

**Available Online at:** https://www.scholarzest.com

Vol. 1 No. 4, December 2020,

**ISSN:** 2660-5589

# SCHOOL-BASED FEEDING PROGRAM IN CULIAT HIGH SCHOOL AND ITS IMPACT ON NUTRITIONAL STATUS AND ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE OF THE SEVERELY WASTED STUDENTS: BASIS FOR DEVELOPING A MULTI-WAYS FEEDING PROGRAM

Rosana D. Agujar **Wylyn Villanueva Roshela Santos** 

### **Article history:**

### **Abstract:**

Received Accepted:

November 28<sup>th</sup> 2020 December 7<sup>th</sup> 2020 **Published:** December 26<sup>th</sup> 2020

performance of the severely wasted students in Culiat High School. One feeding teacher, and fifty students, was involved in this study. Survey questionnaires were administered to gather the data from the respondents. The teacher-respondent assessed the management of the school-based feeding program in terms of assessing the management of the school-based feeding program in terms of selection of the feeding recipients, preparation of food, feeding scheme, and feeding fund. Also, the problems encountered in the management of the program. The student-respondents indicated their body mass index (BMI) and their first and second quarter general weighted average. The findings indicated that in general the management of the SBFP seems to be in need of improvement as seen in the selection of the feeding recipients, preparation of feeding food, and the sufficiency of the feeding fund were achieved to a moderate degree with a mean of 3.00 interpreted as satisfactory, the feeding scheme assessed to be in low degree with a mean of 2.00 interpreted as fair. The top three problems encountered by the teacher respondent in the management of the SBFP were first, some of the feeding recipients don't go down in the feeding area. Second, feeding recipients doesn't want to eat vegetables. Third, feeding recipients were shy. Eight (8) or 16% of the respondents happened to increase their BMI that made them wasted from severely wasted. While forty two (42) or 84% of the feeding recipients remains severely wasted. The overall interpretation is that feeding program shows a little impact in the nutritional status of the severely wasted feeding recipients. Thirty seven (37) or 74% of the student-respondents improved their general average

The main objective of this study was to assess the management of the school-

based feeding program and its impact on nutritional status and academic

Based from the findings, it was concluded that the teacher-respondent perceived that SBFP is not well- managed. In general, the student-respondents may be not well-oriented on the significance of the program to them. SBFP may not have a strong influence to increase the nutritional status of the recipients. While SBFP had an important part in improving the academic performance of the student-respondents.

by 1-5 points. While thirteen (13) or 26% of the respondents shows no increase

Keywords: Feeding program, teacher-respondent assessed, nutritional status, school-based feeding

in their general average

#### 1.INTROUCTION OF THE RESEARCH

School feeding program is defined as the intervention that provides meal or snack in the school setting. Considered as the sound investment in education. It is also a tool which enables children worldwide to attend school. In developed countries such as the USA, Japan, and the UK, millions of children benefitted from SFPs that have been in place for years. It provides disadvantaged children measured by indicators of physical growth and cognitive abilities. It aims to improve attendance, enrolment, learning outcomes and nutritional status of the students.

Nutritional status is the condition of the body resulting from the intake, absorption, and utilization of food. Clinical examination, biochemical analyses, anthropometric measurements and dietary studies are used singly or in a combination to determine the condition (FNRI). Body Mass Index (BMI) is n indicator use to determine the nutritional

status expressed as body weight in kilogram divided by the square in height in meters .it provide the measure of body mass ranging from the thinness to obesity (WHO).

While academic performance is the extent to which a student attained short or long term educational goals as outcome of education. Nutritional and health status are powerful influencers on a child's learning and on how well a child performs in school. To stand-in this, the DepEd implemented the school based feeding program where in Culiat High School is one of the implementers. This program was succeeded every school year to lessen the number of severely wasted students and to develop the students' performance level within that academic year. With the help of Technology and Livelihood Education Teachers, the program were monitored and evaluated if the student's ideal nutritional status were achieved.

Severely wasted students could hardly participate in day-to-day activities in school especially in kinesthetic activities leading poor scholastic performance and poor grades. Even temporary hunger, common in children who are not fed before going to school, can have an adverse effect on learning. Children who are hungry have more difficulty concentrating and performing complex tasks.

Weak health and poor nutrition among school-age children diminish their cognitive development either through physiological changes or by reducing their ability to participate in learning experiences - or both. Children with diminished cognitive abilities and sensory impairments naturally perform less well and are more likely to repeat grades and to drop out of school than children who are not impaired. The irregular school attendance of malnourished and unhealthy children is one of the key factors in poor performance thus contributes to the inefficiency of the educational system.

Based on the June 2019 baseline nutritional status report there were **two hundred eighty one (281) severely wasted students** from grade 7 to grade 10 levels identified in Culiat High School. The data shows that the most number of severely wasted students were from grade 7 which is one hundred six (106) or 38% of the total number of undernourished students.

Culiat High School is a public high school located at Tandang Sora avenue Quezon City with two thousand five hundred twenty six junior high school enrolees for this school year 2019-2020. Most of the students came from depressed and underprivileged areas where in proper nutrition is not the top priority.

Thus, this action research is to be conducted to assess the management of the school-based feeding program and its impact in terms of nutritional status and academic achievement of the severely wasted students. Data that will be gathered in this research will serve as a starting point for developing a multi-ways feeding program.

Evaluating the impact of the feeding program in Culiat high school will help the stakeholders know the current status of the program in order to device multi-ways feeding program to maximize its benefits for the recipients.

### **2.LITERATURE REVIEW**

# **Target Beneficiaries**

The priority beneficiaries shall be SW (severely wasted) and W (wasted). Actual recipients shall be based on the baseline which is the June-July nutritional assessments of the current year (Do.#39.s.2017).

### **Seven Steps in Developing School Feeding Programs that Improve Education**

The research and program literature on SFPs shows the potential that school feeding has to contribute to improving education. These guidelines provide seven recommendations for improving the design and implementation of programs to meet some of this potential. The first recommendation, which calls for the establishment of a policy and objectives for school feeding programming, will provide the framework for implementing the subsequent recommendations. These focus on the most critical aspects of school feeding programming including targeting, cost and financing issues, ration composition and meal delivery, program implementation, and monitoring and evaluation, and on the integration of feeding with other interventions that address the nutrition and health needs of schoolchildren.

Specifically, it is recommended that program managers and policy makers:

1. Build a consensus on a policy and objectives that focuses on how school feeding can effectively contribute to improving education and to meeting the nutrition and health needs of school-age children.

Program managers and policy-makers need to agree on what 'problems' or 'situations' the school feeding program will to address, who the program will serve, and which program models are feasible for implementation. School feeding programs are highly visible and as a result often have a significant political dimension, particularly since they can represent a considerable income transfer. This reality should not inhibit establishing a policy and objectives that will take advantage of the substantial potential for improving the impact of SFPs on education.

2. Develop targeting criteria and mechanisms that concentrate program resources on high risk children and communities.

There is a built-in tendency toward universal coverage - providing meals for all schoolchildren since all children in school throughout the day will require food. Furthermore, program coverage and targeting is always subject to a series of political, logistical, technical and informational constraints. Since resources are finite, particularly in the poorest countries, and that providing food is expensive, targeting is a critical element of any effort to improve the impact of a SFP on education. Targeting is essential if the program is to reach families and

communities that lack the resources to adequately provide for their school-age children or those that need to be motivated to enrol their children in school and to have them attend more regularly.

3. Analyze and identify alternative financing and cost options for SFPs.

The cost of school feeding programs is a major issue for both governments and donors. Feeding programs of any kind are expensive. Financing may include international assistance, but in all cases available public resources, or the potential to draw on them, are required. Cost alone can indicate little about the value of a SFP but, unfortunately, cost-effectiveness analyses, which assess costs relative to impact on nutrition and education outcomes, are for the most part unavailable. Nonetheless, implementing the recommendations in this guide should help to ensure that the benefit-side of the program is enhanced while controlling the cost side.

4. Elaborate appropriate guidelines for ration composition and the timing of school meals.

To establish appropriate ration guidelines, program managers and policy makers need to analyze the nutrition and health needs of school-age children. Conditions in the education sector, such as levels of school enrolment, attendance, and performance, the availability of infrastructure and the capacity to implement different kinds of SFPs also need to be assessed. Information is also required on the community's perceptions and capacity to participate in school feeding programs.

5. Identify and address any potential bottlenecks in implementation: such as the availability of supplies and other resources, the appropriateness of cooking practices and the management of private sector inputs.

This recommendation is particularly relevant for a program manager who is already operating a program. Once school feeding programs are in place, altering them can meet strong resistance, however, a range of new experiences is now available that has the potential to alleviate some of the common obstacles to efficient and effective programming. Where a school feeding program already exists, a wealth of information is readily accessible; a critical step towards a better program is to thoroughly analyze this on-going experience.

6. Develop monitoring systems that focus on program processes, that is, how a program is functioning, and institute an evaluation system to assess the impact of the program on specific outcomes.

The need to monitor and evaluate programs is not unique to SFPs, but this recommendation is critical to increasing the impact of SFPs. Despite decades of experience there is a dearth of concrete information on the functioning and effectiveness of school feeding programs. This guide provides a general framework for establishing monitoring and evaluation systems for SFPs. For detailed guidance on creating these systems, see Monitoring and Evaluation: A Guidebook for Nutrition Project Managers in Developing Countries (Levinson et al, 1998).

7. Integrate feeding programs with other interventions that address the primary nutrition and health problems of the school-age population.

Last, but by no means least, the past decade has shown the added value of integrating other nutrition and health interventions with feeding. Specifically recommended are deworming, micronutrient fortification or supplementation, and health nutrition and hygiene education. These interventions are described in more detail in Class Action: Improving School Performance in the Developing World through Better Health and Nutrition (Del Rosso and Marek, 1996) and in the publications of the Partnership for Child Development (see reference section).

#### **3.FOOD PREPARATION MODALITIES**

The primary objective of having these suggested modalities is to lessen the burden of teachers and of feeding coordinators in the procurement, accounting and liquidation process. First, school led includes regular SBFP scheme where in procurement of food item, food liquidation of funds are done by each school. Parent and volunteers prepares and serve the food. Second, the food preparation done by hired temporary labor/service in schools, the wage of the hired cook shall not lower than the minimum wage set by the DOLE. In this way, the head cook/s prepare the food while the parents and volunteers serve the foods.

### Impact of school feeding programs on children nutritional status

School-based nutrition and health programs such school feeding program can aid in nutrition problem of students. It can also encourage parents to enrol and monitor their children to attend regularly. Experience shows that properly designed and effectively implemented SFPs can:

Alleviate short-term hunger in malnourished or otherwise well-nourished schoolchildren. This helps to increase the attention and concentration of students producing gains in cognitive function and learning.

It can also *motivate parents to enrol their children in school and have them attend regularly*. When programs effectively reduce absenteeism, and increase the duration of schooling, educational outcomes (performance, dropout, and repetition) improve.

Address specific micronutrient deficiencies in school-age children. Most important of these are iodine and iron, which directly affect cognition. Meeting the iron and iodine needs of school-age children can translate into better school performance.

*Increase community involvement in schools,* particularly where programs depend on the community to prepare and serve meals to children. Schools with their communities behind them are more effective than schools with less community involvement.

Vanvynckt (2006) provided an overview of the current state of knowledge about nutrition and health conditions on learning and school participation. She indicated over the past few years there has been an accumulation of research findings from different countries documenting association between nutrition, health and children school

participation. Many prevalent nutrition and health conditions are shown to affect school participation and educational outcomes. Better nutritional history and present nutritional status are associated with higher cognitive test scores or better school performance .Nutritionally stunted children are found to enroll later and drop out earlier than their normal size peer.

### **Motivational Theory by Abraham Maslow**

Motivation has the following functions: motivates, energize and sustain behaviour. It energizes the behaviour of the organisms and arouses it for action .It also sustains behaviour for longer periods in the activity.

In *Maslow hierarchy of needs*, the physiological needs must be met. That children need food in the right quality and quantity. Food is necessary because it builds, protects and repairs the body. The malnutrition and its effects on brain development has tremendous implications on child performance. Poorly fed children are more exposed to disease infections and emotional frustrations as compared to well fed children.

### Impact of school feeding programs on children attendance

According to Jensen (2010), school feeding mostly takes place within the context of broad national school reform programs. These reforms should focus on other essential inputs to education and learning such as teacher development, curriculum reforms and student assessment. National ministries or organizational dealing with education should not be encouraged to take on school feeding at the expense of other educational inputs as it is difficult politically to refuse food aid.

According to Pediatre (2001), attendance and school performance are greatly enhanced by school feeding program. Many schools are already struggling to manage barely functional education systems and to assume the additional burden of food distribution.

### Impact of school feeding programs on children's learning

On food to have any impact on learning, additional monetary inputs are required. Food must be accompanied by additional resources. According to the World Bank Global Food Crisis Response Program and subsequent pilot crisis response window provided rapid assistance by supporting existing school feeding programs and essentially linking access to both food and education for children.

According to Taylor (2010), complementary inputs are needed to overcome the reliance on outside food sources such as school feeding programs. She emphasized on complementary health and nutrition inputs to accompany the feeding program.

### Impact of quality and quantity of feeding program on academic performance

According to Bowlby (1988), food quantity and quality should be considered. Children should be given right nutrients to enhance their growth, development and survival in the community. He also rgued that the frequency of the meals should be noted. Food should be served regularly and the schools set good designs and programs to affect this. He also said that there should be a design or department to deal with this issue within the school.

Providing proper nutrition and promoting stimulation of a child's sense are vital components of children in the sense that they enhance the development and organization of the brain. According to Ann (1986), confirms that human body functions best when supplemented by the right kinds of food in the correct proportion. Food is a basic need and a right for survival for all humanity especially for children whose rights are to enjoy the highest attainable standard of health, nutrition and education, C.R.C (1989).

Food is a basic biological need, Maslow (1970) has emphasized that human beings have a hierarchy of needs ranging from lower level needs of food survival and safety to higher needs. So this should be provided before we can ask the children to be motivated to learn. Nutrients in food are like food that functions in several ways to keep the body healthy. The body should receive enough of each nutrient because foods also vary in their chemical

In the Philippines, malnutrition remains a significant public health concern with a staggering 3.4 million children who are stunted (short for their age) and more than 300,000 children under 5 years who are severely wasted. This continues to be a serious child health problem, with the Philippines being highly disaster-prone.

The risk of malnutrition increases in the aftermath of emergencies (UNICEF Philippines, 2015) A national nutrition survey reveals that, 20 percent of Filipino childrenaged 0 to 5 are underweight while 30 percent are stunted or too short for their age.

The Philippines ranked 9th in the world, with the most number of stunted children according to a UNICEF study. To address the high burden of Severe Acute Malnutrition (SAM) in the country, the Philippine Nutrition Cluster prioritized the urgent need to support the development of national protocols and policy on the management of SAM for children under five years of age. This was achieved through its community-based management of acute malnutrition (CMAM) working group led by the Department of Health (DOH).

The broad objective of this prioritization was to improve theaccess and availability of life-saving services for children with SAM through the institutionalization of SAM management within the national and local health systems, in both emergency and non-emergency settings (UNICEF-Philippines,2016). The Department of Education of the Philippines issued DepED Order No.54, s. 2013-Guidelines on the Implementation of School Feeding Programs. TheDepED Order was issued in support of the Philippine Plan of Action for Nutrition(PPAN) as approved by the National Nutrition Council Governing Board throughNNC-GB Resolution No. 1, s. 2012, the Department of Education (DepED) has advocated school feeding programs for the past years to improve the nutritional status of the undernourished pupils and students.

This Order is being issued to guide the regional, division, and school officials in implementing school-initiated and/or sponsored feeding programs, thereby ensuring that the objectives of the program are achieved. The DepED implements the School Feeding Programs(SFPs) to address the under nutrition problem among the learners toimprove school attendance and to reduce dropout in schools.

The SFPs may be school-initiated or sponsored by individuals, non-government organizations(NGOs) and private companies. School feeding in the Philippines is a tool which today effectively enables hundreds of millions of poor children worldwide to attend school.

Children are the future of any society. For this reason, children should be a starting point in any society that emphasizes human development. It is the children whose individual growth, development and society contribution will shape the future of the world. Many institutions and government bodies have often ignored the importance of child health and nutrition and can be rampaged for improved children's performance. This study therefore expects to fill the gap.

#### **4.SYNTHESIS**

Assessment is the process of utilizing multiple techniques to track progress of the student in a specific program. It is a vital process that educators employ to ensure the development of students in a discipline. Obtaining a clear picture of how well a program was implemented allows programmers to more confidently link programs to observed outcomes.

In order to evaluate program implementation extension educators need to develop an in-depth understanding of their programs. Potter Watts, and Preslar (2002) suggest that in order to accurately measure implementation, programmers need to focus on three key areas: program foundations, the implementation system, and program monitoring.

Child Trends (2007) cited the top 5 reasons (benefits) to conduct program evaluation: 1.) showcase the impact and effectiveness of the services offered by your organization in your community, 2.) Cut costs for your organization and streamline services by showing what works and what does not work, 3.) Promote staff development by improving skills and performance quality with clients ,4.) Strengthen and increase your program's capacity to contribute evidence-based knowledge to the field, and 5.) Provide evidence of service use, effectiveness, and demand in order to justify the need for further funding and support.

Process analysis looks beyond the theory of what the program is supposed to do and instead evaluates how the program is being implemented. This evaluation determines whether the components identified as critical to the success of the program are being implemented. Process evaluation is an ongoing process in which repeated measures may be used to evaluate whether the program is being implemented effectively.

Assessing the impact of the school-based feeding program for the school year 2019-2020 will enhance the awareness of stakeholders about the current state of the program if it is beneficial and conforms to the needs of the students as well as the community.

## **5.RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

This action research aims to assess the impact of the school-based feeding program in term of nutritional status and academic performance of the severely wasted feeding recipients.

Specifically, it seeks to answer the following questions:

- 1. How does the school-based feeding program managed in terms of
  - 1.1. Selection of the feeding recipients,
  - 1.2. Preparation of Food,
  - 1.3. Feeing scheme, and
  - 1.4. Feeding fund?
- 2. What are the problems encountered by the feeding teacher/s in the management of the program?
- 3. Is there a significant impact on the nutritional status and academic performance of the feeding recipients in terms of:
  - 3.1. Body Mass Index (BMI) before and after exposure to feeding program?
  - 3.2. General average of the learners before and after their exposure to feeding program?

### **6.SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS**

This study assessed the management of school-based feeding program and its impact in terms of nutritional status and academic performance of the severely wasted students.

The study is limited to one (1) feeding teacher and fifty (50) Grade 7 feeding recipients from Culiat High School. Purposive sampling was utilized to select the teacher respondent and student respondents. Survey questionnaire were used in gathering data from the respondents.

#### **7.RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

### A. Sampling

In this study, there were two groups of respondents coming from the same school. The feeding teacher and the student-respondents.

In selecting respondents purposive sampling was used for both teacher and the student- respondents. The teacher-researchers assigned number in each male and female student's respondents.

#### **B.** Data Collection

The study conducted as a quantitative/qualitative survey. The research tools used to measure the possible outcome of success or failure that is related to school-based feeding program towards nutritional status and academic performance of student-respondents. The teacher-respondent answered a survey assessing the management of the school-based feeding program in terms of selection of the feeding recipients, preparation of food, feeding scheme, and feeding fund. Also, the problems encountered in the management of the program. The student-respondents indicated their body mass index (BMI) and their first and second quarter general weighted average.

Likert scale was used to assess the management of the school-based feeding program. Teacher-respondent completed the quantitative responses by putting a check mark on the following responses: 1 (very low/never); 2 (low/seldom); 3 (moderate/sometimes), and 4( high/always) after reading the question presented.

The questions presented on the survey allowed teacher-respondent to write the problems encountered during the management of the feeding program. The responses to the surveys was presented in tables. An analysis added along with each table. The surveys designed to have numbered responses where the surveyors rated the statements on a 1 to 4 scale.

The research conducted in Culiat High School. The student respondents are selected grade 7 junior feeding recipients and the feeding teacher is teaching in grade 9 level. The number of students-respondents were fifty (50) and there is only one teacher- respondent. The respondents answered the survey during school time in less than ten minutes. When all the surveys, observations are collected, the teacher researchers gathered the data and created tables with corresponding interpretation of data.

#### **8.THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

#### **Motivational Theory by Abraham Maslow**

Motivation has the following functions: motivates, energize and sustain behavior. It energizes the behavior of the organisms and arouses it for action. It also sustains behavior for longer periods in the activity.

In *Maslow hierarchy of needs*, the physiological needs must be met. That children need food in the right quality and quantity. Food is necessary because it builds, protects and repairs the body. The malnutrition and its effects on brain development has tremendous implications on child performance. Poorly fed children are more exposed to disease infections and emotional frustrations as compared to well fed children.

### **9.DISCUSSION OF RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This part presents the analysis and interpretation of the data obtained in this study. They are presented according to the questions posed.

**Problem No 1.** How does the school-based feeding program managed in terms of

- 1.1. Selection of the feeding recipients,
- 1.2. Preparation of Food,
- 1.3. Feeing scheme, and
- 1.4. Feeding fund?

Table 1

Perception of the feeding teacher on the Management of School-Based Feeding Program in Terms of Selection of the Feeding Recipients

Indicators	Mean	Std. Deviation	Degree of Management	Verbal Interpretation
Selection of the Feeding Recipients	3.00	1.732051	Moderate Degree	Satisfactory
Over all	3.00	1.732051	Moderate Degree	Satisfactory

The following interval scale was used in interpreting the statistical results.

Values	Range	Verbal interpretation
4	3.51-4.00	High Degree/ Very Satisfactory
3	2.51-3.50	Moderate Degree/Satisfactory
2	1.51-2.50	Low Degree/ Fair
1	1.00-1.50	Very Low Degree/ Needs Improvement

Based on the result of table 1, the selection of the feeding recipients got the mean of 3.00 (moderate degree) interpreted as satisfactory which means that half of the total number of severely wasted were catered.

#### Table 2

Perception of the feeding teacher on the Management of School-Based Feeding Program in Terms of Preparation of Food

Indicators	Mean	Std. Deviation	Degree of Management	Verbal Interpretation
1. Preparation of Food	3.00	1.732051	Moderate Degree	Satisfactory
Over all	3.00	1.732051	Moderate Degree	Satisfactory

The following interval scale was used in interpreting the statistical results.

Values	Range	Verbal interpretation
4	3.51-4.00	High Degree/ Very Satisfactory
3	2.51-3.50	Moderate Degree /Satisfactory
2	1.51-2.50	Low Degree/ Fair
1	1.00-1.50	Very Low Degree/ Needs Improvement

Table 2 shows the result of the mean in terms food preparation done in the school-based feeding program which is 3.00 (moderate degree) interpreted as satisfactory. That means that only the feeding teacher prepared the food.

### Table 3

Perceptions of the feeding teacher on the Management of School-Based Feeding Program in Terms of Feeing scheme.

Indicators	Mean	Std. Deviation	Degree of Management	Verbal Interpretation
1. Feeing scheme	2.00	1.54701	Low Degree	Fair
Over all	2.00	1.54701	Low Degree	Fair

The following interval scale was used in interpreting the statistical results.

Values	Range	Verbal interpretation			
4	3.51-4.00	High Degree/ Very Satisfactory			
3	2.51-3.50	Moderate Degree /Satisfactory			
2	1.51-2.50	Low Degree/ Fair			
1	1.00-1.50	Very Low Degree/ Needs Improvement			

Table 3 shows the mean result in terms of feeding scheme which is 2.00 (low degree) interpreted as fair. That means that the feeding program happened twice a week only.

### Table 4

Perception of the feeding teacher on the Management of School-Based Feeding Program in Terms of the level of Sufficiency of the Feeding Fund

Indicators	Mean	Std. Deviation	Level of Sufficiency	Verbal Interpretation
1. Sufficiency of the Feeding Fund	3.00	1.732051	Sufficient	Satisfactory
Over all	3.00	1.732051	Sufficient	Satisfactory

The following interval scale was used in interpreting the statistical results.

Values	Range	Verbal interpretation
4	3.51-4.00	Highly Sufficient/ Very Satisfactory
3	2.51-3.50	Sufficient /Satisfactory
2	1.51-2.50	Moderately Sufficient/ Fair
1	1.00-1.50	Not Sufficient/ Needs Improvement

Table 4 shows the mean result of 3.00 (sufficient ) of the school-based feeding program in terms the level of Sufficiency of the Feeding Fund interpreted as *satisfactory*.

**Problem No 2.** What are the problems encountered by the feeding teacher in the management of the program? **Table 5** 

Problems Encountered in the in the Management of the Feeding Program

Problems encountered	Frequency	Rank
1. Some of the feeding recipients don't	1	1
go down in the feeding area .		
2. Feeding recipients doesn't want to	1	2
eat vegetables.		
3. Feeding recipients were shy.	1	3
Total	3	

Table 5 shows the problems encountered by the feeding teacher in the management of the school-based feeding program that include the following;

First, some of the feeding recipients don't go down in the feeding area.

Second, feeding recipients doesn't want to eat vegetables.

Third, feeding recipients were shy.

The first ranked problem is *some of the feeding recipients don't go down in the feeding area*. This is followed by the *feeding recipients doesn't want to eat vegetables*. Ranked three problem is *feeding recipients were shy*.

**Problem No 3.** Is there a significant impact on the nutritional status and academic performance of the feeding recipients in terms of:

- 2.1. Body Mass Index (BMI) before and after exposure to feeding program?
- 2.2. General average of the learners before and after their exposure to feeding program? Table 6

Impact of the Feeding Program in terms of Nutritional Status of the Feeding Recipients

		T			T	<u>r</u>
Student	BMI (Baseline)		BMI (Midline)			Overall
number	July, 2019	Interpretation	November, 2019	Interpretation	Difference	Interpretations
1	13.88	Severely wasted	14.8	Severely wasted	0.92	Little significant impact
2	13.41	Severely wasted	13.5	Severely wasted	0.09	Little significant impact
3	15.06	Severely wasted	16.08	Wasted	1.02	Little significant impact
4	15	Severely wasted	15.03	Severely wasted	0.03	Little significant impact
5	15.86	Severely wasted	15.86	Severely wasted	0	Little significant impact
6	14.67	Severely wasted	16.32	Wasted	1.65	Little significant impact
7	14.26	Severely wasted	15.38	Severely wasted	1.12	Little significant impact
8	13.9	Severely wasted	13.9	Severely wasted	0	Little significant impact
9	14.35	Severely wasted	14.81	Severely wasted	0.46	Little significant impact
10	13.52	Severely wasted	13.55	Severely wasted	0.03	Little significant impact
11	14	Severely wasted	15.46	Severely wasted	1.46	Little significant impact
12	12.67	Severely wasted	12.78	Severely wasted	0.11	Little significant impact
13	14.79	Severely wasted	15.31	Severely wasted	0.52	Little significant impact
14	12.98	Severely wasted	13.42	Severely wasted	0.44	Little significant impact
15	12.78	Severely wasted	13.98	Severely wasted	1.2	Little significant impact
16	13.8	Severely wasted	14.5	Severely wasted	0.7	Little significant

				1	T
13 72	Severely wasted	13 9	Severely wasted	0.18	impact Little significant
			-		impact Little significant
	,		,		impact Little significant
	,		,		impact Little significant
14.97	Severely wasted	15.82	Severely wasted	0.85	impact Little significant
14.82	Severely wasted	16.15	Wasted	1.33	impact
12.4	Severely wasted	16.77	Wasted	4.37	Little significant impact
13.97	Severely wasted	14.5	Severely wasted	0.53	Little significant impact
15.38	Severely wasted	15.88	Severely wasted	0.5	Little significant impact
13.45	Severely wasted	14.6	Severely wasted	1.15	Little significant impact
13.51	Severely wasted	13.91	Severely wasted	0.4	Little significant impact
13.51	Severely wasted	13.96	Severely wasted	0.45	Little significant impact
14.56	Severely wasted	17.22	Wasted	2.66	Little significant impact
14.21	Severely wasted	15	Severely wasted	0.79	Little significant impact
15.9	Severely wasted	16.75	Wasted	0.85	Little significant impact
14.41	Severely wasted	15.71	Severely wasted	1.3	Little significant impact
13.33	Severely wasted	13.76	Severely wasted	0.43	Little significant impact
13.04	Severely wasted	14.34	Severely wasted	1.3	Little significant impact
14.38	Severely wasted	16.5	Wasted	2.12	Little significant impact
12.02	Severely wasted	14.24	Severely wasted	2.22	Little significant impact
12.71	Severely wasted	13.89	Severely wasted	1.18	Little significant impact
13.58	Severely wasted	15.4	Severely wasted	1.82	Little significant impact
14.13	Severely wasted	15.78	Severely wasted	1.65	Little significant impact
13.52	Severely wasted	14.67	Severely wasted	1.15	Little significant impact
13.63	Severely wasted	15.25	Severely wasted	1.62	Little significant impact
12	Severely wasted	13.23	Severely wasted	1.23	Little significant impact
13.63	Severely wasted	14.55	Severely wasted	0.92	Little significant impact
14.28	Severely wasted	15.77	Severely wasted	1.49	Little significant impact
16.57	Wasted	17.77	Wasted	1.2	Little significant impact
12.43	Severely wasted	13.95	Severely wasted	1.52	Little significant impact
14.35	Severely wasted	15.81	Severely wasted	1.46	Little significant impact
	12.4  13.97  15.38  13.45  13.51  13.51  14.56  14.21  15.9  14.41  13.33  13.04  14.38  12.02  12.71  13.58  14.13  13.52  13.63  12  13.63  14.28  16.57  12.43	13.77 Severely wasted 14.05 Severely wasted 14.97 Severely wasted 14.82 Severely wasted 12.4 Severely wasted 13.97 Severely wasted 15.38 Severely wasted 13.45 Severely wasted 13.51 Severely wasted 13.51 Severely wasted 14.56 Severely wasted 14.21 Severely wasted 15.9 Severely wasted 15.9 Severely wasted 14.41 Severely wasted 13.33 Severely wasted 14.38 Severely wasted 14.38 Severely wasted 14.38 Severely wasted 14.38 Severely wasted 13.58 Severely wasted 13.59 Severely wasted 13.60 Severely wasted 13.60 Severely wasted 13.61 Severely wasted 13.62 Severely wasted 13.63 Severely wasted 13.63 Severely wasted 13.63 Severely wasted 14.28 Severely wasted 14.28 Severely wasted 14.28 Severely wasted	13.77       Severely wasted       14.99         14.05       Severely wasted       13.51         14.97       Severely wasted       15.82         14.82       Severely wasted       16.15         12.4       Severely wasted       16.77         13.97       Severely wasted       14.5         15.38       Severely wasted       15.88         13.45       Severely wasted       14.6         13.51       Severely wasted       13.91         13.51       Severely wasted       13.96         14.56       Severely wasted       15         15.9       Severely wasted       15         15.9       Severely wasted       15.71         13.33       Severely wasted       15.71         13.33       Severely wasted       14.34         14.41       Severely wasted       16.5         12.02       Severely wasted       16.5         12.02       Severely wasted       15.4         14.13       Severely wasted       15.4         14.13       Severely wasted       15.78         13.63       Severely wasted       15.25         12       Severely wasted       15.25         14.28 <td>13.77Severely wasted14.99Severely wasted14.05Severely wasted13.51Severely wasted14.97Severely wasted15.82Severely wasted14.82Severely wasted16.15Wasted12.4Severely wasted16.77Wasted13.97Severely wasted14.5Severely wasted15.38Severely wasted15.88Severely wasted13.45Severely wasted14.6Severely wasted13.51Severely wasted13.91Severely wasted13.51Severely wasted13.96Severely wasted14.56Severely wasted17.22Wasted14.21Severely wasted15Severely wasted15.9Severely wasted16.75Wasted13.33Severely wasted15.71Severely wasted13.04Severely wasted13.76Severely wasted13.04Severely wasted14.34Severely wasted14.38Severely wasted14.24Severely wasted12.02Severely wasted13.89Severely wasted12.71Severely wasted15.78Severely wasted13.58Severely wasted15.78Severely wasted13.59Severely wasted15.78Severely wasted13.63Severely wasted15.25Severely wasted12Severely wasted14.55Severely wasted14.28Severely wasted15.77Severely wasted16.57Wasted17.77<!--</td--><td>13.77         Severely wasted         14.99         Severely wasted         1.22           14.05         Severely wasted         13.51         Severely wasted         -0.54           14.97         Severely wasted         15.82         Severely wasted         0.85           14.82         Severely wasted         16.15         Wasted         1.33           12.4         Severely wasted         16.77         Wasted         4.37           13.97         Severely wasted         14.5         Severely wasted         0.53           15.38         Severely wasted         15.88         Severely wasted         0.5           15.38         Severely wasted         15.88         Severely wasted         0.5           15.38         Severely wasted         15.88         Severely wasted         0.5           13.45         Severely wasted         14.6         Severely wasted         0.5           13.51         Severely wasted         13.91         Severely wasted         0.4           13.51         Severely wasted         17.22         Wasted         0.45           14.21         Severely wasted         15.7         Severely wasted         0.79           15.9         Severely wasted         15.71</td></td>	13.77Severely wasted14.99Severely wasted14.05Severely wasted13.51Severely wasted14.97Severely wasted15.82Severely wasted14.82Severely wasted16.15Wasted12.4Severely wasted16.77Wasted13.97Severely wasted14.5Severely wasted15.38Severely wasted15.88Severely wasted13.45Severely wasted14.6Severely wasted13.51Severely wasted13.91Severely wasted13.51Severely wasted13.96Severely wasted14.56Severely wasted17.22Wasted14.21Severely wasted15Severely wasted15.9Severely wasted16.75Wasted13.33Severely wasted15.71Severely wasted13.04Severely wasted13.76Severely wasted13.04Severely wasted14.34Severely wasted14.38Severely wasted14.24Severely wasted12.02Severely wasted13.89Severely wasted12.71Severely wasted15.78Severely wasted13.58Severely wasted15.78Severely wasted13.59Severely wasted15.78Severely wasted13.63Severely wasted15.25Severely wasted12Severely wasted14.55Severely wasted14.28Severely wasted15.77Severely wasted16.57Wasted17.77 </td <td>13.77         Severely wasted         14.99         Severely wasted         1.22           14.05         Severely wasted         13.51         Severely wasted         -0.54           14.97         Severely wasted         15.82         Severely wasted         0.85           14.82         Severely wasted         16.15         Wasted         1.33           12.4         Severely wasted         16.77         Wasted         4.37           13.97         Severely wasted         14.5         Severely wasted         0.53           15.38         Severely wasted         15.88         Severely wasted         0.5           15.38         Severely wasted         15.88         Severely wasted         0.5           15.38         Severely wasted         15.88         Severely wasted         0.5           13.45         Severely wasted         14.6         Severely wasted         0.5           13.51         Severely wasted         13.91         Severely wasted         0.4           13.51         Severely wasted         17.22         Wasted         0.45           14.21         Severely wasted         15.7         Severely wasted         0.79           15.9         Severely wasted         15.71</td>	13.77         Severely wasted         14.99         Severely wasted         1.22           14.05         Severely wasted         13.51         Severely wasted         -0.54           14.97         Severely wasted         15.82         Severely wasted         0.85           14.82         Severely wasted         16.15         Wasted         1.33           12.4         Severely wasted         16.77         Wasted         4.37           13.97         Severely wasted         14.5         Severely wasted         0.53           15.38         Severely wasted         15.88         Severely wasted         0.5           15.38         Severely wasted         15.88         Severely wasted         0.5           15.38         Severely wasted         15.88         Severely wasted         0.5           13.45         Severely wasted         14.6         Severely wasted         0.5           13.51         Severely wasted         13.91         Severely wasted         0.4           13.51         Severely wasted         17.22         Wasted         0.45           14.21         Severely wasted         15.7         Severely wasted         0.79           15.9         Severely wasted         15.71

47	14.28	Severely wasted	15.44	Severely wasted	1.16	Little significant impact
48	15.35	Severely wasted	15.98	Severely wasted	0.63	Little significant impact
49	15.33	Severely wasted	15.99	Severely wasted	0.66	Little significant impact
50	14.66	Severely wasted	15.75	Severely wasted	1.09	Little significant impact

Table 6 shows the result of the Body Mass Index (BMI) of the feeding recipients during the baseline and midline. Student numbers: 3, 6,21,22,28,30,34,and 44 happened to increase their BMI that made them wasted from severely wasted or 8 (16%). While 42 (84%) of the student- respondents remains to be severely wasted. The overall interpretation is that feeding program shows little impact on the nutritional status of the severely wasted feeding recipients.

Table 7 Impact of the Feeding Program in terms of Academic Performance of the Feeding Recipients

	General Average			J
Student number	First Quarter	Second Quarter	Difference	Interpretation
1	85	84	-1	no significant impact
2	75	75	0	no significant impact
3	81	85	4	significant impact
4	87	88	1	significant impact
5	84	84	0	no significant impact
6	81	83	2	significant impact
7	77	81	4	significant impact
8	75	75	0	no significant impact
9	76	78	2	Significant impact
10	75	79	4	Significant impact
11	76	77	1	Significant impact
12	76	77	1	Significant impact
13	75	76	1	Significant impact
14	75	77	2	Significant impact
15	75	76	1	Significant impact
16	77	78	1	Significant impact
17	74	75	1	Significant impact
18	78	78	0	no significant impact
19	75	78	3	Significant impact
20	76	76	0	no significant impact
21	77	76	-1	no significant impact
22	74	75	1	Significant impact
23	77	76	-1	no significant impact
24	74	75	1	Significant impact
25	77	75	-2	no significant impact
26	77	75	2	Significant impact
27	75	77	2	Significant impact
28	83	90	7	Significant impact
29	77	80	3	Significant impact
30	76	76	0	no significant impact
31	77	76	1	Significant impact
32	76	77	1	Significant impact
33	78	79	1	Significant impact

34	80	84	4	Significant impact
35	85	88	3	Significant impact
36	75	77	2	Significant impact
37	77	79	2	Significant impact
38	75	80	3	Significant impact
39	83	89	5	Significant impact
40	83	89	5	Significant impact
41	80	85	5	Significant impact
42	79	82	3	Significant impact
43	77	78	1	Significant impact
44	83	87	4	Significant impact
45	80	79	-1	no significant impact
46	84	85	1	Significant impact
47	82	86	4	Significant impact
48	73	75	2	Significant impact
49	75	75	0	no significant impact
50	79	83	4	Significant impact

Table above reveals impact of the school-based feeding program in Culiat High School in terms of academic performance of the feeding recipients. Student numbers: 39,40, and 41 got the highest increase which is 5 points in their general weighted average, followed by student numbers 3,7,10,34,44,47,and 50 who got 4 points increase, while numbers 6,9,14,26,27,36,37, and 48 got 2 points additional ,and the last the student numbers 4,11,12,13,15,17,22,24,31,32,33,43,and 46 has 1 point increase. Thirty seven (37) or 74% of the student-respondents increased their general weighted average by 1-5 points.

### 10. FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This part presents the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the study.

### **Findings**

In assessing the management of the school-based feeding program and its impact in terms of nutritional status and academic performance of the severely wasted students in Culiat High School, the following are the findings.

- 1. In general the management of the SBFP seems to be in need of improvement as seen in the selection of the feeding recipients ,preparation of feeding food, and the sufficiency of the feeding fund were achieved to a *moderate degree* with a mean of 3.00 interpreted as *satisfactory* ,the feeding scheme assessed to be *in low degree* with a mean of 2.00 interpreted as *fair*.
- 2. The top three problems encountered by the teacher respondent in the management of the SBFP were *first*, some of the feeding recipients don't go down in the feeding area. **Second**, feeding recipients doesn't want to eat vegetables. **Third**, feeding recipients were shy.
- 3. Eight (8) or 16% of the respondents happened to increase their BMI that made them *wasted* from *severely wasted*. While forty two (42) or 84% of the feeding recipients remains *severely wasted*. The overall interpretation is that feeding program shows a little impact in the nutritional status of the severely wasted feeding recipients. Thirty seven (37) or 74% of the student- respondents improved their general average by 1-5 points. While thirteen (13) or 26% of the respondents shows no increase in their general average.

### **Conclusions**

In light of the findings of this study, the following conclusions are made.

- 1. The teacher-respondent perceived that SBFP is not well- managed.
- 2. In general, the student-respondents may be not well-oriented on the significance of the program to them.
- 3. SBFP may not have a strong influence to increase the nutritional status of the recipients. While SBFP had an important part in improving the academic performance of the student-respondents.

### **Recommendations**

Based from the conclusions, the following recommendations were suggested.

- 1. The curriculum and instruction in the TLE program must be improve to attain a high extent implementation.
- 2. The physical facilities, tools, and equipment to make TLE program improve the teacher-learning situation should be provided and maintained.
- 3. An instructional program should be prepared by the school administrators to facilitate the implementation and the monitoring system of TLE programs.

The overall interpretation is that feeding program shows a significant impact in the academic performance of the severely wasted feeding recipients.

#### **REFERENCES**

- 1. Ann, (1986). Child Development. New York: Longman Publisher
- 2. Do.#39.s.2017 Operational Guidelines on the Implementation of School-Based Feeding Program for School Years 2017-2022
- 3. Child Trends (2007) "Childs Research Brief "4301 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 350, Washington, DC 20008 Phone 202-572-6000 Fax 202-362-5533 www.childtrends.org
- 4. Jensen, (2010). Health and Nutrition: Harvard: Oxford Publishers.
- 5. Maslow, Abraham H. (1996). Critique of self-actualization theory. In: E. Hoffman (Ed.), *Future visions: The unpublished papers of Abraham Maslow.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp. 26–32.
- 6. Pediatre, J. (2001). Effects of Children Nutrition. Paris: Longhorn Publishers
- 7. Taylor (2010), Handbook of Behavior, Food and Nutrition
- 8. UNICEF Philippines, 2015)
- 9. UNICEF-Philippines, 2016
- 10. Vanyyncih, V. (2006). Knowledge. Harvard: Longhorn Publishers