Status of Implementation of the University of Eastern Philippines Scholarship Grants: Inputs for Faculty Development Program

Nenette D. Tan, PhD

College of Arts and Communication, University of Eastern Philippines, University Town, Northern Samar

Abstract: *The study is for the purpose of determining the status of implementation of the University of Eastern Philippines'. The research is descriptive-evaluative and used a triangulation among a survey questionnaire, retrieval of secondary data and interviews among the respondents in its data gathering. Data gathered on the respondents' profile tells that the respondents are from the UEP Main Campus, forty six years old and above, females, married, pursued doctorate degree, associate professors, Plan A recipients and with 16 years and above length of service in the university. Most of the grantees finished their degree program within the allotted time. The scholarship grants program implementation status is summarize thus: objectiveness, qualification of grantees, criteria for granting scholarship and responsibilities of grantees within the scholarship period are excellently implemented. On satisfactory implementation are: organization of the scholarship grants committee, benefits of faculty scholars, duration of scholarship grant, service obligation of scholars, extension of scholarship (duration) and responsibilities of grantees after scholarship period. In sum, the whole scholarship grant program picture in implementation is satisfactory. Problems encountered were ranked and the first three is on subsidy, stipend and allowances. The fourth through the eighth are on policy guidelines being not strictly implemented, non- provision of allowance while on study leave, family related problems, heavy required enrollment load and too high standard of performance. The study provided inputs for reform agenda gleaned from the findings. The reform agenda inputs provided for crafting, clarifying and disseminating the program's objectives; review of functions, crafting of Monitoring and Evaluation Tool and Plan; networking and linkaging for funding windows; review of criteria for selection and consider applications from the two external campuses (Laoang and Catubig) of the university; review provisions on benefits to scale up with real costs (e.g. in metropolis areas), reconsider duration for doctorate programs; consider full enforcement of policy guidelines on obligations and responsibilities (provide for specific implementation rules and regulations); review provisions for duration extension applications, define 'meritorious' ground for extension and inclusion of a specific provision on graduate studies paper presentation on local, national and international venues. All these are captured in the proposed faculty development program. Recommendation number one is to craft a workable and/or strategic faculty development program particularly considering participatory approaches such as using outside reviewers for M & E for success determination and involvement of faculty members in the planning and crafting of a faculty development program; encourage college level faculty development planning and the conduct a similar study correlating scholarship to grantees productivity, research work, classroom instruction and extension services.*

Keywords: scholarship program, scholarship grants, assessment, implementation, faculty development program

1. Introduction

Quality education depends largely on qualifications and competencies of the faculty. In various studies pertinent to the delivery of quality education, faculty development has always surfaced as a priority concern.

Higher education teacher competencies have been seen as a holistic integrated model, which takes into account integrated components such as pedagogical competence, interaction competence, guiding and leadership competence, work life competence, and innovative and research competence. To achieve these competencies, colleges and universities should encourage its faculty to pursue professional development programs. Faculty members must be given especially the chance to grow professionally so they could impart more knowledge to their students.

Article XIV, Section 1 of the Philippine Constitution (De Leon, 1999: p 415) states that the State shall protect and promote the right of all citizens to quality education at all levels and shall take appropriate steps to make such education accessible to all. Accordingly, Section 5, paragraph 4, indicates that the State shall enhance the right of teachers to professional advancement.

Pursuant to this Constitutional mandate, one of the most attractive development programs for professional advancement among faculty members is the faculty scholarship program. It is allotted an appropriate budget – an investment that is deemed to double its return. This means that when more faculty scholars have completed their studies through sound management of time, money and other fiscal resources, the institution would greatly benefit from their acquired expertise.

In the University of Eastern Philippines (UEP), the Board of Regents resolution no. 25, series of 2009 amended the guidelines of implementing the faculty scholarship program. (Legal Basis: UEP Board of Regents Resolution no. 25, S. 2009).The faculty scholarship program in UEP was established in the 1980s to promote teaching and learning innovation. Because of the university's limited offerings in graduate studies, the faculty scholarship program enables faculty members to take post-graduate degree in top notch universities in the Philippines. Its main objective is to send faculty members in other higher learning institutions in pursuit of excellence in learning, resource development, and leadership in the use of technology and strategy in education and training. The program is one of the major activities of the university. It lets faculty members acquire new

knowledge in the teaching and learning process, leadership, and research. In more than two decades since its implementation the program has already granted one hundred thirty seven (137) scholars. Yet, it is a public knowledge that a number of grantees who have availed of the benefits did not return the favor to the university. They either transferred to other institutions for greener pasture or simply left the university to start other careers. There are also grantees that did not finish their curricular program because of some reasons, went back to the university, breaching the contract with the University of finishing their degree programs. These are just some of the problems that the faculty scholarship program of the university encounters. Clearly, there is a need for the program to be evaluated. It is from this perspective that the researcher decided to delve into this issue. Evaluating the university faculty scholarship program would help the university come up with plans about faculty scholarship in all of its three campuses. It is only through evaluation that the university can decide whether the program needs a facelift or continue its mission of sending faculty members to higher learning institutions. It was observed that no studies on scholarship program have been conducted in the whole university. The importance of evaluating the status of the faculty scholarship program can be justified from this view.

2. Objectives of the Study

This study determined the status of implementation of the faculty scholarship grants in the three campuses of the University of Eastern Philippines as inputs to faculty development program. This tried to: (1)determine the profile of the faculty scholar in terms of: age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, academic rank, and length of service; (2)identify what scholarship plan is most availed of in University of Eastern Philippines; (3)find out the number of grantees who: finished within the allotted time in the contract;transferred school even without permission,with extension, shifted course in the course of the grant and did not finish course and graduated, but transferred without serving UEP; (4) assess the status of the implementation university scholarship grants in terms of:objectives, organization,qualification of faculty scholar,criteria in granting scholarship, benefits,duration of scholarship, service obligation of the grantee, extension of scholarship, responsibilities of the grantees during scholarship, responsibilities of the grantees after the scholarship period; (5) identify the problems encountered by the recipients in the implementation of the UEP faculty scholarship grants and (6) propose a faculty development program for University of Eastern Philippines.

3. Methodology

The University of Eastern Philippines is the first state university in the Visayas. UEP is the only comprehensive state university in Region 8. It is also one of the 42 biggest state universities among the 118 state colleges and universities in the country. It is a public-sectarian, non-profit institution of higher learning created under Republic Act 4126 with primary objectives geared toward quality instruction, research, extension, and resource generation.

UEP consists of three campuses, namely: UEP Main campus in Catarman, UEP Laoang, and UEP Catubig. The main campus of the university is situated on a 419-hectare campus in the municipality of Catarman province of Northern Samar. It lies along the national highway between the towns of Catarman and Mondragon, facing the Pacific Ocean. UEP Laoang is located in the municipality of Laoang towards the Pacific area of the province. And, UEP Catubig is located in the municipality of Catubig, one of the two towns comprising the Catubig Valley.

UEP has nine colleges offering different tertiary programs. These are the Colleges of Agriculture, Fisheries and Natural Resources, Arts and Communication, Business Administration, Education, Engineering, Law, Science, Nursing and Veterinary Medicine. It also offers graduate and postgraduate programs with different fields of specialization. Elementary and high schools are maintained in the three campuses as laboratory schools for teacher education.

The purpose of this study was to determine the status of implementation of the faculty scholarship grants. The researcher used descriptive-evaluative design combining qualitative and quantitative approaches to meet its objectives. Specifically, it attempted to find out the status of implementation of the scholarship program in the 3 campuses of the University of Eastern Philippines as assessed by the faculty scholars and the members of the university scholarship committee.

The researcher employed descriptive statistics to gather data from the three campuses. The triangulation of the data (survey questionnaires, interviews, and documents retrieval) provided information regarding the status of implementation.

Descriptive method is appropriate for this study since it aimed at discovering some phenomena which presently exist. According to (Ardales, 2008: p. 126), a descriptive study describes and interprets what is existing. This study involved description, recording, analyzing, and interpreting the prevailing conditions. Accurate observations and assessments arise from data that ascertain the nature and incidence of prevailing conditions. The scholar respondents were described using descriptive statistics. The scholars and implementers assessment of the scholarship program were used as bases for the evaluative part of the study.

There are three types of variables included in this study, the input, process and the output variables. Considered as input variables are the components of the UEP Faculty Scholarship Grants in terms of Objectives, Qualifications, Categories of Scholarship, Criteria, Benefits, Duration of Scholarship, Service Obligation of the grantee, Extension of Scholarship, and Responsibilities of the Grantees. The problems encountered in the implementation of the scholarship grants are also included in the Input variable. The process variables included the evaluation of the status of implementation of the faculty scholarship program and the possible solutions to the problems encountered. Output variable is the enhanced faculty scholarship grants to be used as inputs to UEP faculty development program.

The population of this study consisted of recipient faculty members from and the members of the UEP Scholarship Committee. Purposive sampling was used in this study. It is a sampling technique which takes on a non probability sampling. The researcher purposively selects particular elements or subjects for addition in a study so as to make sure that the elements will have certain characteristics pertinent to the study. It normally targets a particular group of people (McNeil & Chapman, 2004). The actual number of faculty scholars was obtained from the Human Resource Management Office. There were 60 faculty recipients from 2003 to 2013 and 22 members of the university scholarship committee.

The implementers (UEP Scholarship Committee) and recipients of the faculty scholarship program in the three campuses of University of Eastern Philippines were the respondents of this study. The respondents were 60 faculty scholars purposively selected from the list of total scholars and the 22 members of the university scholarship committee. The respondents were the grantees who finished the contract within the allotted time, granted and continued with extension, granted but transferred to other work and granted but did not continue the scholarship. There were 22 members of the university scholarship committee designated by the University President. These are: Chairperson: Vice President for Academic Affairs; Vice Chairperson: Vice President for External Affairs; Co-Vice Chairperson: Vice President for Administration and other members are: Director for Instruction, Dean of Student Affairs, All Academic Deans, Chief Administrative Officer, Human Relations Management Officer, Budget Officer, HRMO-secretary (non-voting), a representative of the UEP Faculty Association and the Executive Directors of the external campuses who shall act as member/s if the applicant is a faculty of that campus.

This study utilized two sets of questionnaires as the main data gathering instruments. Part I was answered by the faculty scholars and Part II was answered by the members of the scholarship committee. To establish objectivity and validity of the responses, triangulation was done. The members of the university scholarship committee were interviewed, and documents of the committee were reviewed.

4. Findings

Objective 1
Determine the profile of the faculty scholar in terms of: age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, academic rank, and length of service.

Profile of Faculty Scholars

Variable	Number	Percentage
Campus		
UEP Main	60	100
UEP Laoang	0	0
UEP Catubig	0	0
Total	**60**	**100**
Age		
35 below	2	3.39
36 to 40	5	8.47
41 to 45	16	25.43
46 above	37	62.71
Total	**60**	**100**
Sex		
Male	19	31.67
Female	41	68.33
Total	**60**	**100**
Civil Status		
Single	10	16.67
Married	50	83.33
Total	**60**	**100**
Educational Attainment		
Baccalaureate	2	3.33
With MA units	3	5.0
Master's Degree	14	23.33
Doctorate units	11	18.33
Doctoral	30	50.00
Total	**60**	**100**
Academic Rank		
Instructor	8	13.33
Assistant Professor	23	38.33
Associate Professor	24	40
Professor	5	8.33
Total	**60**	**100**
Length of Service		
Less than five years	1	1.72
Five to 10 years	0	0
11 to 15 years	6	10.34
16 years and above	51	87.94
Total	**60**	**100**

Profile of the Faculty Members
Table 1 presents the profile of the respondents in terms of age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, academic rank, and length of service.

From the main, Laoang and Catubig campuses the data revealed that 60 or all respondents are from the UEP Main Campus, hence, no faculty member from UEP Laoang and Catubig campuses ever received a grant from the UEP Faculty Scholarship Program. This finding was confirmed when the researcher interviewed some faculty members and executive directors from the two external campuses of UEP. The interviewees asserted that although heads of the two external campuses are members of the scholarship committee, there were no scholarship application submissions from their faculty members. Presently, there are some faculty members from the external campuses who are pursuing graduate studies outside the UEP system and are only extended the "office time" privilege. Based on the interview, some faculty members in the two external campuses availed of the dissertation aid when they finished the doctoral degree. This also appears on record with the university Scholarship Committee.

The facts in this study disclosed that 37 or 62.71 percent of the respondents belonged to the 46 years old and above age bracket. There were also 16 scholarship recipients whose age ranged from 41 to 45, five (5) for 36 to 40, and two (2) for 35 and below.

The data on this variable recorded 41 or 68.33% female scholarship grantees and only 19 or 31.67% male. Simply put, there were more female scholars than male.

The data on civil status indicate that forty (40) or 71.67 percent of the respondents were married and ten or 16.67 percent of the respondents were single.

This means that, there were more married faculty scholars than those who were single.

The responses of the faculty scholars showed that 30 or 50 percent of them were doctoral degree holders while 11 or 18.33 percent were master's degree holders with doctorate units. Moreover, 14 or 23.33 percent of the respondents were master's degree holders and enjoyed Plan A scholarship grant, three (3) or five (5) percent were bachelor's degree holders with master's units, and two (2) or 3.33 percent were bachelor's degree holders.

In sum, 30 or 50% of the faculty scholars were with doctoral degree.

Responses on this variable revealed eight (8) or 13.33 percent were instructors; 23 or 38.33 percent were assistant professors; 24 or 40 percent were associate professors and 5 or 8.33 percent were professors in academic rank.

In a statement, one- third of the faculty scholars were associate professors in academic rank.

As to length of service, one (1) or 1.72 percent had less than five years length of service; six (6) or 10.34 percent, 11 to 15 years; 50 or 87.94 percent within 16 years and above length of service; but none had 5-10 years experience.

The data indicates that a good majority of the faculty scholars have served the university for 16 years and more. The university Scholarship Committee keeps record of such faculty scholars' profile. The same data appeared in the questionnaires administered to the respondents.

The data gleaned from the faculty scholars' personal profile and professional characteristics do not speak of a performance and/or productivity improvement. This corroborates Alonzo's finding that such profile and professional characteristics were found to have no significant influence on performance and productivity. Similarly, Sarmiento's study on the impact of institutional climate on the morale and performance of science teachers in Higher Education Institutions HEIs in Metro Manila concluded that demographic variables are not predictors of institutional climate.

In the main, findings on personal profile and professional characteristics of the faculty scholars involved in this study confirm the findings of Alonzo and Sarmiento. These characteristics did not influence performance and productivity neither these are predictors of institutional climate.

Objective 2. Identify what scholarship plan is most availed of in University of Eastern Philippines.

Category of Scholarship Applied For

Category of Scholarship	Number	Percentage
Degree		
Master's Degree	21	35.00
Doctorate Degree	39	65.00
Total	**60**	**100.00**
Plan		
Master's Degree		
Plan A	11	18.33
Plan B		
Plan C	10	16.67
Plan D		
Doctoral Degree		
Plan A	20	33.33
Plan B	1	1.67
Plan C	16	26.67
Plan D	2	3.33
Total	**60**	**100.00**

The responses of the faculty scholars revealed that 21 or 35 percent applied scholarship for master's degree and 39 or 65 percent applied for doctorate degree scholarship.

The master's degree scholarship applications were on Plan A at 11 or 18.33 percent and 10 or 16.67 percent for Plan C. On the other hand, there were 20 or 33.33 percent scholarship applications for Plan A, one (1) or 1.67 percent for Plan B, 16 or 26.67 percent for Plan C and two (2) or 3.33 percent for Plan D for doctorate degree.

This data revealed that a good number of faculty scholars for both the master's and doctorate degrees availed of Plan C Scholarship. This scholarship plan is made available to faculty applicants who spend for their own school expenses, enroll on a priority field within the thrust of the University, has completed the academic requirements and passed the comprehensive examination as certified by the Graduate Studies Director, and has an approved thesis proposal. The benefits extended to faculty scholars in this plan include: monthly basic pay and other remuneration as well as thesis/dissertation support or aid. The faculty scholars are granted one (1) school year to finish their program without extension.

These data are available at the Office of Secretary of the Scholarship Committee of the University corroborated by the faculty scholars' answers in the questionnaire administered to them.

Based on the records, there was academic "in breeding" in terms of scholarship program granted. Academic "in breeding" is a practice that perpetuates the parochialism of ideas since the academic experience is limited to the same established knowledge and long held ideas and beliefs. This runs contrary to the demands of today's knowledge based societies. There were 26 faculty members (Plan C) who were within this in-breeding trend. They finished baccalaureate and graduate studies in the university.

This finding suggests that faculty members positively consider the continuing education program of the institution an imperative factor to achieve better career opportunities; hence, they are encouraged to pursue and finish higher

studies. This confirms Montuerto's claim that teachers are concerned with professional growth. It also supports Saldana's statement that teachers are willing to pursue their doctoral program if subsidy continues.

Objective 3: Find out the number of grantees who: finished within the allotted time in the contract;transferred school even without permission,with extension, shifted course in the course of the grant and did not finish course and graduated, but transferred without serving the university.

Recipients' Scholarship Status
There are seven (7) categories for the scholarship status. Forty (40) or 66.67 percent finished within the allotted time in the contract; one (1) or 1.67 percent transferred employment even beforegraduating; 11 or 18.33 percent with extension; six (6) or 10.00 percent did not finish, two (2) or 3.33 percent were granted and supposed to finish within the allotted time. There was none on the two other scholarship status.

These data mean that faculty members who were given scholarship grants were motivated to finish their degrees. This confirms Popham's suggestions that the faculty scholar's loyalty to the institution and the ability to live up to his/her promise should be considered in approving grants.

Recipients' Scholarship Status

Scholarship Status	Number	Percentage
Finished within the allotted time in the contract	40	66.67
Transferred school even before graduated	1	1.67
With extension	11	18.33
Shifted course in the course of the grant	0	0
Did not finish course	6	10.00
Graduated, but transferred without serving the university	0	0
Will finish within the allotted time	2	3.33
Total	60	100.00

Objective 4. Assess the status of the implementation university scholarship grants in terms of:objectives, organization,qualificati*o*n of faculty scholar,criteria in granting scholarship, benefits, duration of scholarship, service obligation of the grantee, extension of scholarship, responsibilities of the grantees during scholarship, responsibilities of the grantees after the scholarship period.

Summary Table of Status of Implementation of Scholarship Grants

Area	Grand Mean	Interpretation
Objectives	4.34	Very Much Implemented
Organization	3.91	Much Implemented
Qualification of Faculty Scholar	4.28	Very Much Implemented
Criteria in Granting Scholarship	4.14	Very Much Implemented
Benefits of Faculty Scholar	3.54	Much Implemented
Duration of Scholarship	3.99	Much Implemented
Service Obligation of Scholars	3.69	Much Implemented
Extension of Scholarship	3.79	Much Implemented
Responsibilities of the Grantees (during scholarship period)	4.26	Very Much Implemented
Responsibilities of the Grantees (after scholarship period)	3.72	Much Implemented
General Average	3.96	Much Implemented

summarize thus: objectiveness, qualification of grantees, criteria for granting scholarship and responsibilities of grantees within the scholarship period are excellently implemented. On satisfactory implementation are: organization of the scholarship grants committee, benefits of faculty scholars, duration of scholarship grant, service obligation of scholars, extension of scholarship (duration) and responsibilities of grantees after scholarshipperiod. In sum, the whole scholarship grant program picture in implementation is satisfactory.

Objective 5: Identify the problems encountered by the recipients in the implementation of the UEP faculty scholarship grants.

Problems Encountered in the Implementation of the Faculty Scholarship Program

Problem	Frequency	Rank
The regular load of nine units per semester/summer is heavy for the scholars.	6	7
No allowances from the university during the duration of the leave of absence.	15	5
The faculty scholarship general policy guidelines are not strictly implemented.	16	4
The book allowance is not enough to meet the requirements of the scholars.	34	3
The monthly stipend is inadequate to support the expenses of a scholar.	36	2
The thesis/dissertation subsidy is not enough.	39	1
Too high standard of performance.	3	8
Family related problems.	9	6

The problems encountered are the following: The first is the thesis/dissertation subsidy is not enough, second is the monthly stipend is inadequate to support the expenses of a scholar, third is the book allowance is not enough to meet the requirements of the scholars, fourth is the faculty scholarship general policy guidelines are not strictly implemented, fifth is the no allowances from the university during the duration of the leave of absence, seventh is the regular load of nine units per semester/summer is heavy for the scholars, and eight is too high standard of performance.

The first three problems of the faculty scholars refer to financial considerations. A study reviewed in this study revealed that financial aspects of faculty scholars are moderately correlated with performance. It recommended an all-out support for the advancement of faculty development and support staff in the institution concerned. This correlation is corroborated by the findings of another study reviewed conducted in Albay. It revealed that subsidy provided to scholars motivate them to pursue graduate program. Other findings showed that teachers who have finished their master's degree were willing to continue towards their doctoral program if such subsidy continues.

The fourth problem is on non-strict implementation of general policy guidelines which calls for a rather immediate action to ensure that accountability on the part of the faculty scholars are complied with. As intimated during interviews, this particular guideline refers to submission of reports, enrolment of the required number of units, and requests for extension among others. Monitoring and evaluation therefore is important. This ensures compliance to

guidelines for both the grantee and the host institution. A Monitoring and Evaluation Tool therefore is necessary. Should there be none; one should be crafted.

The fifth is on no allowances from the university during the duration of the leave of absence. From the interviews, it was revealed that the scholars' monthly allowance is very minimal (at Php 3,000.00). However, such amount does not suffice to even foot the bills for mobility especially in the metropolis. This was ranked fifth primarily because there actually is an allowance but appears to be insufficient. A study reviewed revealed that allowances and other financial considerations are moderately correlated with performance.

On the sixth rank are family related problems. The effect of this problem may be remote but indeed this may still be a problem.

The seventh problem is on the required number of units for enrolment which is nine (9) appears heavy on the part of the scholar. In the interviews however, it was intimated that other scholars are tempted to accept part time jobs to augment their finances thereby reducing their units enrolled.

On the thesis/dissertation subsidy being not enough, this may be understood to be synonymous with other financial considerations the scholars would like to be addressed as revealed in the interviews.

5. Conclusions

From the findings of the study, conclusions and implications are herein forwarded:

Most of the scholarship grantees are within the age range of 46 years and above, female, pursued doctorate degrees, married, assistant professors and 16 years and above in length of service in the university.

This implies is that scholarship programs make awards to talented faculty on regular status with the hope that it will help the grantees become "all that they can be".

Gleaned from the data gathered, the faculty scholars are assumed to have the necessary experience in their profession. To be more valuable however, these faculty members have availed of the university scholarship program to enable them to meet the challenges of the teaching profession.

Faculty scholars who pursued master's degree availed of Plan A and Plan C. The former scholarship plan provides for monthly basic salary and other remuneration for the duration of the grant, matriculation and other school fees, book allowance, monthly stipend, thesis support, graduation fees, travel expenses upon enrolment and return at the endof the grant. This plan is for two years with three years return service for every one year; and the later allows the grantee a leave status with pay and thesis writing support for one year without extension.

On the other hand, faculty scholars who pursued doctoral degree availed of either Plan A or C. Most of the faculty

scholars finished their degree within the allotted time so provided in the contract and few requested for extension and were granted.

If faculty development is one major means of improving education, then institutional scholarship programs should be in place. One which serves its purpose, implemented, and adhered to by grantees. Such will boost the commitment ofevery teacher to the teaching profession as they continue to grow professionally.

Scholarship objectives implementation has been described very much implemented which means that it accorded slots for scholarships; raise the quality of as well as increase the number of faculty with graduate degrees; and minimize inbreeding. This implies that if a faculty development program is in place, and a scholarship program provides for the adequate needs of applicants; then more grantees will finish their graduate programs within the allotted time in their contract.

Organization implementation has been described much implemented. It described the Scholarship Committee Composition and its functions of determining slots availability, evaluation, screening, monitoring, appraising and recommending actions against reneging scholars.

The applicant's qualification has been described very much implemented. It considered screening and selection of applicants, their age, employment status, length of service among others provided in the scholarship guidelines.

The criteria for granting scholarship has been described much implemented. It means that the application is for master's or doctoral degree in priority programs identified by the university and that the potentials and qualification of the applicant is consistent with the plans/thrusts of the college/department where the applicant belongs.

That the benefits implementation of the scholarship program is much implemented stipulates for the provision of tuition fees, book allowance, monthly stipend and thesis/dissertation support.

Likewise, the scholarship duration implementation is described much implemented stipulates time allotment to finish the type of scholarship availed of.

The grantees' service obligation and extension of scholarship is much implemented; that is service render as per contract and/or repayment of expenses incurred by the university.

That the responsibilities of grantees during the scholarship duration are described as very much implemented imply that full time studies, finishing the degree program applied for at an institution so declared upon application among others are fully stipulated in the contract.

The responsibilities of grantees after scholarship are much implemented. These are the submission of three copies of thesis/dissertation, clearance from all responsibilities and accountabilities among others so stipulated in the contract.

The scholarship program implementation has problems which are financial in nature. These are: not enough thesis/dissertation writing support, inadequate monthly stipend, not enough book allowance, not strict implementation of the faculty scholarship general policy guidelines and non provision of allowances from the university while on leave of absence status, among others.

In a nutshell, the implementation status of the university Scholarship Program is much implemented despite problems encountered.

What is implied from the abovementioned conclusions is the faculty development is one major means of improving education. If properly implemented, this will boost the commitment of every teacher to the teaching profession as they continue to grow professionally.

If a school's scholarship program delivers its purpose as it should, then addressing its weak points would galvanize it. Strong as it should be – more faculty members would be motivated to further their graduate studies and live up to the expectations of the institution and themselves.

Gleaned from the data is the existence of a scholarship program in the university. It does provide assistance and support to interested and qualified applicants. It is not without weak points. In fact, problems were pointed out. If such be the circumstance; then addressing the problems would be the next logical move.

On the whole, the scholarship program of the university appears to be only a parcel of a much needed institutional faculty development program. It should be crafted around the institution's program thrusts and look forward to creating and providing breaks and opportunitieswith support adequate to meet the current conditions of the playing field.

Finally, if a program has to be evaluated – then a firm framework of evaluation should be devised. If an evaluation is to measure success; then determinants should be identified. If programs have to satisfactorily fulfill its goals, then it has to undergo regular monitoring, evaluation and improvement to keep pace with the field realities.

6. Recommendations

Hereunder are the recommendations for consideration and/or future action.
1) Encourage the younger pool of faculty members to avail of the university scholarship program to better prepare them for the challenges of the teaching profession. Faculty development is one major means of improving education.
2) Revisit the university Scholarship Program. Consider improving its Policy Guidelines particularly the benefits and allowances so provided in the current types of Plan available.
3) Finishing within the allotted time should not be the "be all" for the faculty scholars. Submission of evidence of improved teaching-learning strategies, techniques and technology may be required from the faculty scholars at a time so determined by the Scholarship Committee.
4) The Scholarship Program of the university should create a Monitoring and Evaluation Committee which is tasked to conduct monitoring and evaluation. It must craft its monitoring and evaluation tool; create and maintain a database for records keeping. Meanwhile, the Scholarship Committee should also create and maintain a database to include minutes of meetings, screenings, and monitoring and evaluation results. This is to keep track of anything and all about the university faculty scholarship program.
5) Re-engineer the Scholarship Committee. Trim down membership inasmuch as it was found out that other members do not attend meetings and others do not even know that they are members. Define its functions and tasks.
6) Address the problems encountered such as increase in stipend, allowances and financial support to thesis/dissertation writing.

All these can be captured and addressed within a Faculty Development Program.

7. Acknowledgement

References

Books
[1] Aquino, Gaudencio V. (2000). Educational Management. Manila: Rex Bookstore.
[2] Ardales, V.B. (2008). Basic Concepts and Methods of Research, 3rd ed. Educational Publishing House, Manila.
[3] Alkin, J.E. & Christie, H.R. (2004).Faculty Evaluation and Faculty Development in Higher Education. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research. New York: Agathon Press. As cited in Menges, R. J., & Austin, A. E. (2007). Teaching in higher education. In V. Richardson (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (4th ed.). Washington DC: AERA.
[4] De Leon, Hector. (1999). Philippine Constitution. Manila: Rex Bookstore.

[5] Fitzpatrick, J. L., Sanders, J. R., &Worthen, B. R. (2004). Program Evaluation: Alternative Approaches and practical guidelines (3rd ed.). New York: Pearson.

[6] Garfinkel, L. (1997). Youth with disabilities in the justice system: Integrating disability specific approaches. Focal Point, 11(1).

[7] Goldin, Gerald. A., & Rouse, James, J. (2000).A joint perspective on the idea of representation in learning and doing mathematics. In Les Steffe, Pearl Nesher, Paul

[8] Cobb, Gerald Goldin& Brian Greer (Eds.), Theories of Mathematical Learning. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

[9] McNeil, Patrick and Steve Chapman (2004).Research Methods. USA: Routledge Publishing.

[10] Saks, John (2008). Organizational Behavior. USA: Prentice Hall Publishing, 7th Ed.

[11] Sevilla, Consuelo G.(2001). Research Methods. Manila: Rex Bookstore.

[12] Tenedero, Avelino P.(1984) Theory and Practice of Public Administration in the Philippines. Manila: Rex Bookstore.

[13] Katchadourian, Heran A., and John Boli. (1994). Cream of the Crop: The Importance of Elite Education in the Decade After College. New York: Harper Collins Publishers.

[14] McKenna, M., and Willms, J.D. (2005) Co-operation between families and schools: 'What Works' in Canada Research Papers in Education.

[15] Popham, W.J. (1983). Educational Evaluation. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

[16] Simonton, Dean K. (1996). " Creative Expertise: A Life-Span Developmental Expertise." Pp. 227-254 in The Road to Excellence. The Acquisition of Expert Performance in the Arts, Sciences, Sports, and Games, edited by K. Anders Ericsson. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. Mallard, Gregoire, Michèle Lamont, and Joshua Guetzkow. 2002. "The Pragmatics of Evaluation: Beyond Disciplinary Wars in the Assessment of Fellowship Proposals in the Social Sciences and the Humanities." Presented at the mini-conference organized by the Theory Section on " Sociological Theory and Empirical Research" , American Sociological Association Meetings, Chicago, August.

[17] Stufflebeam, D. (Ed.). (1983). The CIPP Model for Program Evaluation .Boston : Kluwer-Nijhoff.

[18] Stufflebeam, D.L. & Webster, W.J. (1983). Alternative Approaches to Evaluation. In G.F. Madaus, M. Scriven&D.L. Stufflebeam (Eds.). Evaluation Models: Viewpoints on Educational and Human Services Evaluation. Boston: Kluwer Nijhoff.

[19] Stufflebeam, D.L. & Webster, W.J. (1983). Alternative Approaches to Evaluation. In G.F. Madaus, M. Scriven& D.L. Stufflebeam (Eds.). Evaluation Models: Viewpoints on Educational and Human Services Evaluation. Boston: Kluwer Nijhoff.

Journals

[20] Campbell, Donald (2004)." Relabeling Internal and External Validity for Applied Social Scientists" Copyright in Wiley Periodicals, Inc. Retrieved from onlinelibrary.wiley.com.

[21] Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, (2002)."Does emotional intelligence—as measured by the EQI—influence transformational leadership and/or desirable outcomes?"Leadership& Organization Development Journal, 27.

[22] Kennedy, Richard H.(2003). "Developing and Sustaining a Culture of Scholarship", American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education,67. Retrieved from www.researchgate.net.

[23] Michalski, G.V., & Cousins, J.B. (2001)."Multiple Perspectives on Educational Evaluation: Probing Stakeholder Perceptions in a Global Network Development Firm."American Journal of Evaluation, 22.Retrieved from www.researchgate.net.

[24] Mordechai, R. & Connie, C. (2001)."Evaluating university teaching: Time to Take Stock."Assessment and Evaluation,26(4).

[25] Odabaşı, H. F. (2003). "Faculty point of view on faculty development."Hacettepe University Journal of Education, 24.

[26] Smesny, Andrea et. al. (2007)."Barriers to Scholarship in Dentistry, Medicine, Nuring, and Pharmacy Practice Faculty", American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education. Retrieved from

[27] http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2064889/