this study consisted also of all faculty members in the university from all its campuses who were handling English subjects in the Senior High School. There were eleven (11) total number of teachers identified in this study. As the prime-movers of any academic institution, when there are programs implemented by the government, the teachers are always at the forefront. They are obliged to catapult teaching pedagogies and methodologies in order to ensure that there shall be effective transfer of learning from and among their students. As the new curriculum is implemented, they are also posed with a challenge on hoe to materialize its objectives and meet all of the administrative expectations. Considering the small size of the teacher-population, total or complete enumeration was used.

For the student-respondents, a sampling determination formula was used. After determining the number of samples, actual respondents were selected using the random sampling. Students were selected from Grade 11 and were identified using draw lots. Representatives from each campus were considered in their identification The Results of the analyses led the researchers to evaluate the English curriculum implementation under the General Education program of the university, organization, content, teaching strategies utilized by teachers, student

learning activities, standards, assessment, alignment with school mission, and completeness or scope of the implementation.

The data were personally gathered by the researchers. First, permissions were asked from the office of the President and Directors of satellite campuses to conduct the study and to field questionnaires among the faculty and students. Letter of permission was also sought from the students and faculty members while informed consent was sent to parents of students informing them therein of the involvement of their children in the study. The questionnaire was administered and retrieved according to set standards and respondents were given ample time to scribe their responses. After the data were gathered, the researchers, with the aid of a statistician, analyzed the data using appropriate statistical tools. This study used descriptive statistics to present the nature of the variables involved.

4. Results and Discussions

Based on the data gathered, the following findings were revealed as to how the Basic English Curriculum is implemented in the university. The data also underscore the instructional materials used by the university in addressing the needs of the students, the problems encountered by the teachers in its implementation and the over-all program implementation as perceived by both students and teachers as the primary recipients of the program.

4.1 On the Instructional Materials Used by Teachers

As seen on Table 1, teachers use internet-accessed materials as their reference in class. Three (3) use Oral Communication in Context by Ramona S. Flores; two (2) use Reading and Writing by Marella Therese A. Tiongson and Maxine Rafaella C. Rodriguez, and one (1) use the book, A Memoir of the Craft by Stephen King published by Pocket Books Bishop, Wendy. Released into Language: Options for Teaching Creative Language. These are the only books that the teachers use as reference.

All the three campuses of UEP lack significant references that the teachers and students need. The teachers follow the lessons from the curriculum guide given but the textbooks available does not jibe with the Curriculum guide. Some IMs are personally made by teachers just to give the students the knowledge and motivation that they need. To cope up with the lack of materials, teachers access almost all information from the internet. This made online resources the most sought-after references for almost their teaching needs.

The curriculum guide provides a list of outputs and websites but the availability of materials, computers/laptops and even internet connection is a big problem especially to the students. Teachers are provided with huge/wide curriculum guidelines only. Websites are available but the problem is, the computers and internet connection. Available books in the library are not really for senior high school students. These are the books/references of the college students.

It is concluded that there is a need to provide for instructional materials for English language in the whole of the University of Eastern Philippines (UEP) System, if the K to 12 English language program is to succeed. The instructional materials that the university has are not adequate. This negates the study of Lipscomb, Swanson and West (2010) which stressed that instructional method should be parallel with the objectives and thus be appropriate for reaching the specified outcome. Moreover, teaching materials, methodologies and the likes must instigate students to engage in the curriculum and that assessment of learning materials shall be prioritized.

Table 1. Instructional Materials used by English Teachers

Resources	Frequency	Rank
Internet accessed material	12	1
Reading and Writing by Marella Therese A. Tiongson and Maxine Rafaella C. Rodriguez	2	3
A Memoir of the Craft by Stephen King published by Pocket Books	1	4.5
Bishop,Wendy. Released into Language: Options for Teaching Creative Language	1	4.5
Oral Communication in Context by Ramona S. Flores	3	2

4.2 On the Problems Encountered by Teachers

Problems were encountered in the implementation of the English Curriculum (Table 2). Overall, there were serious problems which the respondents identified. Topping the list of the problems is lack of materials with a mean of 4.5. Lack of support with 3.23 rated as slightly serious came next. This included problems on trainings, support from students, school head and administrators. The last are the difficulties met with 3.04 or slightly serious which includes difficulties in using the English language, lesson planning, competencies, unpreparedness, student's assessment, student's financial problem, repetitive lessons and differentiated instruction due to excessive number of students per class.

These findings show that the problems are the basic requirements of English curriculum implementation aside from the quality of its teachers. Teachers have acknowledged not just the lack but the absence of the materials for the English subjects. This is indeed a very serious problem considering that the materials are the tools which students and teachers may use to make the new curriculum be tolerable to the students.

These problems identified should be taken serious by the university as these would derail the successful implementation of the program. Problems such as this would question the capability of the school to implement such curriculum and at the same time question the ability of the administration officials for its sincerity in offering the English Curriculum.

The serious problem on lack of instructional materials affirms the study of Surafel (2002) expostulates that the greater the number of the class size is, the lesser the learning materials are and the lesser the support of their provisions there may be.

Table 2. Problems Encountered by Teachers

Problems Encountered	Weighted mean	Interpretation
Lack of instructional materials • insufficient English materials	4.50	Very much serious
Lack of support • trainings provided were not enough; less support from student due to low awareness on the curriculum; less assistance from the school; less support from the administrators	3.23	Slightly serious
Difficulties met • difficulty of using the language; difficulty in lesson planning; competencies are not suited for students; unprepared to implement the curriculum; difficulty in students' assessment; supervisors contradicting ideas on the use of the English language; lessons are repetitive	3.04	Slightly serious
Mean	3.59	Slightly Serious

4.3 On the Evaluation of the Implementation of the Basic English Curriculum

The status of implementation of the Basic English Curriculum was evaluated by the English teachers and senior high school students. There were nine criteria evaluated, namely: Objectives, Organization, Content, Teaching Strategies, Student Learning Activities, Standards, Assessment, Alignment with School Mission, and Completeness or Scope. Overall, the curriculum was implemented according to teachers with grand mean = 3.81. However, students rated the implemented with a grand mean of 2.89 interpreted as "moderately implemented". The different ratings could imply differences in the context of evaluation or different effect on the two types of respondents.

As regards the objectives of the curriculum, the sub-mean of teachers was higher than the mean of the students. This means that most teachers considered the objectives to have clear learning objectives and that it describes observable student behavior or performance. However, same indicators were rated by students at "fairly implemented" and "moderately implemented", respectively. This difference could mean that teachers and students have different perspective when looking at the curriculum's objectives which affirms English' (2000) caution not to confuse objectives with teacher's tasks; behavioral objectives are student actions that demonstrate what they have learned.

Similarly, the organization or sequence of the curriculum was rated by teachers as "implemented" while students judged it as "moderately implemented". Teachers judged the indicator as "fully implemented" while students rated it as "moderately implemented". Another indicator in which the two groups of respondents starkly differ is on vertical alignment of content and skills. Teachers rated it to be "fully implemented" while students regarded it to be "moderately implemented". Again, the difference suggests that some topics in the curriculum did not follow a logical sequence to build on previously grained knowledge as confirmed in the study of Roadley (2017).

The table indicates the inconsistency of the ratings made by teachers and students in areas of curriculum implemented. Teachers and students had dissimilar extent of implementation for the areas of Content, Teaching Strategies, Student Learning Activities, Standards, Assessment, Alignment with School Mission, and completeness or scope of the curriculum.

Content was judged to be "Moderately Implemented" by the respondent-teachers; "Implemented" by the student-respondents. It may be inferred that the logical sequence of lessons in the English curriculum has not been observed. Organization of lessons therefore has been affected and caused the process of learning some pitfalls for the learners. Learners see some repetitions of lessons. It is concluded that the English curriculum was "moderately implemented." However, a steadfast administration can well improve it. The data suggests that there is a need to address the implementation status which must have been caused by weaknesses as assessed by both sets of respondents. As implementation involves the emotional process of learning on one side, the other side is on the supply side from both the administration for the provision of what the system lacks and the teachers' preparedness in embarking on the new English curriculum.

The respondent-teachers rated teaching strategies, student learning activities, alignment with school mission and scope as "implemented" and student-respondents said "moderately implemented." Collectively, the ratings forwarded by both the respondent-teachers and the student-respondents tell of the different perspectives the students and the teachers have may be because they have rated the indicators also from a different plane. It may be also that the student-respondents are not conversant about the indicators. It is concluded that the indicators, viz., teaching strategies, student learning activities, alignment with school mission and scope were rated by the respondent-teachers and student-respondents "implemented" and moderately implemented" respectively. The data suggests that both the teacher-respondents and the student-respondents should rate with common understanding

about the indicators. However, the ratings suggest of how the same indicators were understood. Different as it is, the English literacy curriculum was rated.

As to the standards of the English literacy curriculum, the respondent-teachers rated it "fully implemented and the student-respondents "moderately implemented." The "moderately implemented" rate the student-respondents gave to standards may be thought of as the inability to really understand the statements presented to them for rating. The "fully implemented" rating may be understood as the respondent-teachers rating probably because they know and understand the statements and they are the very teachers who implement the English literacy curriculum. It is concluded that standards of the English literacy curriculum were rated "moderately implemented" by the student-respondents and "fully implemented" by the respondent-teachers. The data suggests that the respondents involve should come to terms on the understanding of the statements asked of them to be rated. A thorough understanding would warrant a more accurate evaluation on an indicator. It also suggests that "standard" as an indicator appears to be a consideration for limitation insofar as this evaluation is concerned.

Generally, the curriculum was implemented as it was aimed for. Though, dissimilarities were observed in its implementation between teachers and students, the curriculum is still implemented. The difference could be traced to the fact that students nowadays apply a wide range of strategies to comprehend, interpret, evaluate, and appreciate texts. These strategies are somewhat different from the usual strategies used by English teachers (NCTE 2008). In learning the English language, students in the 21st century draw on their prior experience, their interactions with other readers and writers, their knowledge of word meaning and of other texts, their word identification strategies, and their understanding of textual features (e.g., sound-letter correspondence, sentence structure, context, graphics). Furthermore, students in the university system were observed to be technologically savvy as most of them have been exposed to all forms of technology that they utilize in their learning activities. As Cox & Sanders (1994) explain, the primary objective of communicative English program is to aid teachers in their pedagogies. Hence, documentation is essential in putting forth efforts of establishing appropriate content of the program.

Table 3. Evaluation of the Implementation of the Basic English Curriculum

Criteria	Teachers		Students	
Objectives	WM	Interpretation	WM	Interpretation
Does the curriculum include clear learning objectives?	3.80	Implemented	2.50	Fairly implemented
Do the objectives describe observable student behavior or performance?	3.80	Implemented	2.67	Moderately implemented
Are the objectives written to specify the content or area in which the performance is to operate?	3.60	Implemented	2.67	Moderately implemented
Is there a close alignment between the intended course objectives and student assessment?	3.80	Implemented	3.00	Moderately implemented
Are objectives used to make both formative and summative judgments about learning?	3.80	Implemented	3.50	Implemented
Mean	3.76	Implemented	2.87	Moderately implemented
Organization or Sequence				
To what extent do topics follow a logical sequence in which topics build on previously gained knowledge?	4.20	Fully implemented	3.00	Moderately implemented
Are topics organized to answer the essential questions identified by the course?	3.00	Moderately implemented	3.00	Moderately implemented

Vertical alignment – Are content and skills arranged so that they align with the general sequence of cognitive development?	4.20	Fully implemented	2.83	Moderately implemented
Does the curriculum assure that all teachers of a common year level or subject address specific subject matter following the same time line?	3.80	Implemented	2.83	Moderately implemented
Integration – Do opportunities exist for connections between and among content areas?	3.40	Implemented	3.17	Moderately implemented
Mean	3.72	Implemented	2.97	Moderately implemented

Content

Does the curriculum comprehensively address essential knowledge and skills of the content area?	3.20	Moderately implemented	2.32	Fairly implemented
Is curricular content supported by topics or concepts, lessons, activities, examples, and/or illustrations?	4.20	Fully implemented	2.30	Fairly implemented
How clearly is the content described in the curriculum document?	4.20	Fully implemented	2.83	Moderately implemented
Is the content up-to-date for the academic discipline and the context in which the content is presented?	4.80	Fully implemented	2.72	Moderately implemented
To what extent does the content include authentic, problem-centered connections to life in a context that is meaningful to students?	3.20	Moderately implemented	3.83	Implemented
Mean	3.92	Implemented	2.80	Moderately implemented

Teaching Strategies

Does the curriculum allow for different teaching strategies for different learning outcomes?	4.00	Implemented	2.30	Fairly implemented
Are the teaching strategies appropriate for reaching the specified objectives?	4.00	Implemented	3.00	Moderately implemented
Do suggested teaching strategies adequately support instruction and effectively engage students using technology and other resources?	3.60	Implemented	2.83	Moderately implemented
Are the teaching strategies fully consistent with research on learning and student development?	4.60	Fully implemented	2.33	Fairly implemented
Do the teaching strategies ensure rigor, giving all students the opportunity to participate in challenging & enriching activities?	3.40	Implemented	3.00	Moderately implemented
Mean	3.92	Implemented	2.69	Moderately implemented

Student Learning Activities

Does the curriculum encourage student involvement in their own learning?	3.60	Implemented	3.00	Moderately implemented
Does the curriculum require that students are consistently actively engaged in learning activities?	3.80	Implemented	3.00	Moderately implemented
Has the curriculum been designed such that each student has the opportunity to apply the knowledge and skills that have been identified as intended outcomes?	3.20	Moderately implemented	2.33	Fairly implemented
Does the curriculum provide a variety of learning activities, both in traditional and technology-enhanced formats?	4.40	Fully implemented	2.83	Moderately implemented
Does the curriculum allow for both individual and cooperative learning activities?	4.20	Fully implemented	2.17	Fairly implemented
Mean	3.84	Implemented	2.67	Moderately implemented

Standards

How well do the objectives align with the appropriate national standards?	3.20	Moderately implemented	2.50	Fairly implemented

How well does the content align with the appropriate state and national standards?	4.80	Fully implemented	2.50	Fairly implemented
Does the curriculum include teaching and learning materials that are aligned with state and national standards?	5.00	Fully implemented	2.43	Fairly implemented
Does the curriculum incorporate interdisciplinary content standards?	4.20	Fully implemented	3.20	Moderately implemented
Are there methods for teachers to document that students are achieving the objectives mandated by state and national standards?	4.20	Fully implemented	3.44	Implemented
Mean	4.28	Fully implemented	2.81	Moderately implemented
Assessment				
Does the curriculum include an assessment process that shows whether the expected results are being achieved?	3.00	Moderately implemented	2.83	Moderately implemented
Are diverse methods of assessment being used as appropriate for varied learning styles?	3.40	Implemented	3.20	Moderately implemented
Does the curriculum specify common major assessments for all teachers teaching the course?	3.00	Moderately implemented	3.17	Moderately implemented
Are assessments reliable and valid, providing consistent and comparable results with other forms of measurement and over time?	4.20	Fully implemented	3.17	Moderately implemented
Does the curriculum use the findings of assessment to improve program effectiveness?	3.00	Moderately implemented	3.33	Moderately implemented
Mean	3.32	Moderately implemented	3.14	Moderately implemented
Alignment with School Mission and Government Support				
Is there an indication that the curriculum considers school mission and/or philosophy?	4.20	Fully implemented	2.45	Fairly implemented
To what extent do the curriculum's objectives align with the school's mission and/or philosophy?	4.20	Fully implemented	3.17	Moderately implemented
To what extent does the curriculum's content align with the school's mission and/or philosophy?	4.00	Implemented	3.17	Moderately implemented
To what extent do the curriculum's instructional strategies align with the school's mission and/or philosophy?	3.60	Implemented	3.67	Implemented
To what extent do the curriculum's resources align with the school's mission and/or philosophy?	3.40	Implemented	2.83	Moderately implemented
Mean	3.88	Implemented	3.06	Moderately implemented
Scope				
Horizontal alignment – Does the curriculum allow for grade level appropriate breadth and depth?	3.60	Implemented	3.50	Implemented
Is an appropriate amount of time devoted to each topic to ensure adequate coverage of the total curriculum?	3.80	Implemented	3.00	Moderately implemented
To what extent is the content presented in small "chunks" for ensuring student understanding?	4.00	Implemented	3.50	Implemented
Does the curriculum ensure that the range of information includes all significant aspects of that particular portion of the curriculum?	3.20	Moderately implemented	3.00	Moderately implemented
Are resources and materials sufficient for teaching the curriculum in appropriate depth?	3.80	Implemented	2.00	Fairly implemented
Mean	3.68	Implemented	3.00	Moderately implemented
Grand Mean	**3.81**	**Implemented**	**2.89**	**Moderately implemented**

5. Conclusion

It is concluded that there is a need to provide for instructional materials for English language in the whole of the University of Eastern Philippines (UEP) System, if the K to 12 English language program is to succeed. The school lacks instructional materials that the teachers and students actually need. The absence of instructional materials which is the number one problem of the teachers in the three campuses of the university only implies that the university should address this first considering that the materials are the tools which students and teachers use ensure effective implementation of the new curriculum. Unavailability of materials, computers/laptops and even internet connection is a big problem especially to the students.

It is concluded that the UEP System is not without strengths and weaknesses in the implementation of the K to 12 English Curriculum Program. The strengths immerse learners in the very heart of English language acquisition. However, the weaknesses present the risk of boredom and loss of interest among the English language learners posed by repetitive tasks required towards similar knowledge and skills. The K to 12 Program in the UEP System fails to assure students of their optimum development in English language skills. A steadfast administration which will address the weaknesses, however, will ensure the meaningful satisfaction of the requirements of the new program.

Overall, the curriculum was moderately implemented. This could be attributed as well to the lack of support provided by the government in the provision of resources. Students' rating was lower compared to teachers' rating. This could imply that since students are placed at the heart of the educative process, they ultimately feel the scarcity of resources that the university could cater. Further, while differences in the context of evaluation or different effects on the two types of respondents emanated in this investigation, it cannot still be denied that students' perspectives and clamor to effectively implement the curriculum must be hearkened. Even if teachers considered the objectives to be clear in direction, students still rated similar indicators to be fairly implemented. This difference could mean that teachers and students have different perspective when looking at the curriculum's objectives and that students significantly feel the needs to be improved in the implementation of the curriculum.

References

Aguirre, Maryjane M. 2014. *Teachers' Awareness and Behavior towards K-12 for Effective Curriculum Implementation*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Eastern Philippines.

Assel, M. A., S. Landry, P. Swank and S. Gunnewig. 2007. An evaluation of curriculum, setting, and mentoring on the performance of children enrolled in prekindergarten. *Reading and Writing* 20, 463-494.

Borja, R. R. 2008. Reviewing e-books: The benefits and drawbacks of virtual textbooks [Electronic version]. *Education Week, 2.* Retrieved November 2, 2008, from http://www.edweek.org/dd/articles/2008/06/09/01ebooks.h02.html?qs=electronic _textbooks

Brown, H. D. 1994. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Brown, S. L. 2005. Inside small and large high schools: Curriculum and social relations. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 22, 147-171.

CHED CEB Resolution No. 298-201. Commission on Higher Education, Philippines.

CHED Memorandum Order No. 20. s. 2013. Commission on Higher Education, Philippines.

Cox, T. and S. Sanders. 1994. *The Impact of the National Curriculum on the Teaching of Five-Year-Olds* (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429454707

Department of Education. (2020. Retrieved from https://www.deped.gov.ph/2020/05/06/official-statement-2.

Ediger, M. 2005. Sequence and scope in the curriculum. *Education*. Retrieved July 27, 2016, from http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3673/is_199510/ai_n8729573

English, F. 2000. *Deciding What to Teach and Test: Developing, Aligning, and Auditing the Curriculum*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press.

Galvez-Tan, Jaime Z. *The Health Curriculum in Our Basic Education*. Manila Bulletin. Retrieved January 12, 2007. http://www.mb.com.ph/issues/2007/09/16

Griffith, J. 2009. The school leadership/school climate relation: Identification of school configurations associated with change in principals. *Educational Administration Quarterly* 3, 267-291.

Guina, J. M. 2005. *Design and Evaluation of English Programs in Education.* New York: McGraw-Hill Higher Education.

Hewitt, T. W. 2006. *Understanding and Shaping Curriculum: What We Teach and Why*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.

Hook, W., W. Bishop and J. A. Hook. 2007. Quality math curriculum in support of effective teaching for elementary schools. *Educational Studies in Mathematics* 65, 125-148.

Huffman, D., F. Lawrenz and K. Thomas. 2008. Science and mathematics instruction in a reform-based teacher preparation program. *School Science and Mathematics* 108, 137-148.

Hymes, D. H. 2002. *On Communicative Competence: The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kelly, A. V. 2004. *The Curriculum: Theory and Practice.* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Lee, V. E., B. A. Smerdon, C. Alfeld-Liro and S. L. Brown. 2000. Inside small and large high schools: Curriculum and social relations. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 22, 147-171.

Lipscomb, A., J. Swanson and A. West. 2010. *Emerging Perspectives on Learning, Teaching, and Technology, Global Text, Michael Orey. Chapter 21*. Retrieved from https://textbookequity.org/Textbooks/ Orey_Emergin_Perspectives_Learning.pdf

Marzano, R. J., D. J. Pickering and J. E. Pollock. 2001. *Classroom Instruction that Works: Research-based Strategies for Increasing Student Achievement.* Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Moschetta, H. M. 2010. *Development, Evaluation, and Implementation of English Curriculum Instrument.* Unpublished dissertation. Robert Morris University

Mushtaq, I. and S. Khan. 2012. Factors affecting students' academic performance. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research* 12.

National Council of Teachers of English. 2008. *21st Century Curriculum and Assessment Framework.* Retrieved August 2, 2016, from http://www.ncte.org/positions/ statements/21stcentframework

Ornstein, A. C. and F. P. Hunkins. 2004. *Curriculum: Foundations, Principles, and Issues* (4th ed.). New York: Pearson Education, Inc.

Poetter, T. S. et al. 2007. Teachers critique the curriculum: Frame factors at play. *Kappa Delta Pi Record* 43(2)*, 82-87.

Roadley, G. 2017. How can we shape and design a curriculum to help future proof our graduates in the next 10+ years. University of Birmingham. Retrieved on January 12, 2020, accessed from https://www. birmingham.ac.uk/index.aspx.

Sanders, J. R. 1994. *The Program Evaluation Standards: How to Assess Evaluations of Educational Programs*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Sanders, J. R. and D. H. Nafitzger. 1976. *A Basis for Determining the Adequacy of Evaluation Designs.* Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED127345)

Sanico, N. 2015. *The Implementation of the K-12 TLE Curriculum in the Central Area of Northern Samar.* Unpublished master's thesis, University of Eastern Philippines.

Seed, A. H. 2005. Collaborating for school improvement [Electronic version}. *Curriculum Leadership 3.* Retrieved November 2, 2008, from http://www.curriculum.edu.au/leader/ collaborating_for_school_ improvement,123 32.html?issueID=9799

Sewell, W. 2008. Entrenched pedagogy: A history of stasis in the English language arts curriculum in United States secondary schools. *Changing English* 15(1), 87-100.

Shadish, W. R., T. D. Cook and L. C. Leviton. 1995. *Foundations of Program Evaluation.* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Spiel, C. 2001. Program evaluation. In N. J. Smelser and P. B. Baltes, eds., *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences,* 12169-12173. Oxford, UK: Elsevier Science.

Spiel, C., B. Schober and R. Reimann. 2006. Evaluation of curricula in higher education: Challenges for evaluators. *Evaluation Review* 30, 430-450.

Squires, D. A. 2004. *Aligning and Balancing the Standards-based Curriculum.* Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press.

Surafel Z. 2002. The effects of the 'new' English language teaching methodology in the first cycle secondary schools. *Educational Journal* 6/13, 70-86.

Tablante, I. and C. Botor. 1978. *Learning Styles of Selected Filipino Children*. NSDB Assisted UP's Integrated Research Project No. 7610.

Tomlinson, C. A. 2009. *The Differentiated Classroom: Responding to the Needs of All Learners.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Viloria, Y. 1993. *The Learning Style of Selected College Students at Nueva Vizcaya State Polytechnic College: Correlates, Factors and Predictors*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Philippine Normal University, Philippines.

Wiggins, G. 2004. *Authentic Education*. Retrieved July 28, 2016, from http://www.grantwiggins.org/

Examples in: English
Applicable Languages: English
Applicable Level: Secondary