

REPORT ON THE RAPID ASSESSMENT OF DEVOLVED DSWD FACILITIES

I. BACKGROUND

With the passage of Republic Act No. 7160 otherwise known as the Local Government Code of 1991, the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD) was one of the national agencies affected to devolve to the local government units its implementing functions together with its programs and services, direct service workers, assets and liabilities, and budget corresponding to the salary and funds of corresponding staff and devolved programs. In 1996, Department Order No. 22, Series of 1996 laid down the policies and guidelines in the devolution of DSWD centers/institutions which signaled the devolution of the Productivity Skills and Capability Building and Lingap centers.

The **PSCB** is a program meant to provide skills training to disadvantaged women that would enable them to gain employment either through self, open employment or sheltered workshop.

The **Lingap Center**, on the other hand, is a transitional home for street children aged seven (7) to 17 years who are abandoned or whose parents cannot at the time provide for their needs adequately.

Sixteen years after the passage of the Local Government Code of 1991, the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD) commissioned the Ateneo School of Governance in November 2007 to conduct a study aimed at assessing the implementation of the devolved DSWD programs and services. This study tried to look into the following:

1. The status of implementation of programs and services that have been devolved to the local government units;
2. The effectiveness of these programs and services to address social welfare and development concerns in the locality as well as the goals of devolution;
3. The extent of influence and relevance of the department's assistance to the local government units for them to achieve objectives and goals of these programs and services.

After the completion of the study's data gathering phase in January 2008 came the call to appraise the facilities where the devolved programs and services are being delivered. A rapid appraisal to illustrate the current state of DSWD devolved facilities and to look into the factors that either sustained these facilities' operations or led to their under utilization then followed.

II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

What is the current state of the DSWD devolved facilities? What are the factors that sustained these facilities' operations or led to their under utilization? What are the criteria used for devolving these facilities?

III. OBJECTIVES

1. To come up with a complete profile of all DSWD devolved facilities
2. To identify the factors that sustained these facilities' operations
3. To identify the factors that led to these facilities under utilization
4. To identify the criteria used for devolving these facilities

IV. METHODOLOGY

The Policy and Research Division (PRD) of the Policy Development and Planning Bureau (PDPB) in coordination with the 16 Field Offices (FO) conducted this nationwide rapid assessment of the devolved DSWD Productivity and Skills Capability-Building (PSCB) and Lingap Centers using Self-administered Questionnaire (SAQ) supplemented by a focused group discussion. To come up with a more accurate assessment of the status of these facilities, validation visits to the centers were also done to supplement the result of the SAQs and FGDs.

V. SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS

The research covered all the **97 PSCBs** and **18 Lingap Centers** for a total of 115 Centers nationwide¹, while the FGDs were conducted in selected regions representing the three island groups – 2 from Luzon, 1 from Visayas and 2 from Mindanao. Regions with the highest number of fully devolved facilities were selected as the study sites. The regions, which were earlier covered by the study made by the Ateneo School of Governance, were given lesser priority. These include Regions I, II, IV-A, VII, VIII, XI and XII.

1. The initial assessment using the Self-administered Questionnaire (SAQ) and focused group discussions were done in October 2008 – November 2008. The initial report was submitted in December 2008 with the recommendation to validate the data gathered through actual visitation to the centers.
2. Actual visit to the centers were done by mid-January to mid-February 2009 to validate the data submitted to come up with a comprehensive report on the real state of the devolved facilities/centers.

Table 1. Total PSCB and Lingap Centers Nationwide

Region	PSCB				Lingap		
	Retained	Devolved	Divested	TOTAL	Retained	Devolved	TOTAL
I	-	6	-	6	-	1	1
II	-	1	2	3	-	1	1
III	1	5	-	6	1	1	2
IV-A	1	9	-	10	-	1	1
IV-B	-	3	-	3	-	-	-
V	2	0	1	4	-	1	1
VI	-	4	-	4	-	1	1
VII	3	6	-	9	-	1	1
VIII	2	5	-	7	-	1	1
IX	1	7	-	8	2	1	3
X	1	3	-	4	-	1	1
XI	1	5	-	6	-	1	1
XII	-	4	-	4	-	1	1
NCR	-	14	1	15	-	1	1
CAR	2	2	2	6	-	1	1
CARAGA	-	2	-	2	-	1	1
TOTAL	14	76	6	97	3	15	18

¹ August 31, 2006 report of PMB-DSWD

VI. ASSESSMENT RESULTS:

VI.A PRODUCTIVITY SKILLS AND CAPABILITY BUILDING

1. Out of 97 targeted centers, 95 were surveyed and 92 were visited. The three (3) centers that were not visited were those transferred to new locations namely Paoay, Ilocos Norte from San Fernando, La Union in Region I, Baler, Aurora from Cabanatuan City and Malaybalay, Bukidnon from El Salvador, Mis. Oriental in Region X (please refer to Table 2)
2. The discrepancies on the number of target versus actual number were brought about by the following:
 - a. Four (4) existing centers were not in the 2006 listing
 - i. Sewing Craft in Talisay, Cebu, Region VII
 - ii. Sewing Craft in Koronadal, South Cotabato, Region XII
 - iii. Food Processing and Preservation in Gen. Santos City, Region XII
 - iv. Sewing Craft in Tabuk, Kalinga Apayao, CAR
 - b. Seven (7) centers in the same 2006 listing are no longer existing
 - i. 1 Toy Craft in Toril, Davao
 - ii. 1 Sewing Craft in Manila
 - iii. 5 projects managed by the National Training Center & Laboratory for Womens Welfare & Development (NTCLWWD)
 - a. 1 Toy Craft,
 - b. 2 Sewing Craft,
 - c. 1 Food Processing & Preservations and
 - d. 1 Home Aide

Table 2. Target and Actual Number of PSCBs Surveyed and Visited

REGION	TARGET	ACTUAL	
		SURVEYED	VISITED
I	6	6	5
II	3	3	3
III	6	6	5
IV-A	10	10	10
IV-B	3	3	3
V	4	4	4
VI	4	4	4
VII	9	10	10
VIII	7	7	7
IX	8	8	8
X	4	4	3
XI	6	5	5
XII	4	7	7
CARAGA	2	2	2
CAR	6	7	7
NCR	15	9	9
	97	95	92

3. A total of **95 centers** were surveyed out of the **97 PSCBs** reported to be existing. Out of 95, **76 centers** or **80%** were devolved to local government units; **13** or **14%** were retained, and **six** or **6%** were divested to the Technical Education and Skills Development Authority (please refer to Table 3).

**Table 3. Plan vs. Actual Status of Devolution/Divestment of PSCBs
(As of 30 March 2009)**

REGION	TOTAL CENTERS		DEVOLVED		RETAINED		DIVESTED	
	PLAN	ACTUAL	PLAN	ACTUAL	PLAN	ACTUAL	PLAN	ACTUAL
I	6	6	6	6				
II	3	3	1	1			2	2
III	6	6	5	5	1	1		
IV-A	10	10	9	9	1	1		
IV-B	3	3	3	3				
V	4	4	2	0	2	2	2	2
VI	4	4	4	4				
VII	9	10	6	8	3	3		
VIII	7	7	5	5	2	2		
IX	8	8	7	7	1	1		
X	4	4	3	3	1	1		
XI	6	5	5	5				
XII	4	7	4	7				
CARAGA	2	2	2	2				
CAR	6	7	2	3	2	2	2	2
NCR*	15	8	15	8				
TOTAL	97	95	79	76	13	13	7	6

4. **Status of Operation.** Out of the **95 PSCBs** surveyed, **65** or 68% are still operational, 16 or 17% have temporarily stopped operation and 14 or 15% have totally ceased operation. A center is deemed operational if it was able to conduct trainings. On the other hand, reasons cited for the temporary/permanent closure of centers were: i) absence of a trainer, ii) lack of funds, iii) peace and order, iv) lack of raw materials, v) center is under construction. Most of the retained PSCBs that were operated as productivity centers ceased operation where equipment such as sewing machines were used for therapy and food processing equipment were utilized by the residential homes (Regions 8, 10, CAR, NCR. (please refer to Annex A for the details).



Table 4 shows status of operation according by category where 58 or 76% of the 76 devolved PSCBs to the LGUs are still operational while 18 or 24% are closed (temporarily or permanently).

Of the 6 PSCBs divested to TESDA, two are still operational, and 5 are closed (temporarily or permanently). In terms of the retained centers at the field offices, five are operational and seven (7) have ceased its operation.

**Table 4. Status of Operations by Category (Devolved/Divested and Retained)
(As of 30 March 2009)**

Region	DEVOLVED			TOT AL	DIVESTED			TOT AL	RETAINED			TOT AL
	Oprt'l	Temp. Closed	Closed		Oprt'l	Temp. Closed	Closed		Oprt'l	Temp. Closed	Closed	
I	6			6				0				0
II				0	1	1	1	3				0
III	5		1	6				0				0
IV-A	9	1		10				0				0
IV-B		2	1	3				0				0
V				0		2		2			2	2
VI	4			4				0				0
VII	6			6				0	4			4
VIII	4	1		5				0			2	2
IX	4	2	1	7				0	1			1
X	1	2		3				0			1	1
XI	4	1		5				0				0
XII	4	2	1	7				0				0
CARAGA	2			2				0				0
CAR	3			3	1		1	2			2	2
NCR	6	2	1	9				0				0
TOTAL	58	13	5	76	2	3	2	7	5		7	12

5. In terms of **accomplishments**, a total of 19, 912 women, youth and men were trained for the period 2006-2008, which mostly are food processing and sewing. Table 5 shows a declining trend on the number of trainees per year. Among the reasons cited were: almost all the interested residents in the LGU were already trained; non-interest in the offered skills training which is sewing; accessibility (no funds for transportation and food), among others.

Table 5. Number of Trainees

Region	NO. OF TRAINEES PER YEAR		
	2006	2007	2008
I	487	200	500
II	231	290	220
III	816	673	35
IV-A	1,439	1357	12
IV-B	352	282	180
V	41	11	0
VI	344	327	225
VII	513	683	585
VIII	453	513	441
IX	476	508	491
X	70	105	73
XI	1,294	850	972
XII	435	400	600
CARAGA	203	40	47
CAR	73	103	263
NCR	575	528	596
TOTAL	7,802	6,870	5,240



6. On the **staff complement**, a PSCB facility, based on available records during the validation visits, has an **average of three (3) staff** per center. In terms of tenure, only the focal person for women who monitor the program hold a permanent position, while the trainers are hired on Job Order basis which was one reason cited for the irregular conduct of training or the closure of the center (please refer to Table 6 for the details).
7. In terms of **budgetary allocation**, those that were reported operational have yearly appropriations of Php30,000.00 to Php1.0Million. The funds were used to pay the honorarium of the trainer, training materials, repair of equipment and other logistical requirements.
8. The centers were found to have adequate space (58 centers), well ventilated (66) and well maintained (63).
9. With regard to the equipment, 61 centers reported that majority of their machines are functional and well utilized, while 20 centers have underutilized machines.

Table 6. Staff Complement of both PSCB and Lingap Centers

Region	PSCB			Lingap		
	Total No. of Staff	Total No. of Centers	Ave. No. of Staff	Total No. of Staff	Total No. of Centers	Ave. No. of Staff
I	10	6	2	-	1	-
II	8	3	3	13	1	13
III	19	6	3	-	1	-
IV-A	17	10	2	-	1	-
IV-B	8	3	3	-	-	-
V	1	4	-	7	1	7
VI	6	4	2	1	1	1
VII	38	11	3	19	1	19
VIII	55	7	8	-	2	-
IX	44	8	5	18	3	6
X	6	4	1	-	1	-
XI	13	5	2	12	1	12
XII	24	6	4	-	-	-
NCR	36	8	4	-	1	-
CAR	7	7	1	-	1	-
CARAGA	6	2	3	-	-	-
Total/Average	298	94	3	70	16	4

VI.B. THE LINGAP CENTERS

1. Out of 18 targeted centers², 16 were visited, including one (1) Lingap center that was not included in the list (Lingap Center, managed by Ormoc City). Three (3) centers out of 18 in the list no longer exist (one each in Regions III, XII and CARAGA). The actual number of Lingap centers should be 16, in effect all the existing centers were visited. There are 8 centers retained at the Field Office which is 38% more than the target of only 3 centers. Reasons cited for the non-devolution was the inability of LGUs to provide funding for its operation. Further, the retained centers operate either as reception and study center for children, home for girls, regional rehabilitation center for youth or expanded to cater to women.

Table 7. Target and Actual Number of Lingap Centers Surveyed and Visited

Region	Target			Actual Visited		
	Retained	Devolved	TOTAL	Retained	Devolved	TOTAL
I	-	1	1	-	1	1
II	-	1	1	-	1	1
III	1	1	2	1		1
IV-A	-	1	1	-	1	1
V	-	1	1	1		1
VI	-	1	1	1		1
VII	-	1	1	1		1
VIII	-	1	1	2		2
IX	2	1	3	1	2	3
X	-	1	1		1	1
XI	-	1	1		1	1
XII*	-	1	1		0	0
CARAGA**	-	1	1	-	-	0
CAR	-	1	1	1		1
NCR	-	1	1		1	1
TOTAL	3	15	18	8	8	16

* FO XII and CARAGA claims there is no Lingap Center in the Region

2. In terms of the actual status operation, only one (1) of the 8 devolved centers have ceased to operate which is the Dipolog Lingap Center. However, the LGU started a new center in 2008 called Dipolog Childrens Center catering to the same clientele which are stretchchildren.
3. The 8 devolved centers, including the Dipolog Children Center were able to serve 5,440 children for the period 2006-2008. The average number of staff per center is four (4), but only one staff holds a permanent item.



² Based on PMB report dated 31 Aug. 2006

4. Except for the Lingap Center located in Lumbia, Cagayan de Oro (see pictures below) which is dilapidated, all the 7 devolved facilities are well maintained. Most of the fixtures and equipment provided are still being used.



C. OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATIONS GATHERED:

a. Availability Of Memorandum Of Agreement (MOA) and Inventory Of Equipment

Of the **111 PSCB and Lingap Centers** surveyed, **78 (or 71%)** had their inventory of equipment available during the validation visits while **66 (or 59%)** presented copies of the Memoranda of Agreements (MOAs) signed with the DSWD Field Office concerned for the devolution of such facilities.

b. Hindering and Facilitating Factors

1. Major hindering factor is lack of support from some local government units (LGUs) concerned in terms of budget allocation and staff complement for centers that have stopped operation
2. Major facilitating factors for the functional centers are committed and capable trainer and staff as well as availability of logistical support from the LGUs.

c. Criteria For Devolution

The criteria used for devolution as perceived by the trainers and focal persons are:

- 1) willingness and capability of the LGUs to support program through provision of funds for salaries of staff and program expenses;
- 2) available location; and,
- 3) demand for program from the locality.

d. On Accreditation

Only **6** of the 16 Lingap Centers (**or 38%**) were found to be accredited by the DSWD. Of the **95 PSCBs** surveyed/visited, only **32 trainers** and **15 centers** are accredited by the TESDA. The accredited centers use the TESDA training modules.

VII. ANALYSIS

A. Monitoring Of Centers

The total number of centers actually surveyed was 111 out of the 115 listed in the PMB report. This discrepancy means that monitoring of the devolved centers is lacking and there is a need to update the DSWD records. It is also critical to find out what happened to the 15 PSCB and Lingap Centers unaccounted for from the 115 centers in the same PMB record. Another area where updating of records is needed concerns the inventory of equipment and other records such as the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with local government units/partners. When visited, only 71% of the centers have an inventory and 58% have their MOA readily available.

B. Status of Operation and Clients Served

Of the 111 centers surveyed, 72% are still operational. It does not mean to say that the devolution process has gone well considering other pertinent findings of the assessment. From 2006 to 2008, the number of clients served by these two (2) centers decreased from 10,271 in 2006, 7,740 in 2007, to 6,050 by 2008. This means that PSCB and Lingap Centers served a decreasing number of clients for the last three (3) years due to the following: almost all the interested residents in the LGU were already trained; non-interest in the offered skills training which is sewing; accessibility (no funds for transportation and food).

LGUs and TESDA transferred equipment to other LGUs, other TESDA schools, Non-Government or People's Organizations, an action that was not stipulated or covered in the signed MOA.

C. Staff Complement

The data on staffing seem to show that PSCB and Lingap Centers are overstaffed. The caseload of 22 clients trained by a PSCB staff and 21 clients served by Lingap staff, annually from 2006 to 2008, may seem too low. However, other factors not reflected in these data should also be considered such as:

1. The data taken from self-administered questionnaires and list of staff submitted during validation visits which includes part-time and job order staff (who are not regular personnel). Some of the workers reflected by the data generated from the survey are PSCB graduate-volunteers.
2. Focused group discussions and field validation visits found that center workers complain of being overworked especially among LGU workers, who are also performing other responsibilities aside from what they should be doing as center workers. For example, PSCB workers specializing in Food Processing and Preservation training in Bais, Negros Oriental regularly bake cakes as gift of the mayor to senior citizens in the locality who are celebrating their birthdays. Many PSCB workers denoted here continue to work for other Local Social Welfare and Development Offices (LSWDO)/LGU concerns even though their program has stopped operating temporarily. And usually, the reasons for the temporary closure are lack of funds for the program and need for the PSCB staff to focus on another area of work in the LSWDO/LGU.

3. There is variance on the number of staff based on the capability of an NGO, LGU or other National Government Agencies (NGAs) to provide job positions/salaries. A validation of the province/city/municipality classification may show that LGUs with high income tend to hire more staff who may be assigned not for the center's program implementation but for other LGU priorities.
4. Low and decreasing number of clients served vis-à-vis number of staff available may be seen as symptoms of lack of priority and low budget support for the center's program.

D. Quality Of Service

The quality of services through these centers also appears to be deteriorating. Only 55% of the centers have equipment that are mostly functioning which means that many are in need of repair. On the extreme side, 18% of the centers have underutilized equipment.

The poor condition of PSCB and Lingap facilities is further borne out by the findings wherein only 53% were assessed to have adequate space, 60% that are well-ventilated and 57% that are well-maintained. Moreover, only 6 of the 16 Lingap Centers visited (or 38%) have been accredited by DSWD while only 31 trainers and 15 courses have been accredited by the TESDA of the 94 PSCBs visited.

E. Budget

Only 55 or 50% of the 111 centers surveyed clearly indicated the budget they received for CY 2008. Fund shortage for continued operation is very much expressed during field visits and focused group discussions conducted. That 50% of the centers were not able to clearly indicate their budget for CY 2008 may mean that the survey respondent/center staff is not aware of their organizational budget or it may also mean that the source of funds for continued operation is not only insufficient but also unreliable and not fixed.

In comparison with the average client served in a year, PSCBs spend an average of Php310,179.00 for an average of 6,551 clients yearly or about Php 47.00 per client yearly from 2006 to 2008. Meanwhile, a Lingap Center spends an average of Php1,618,470.00 for an average of 1,470 clients yearly or Php 1,101.00 per client in a year.

VIII. CONCLUSION

The status of PSCBs and Lingap Centers should alarm the Department. The rapid assessment shows poor performance (only 72% are operational), low and decreasing number of clients served and low quality of services provided.

There are significant numbers of PSCBs and Lingap Centers performing well despite the Department's shortcomings in monitoring as well as in providing technical assistance and resource augmentation.

The centers are not doing well because of the low priority and lack of budget given mostly by local chief executives (LCE). This appears to be caused by gaps in the haste to divest/devolve the said facilities.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is the duty of the state to provide social protection to its citizens. When it comes to the vulnerable sector, the DSWD is the agency mandated to ensure that adequate and quality services are provided to them as stipulated in Sec. 3. a) of EO #221-Redirecting the Functions and Operations of the Department of Social Welfare and Development on the Powers and Functions of DSWD, which is to "set standards, accredit and provide consultative services to public and private institutions, organizations and persons engaged in social welfare activities, and monitor performance and compliance to standards by institutions, organizations and persons engaged in social welfare activities, both public and private" Given this premise, the following actions are recommended:

- a. Continue to monitor, provide technical assistance and find ways to augment resources to devolved PSCBs and Lingap Centers. The detailed statistical report on the status of centers would show what centers are in critical status and in need of immediate monitoring and technical assistance and resource augmentation.
- b. Establish a more accurate and updated baseline information on the status of PSCBs and Lingap Centers using past PMB records and this assessment. Ensure integrity of data. The PSCBs and Lingap Centers not surveyed should be accounted for. The centers surveyed but not in the PMB list should be reconciled with the master list. Exclude retained centers from the list after proper audit and turnover is done.
- c. Collect existing MOA and Inventory of Equipment of DSWD with partner LGU/NGO/NGA. Consider legal feasibility of retrieving/recovering unutilized equipment of closed centers and use the equipment where it is most needed. Review existing MOAs and consider forging better agreements with existing or new partners.
- d. Review DSWD divestment policies taking in to consideration the following concerns:
 - i. Why, to whom, how and when should devolution/divestment be undertaken? Rationale, objectives, parameters and operational policies should be consistent with the DSWD mandate, vision, mission and goals.
 - ii. What criteria should be used? Is it enough just to have a Memorandum of Agreement signed by the LCE or center/agency head? Some suggestions would be to require a local council resolution passed expressing continued support for the program and appropriation of funds not only for the salaries of the staff but also for program operation and maintenance. For NGOs, a board resolution and DSWD accreditation may be the minimum requirements.
 - iii. How regularly and until when is it necessary to monitor divested/devolved centers? Is it necessary to monitor divested programs and services to NGAs such as TESDA?
 - iv. What should be done with PSCBs and Lingap Centers retained by DSWD? The recommendation here is to officially integrate/merge/convert these facilities to existing programs as what has actually happened already to our PSCBs/Lingap Centers and Area Vocational Rehabilitation Centers and Regional Rehabilitation Centers for the Youth.

- e. Work for the accreditation of Lingap Centers by the DSWD and accreditation of the staff/program of PSCBs by the TESDA for centers that are still operational and temporarily closed.
- f. Rethink and enhance existing DSWD livelihood skills development program. Job opportunities in our country are becoming more difficult to find these days. This situation is more difficult to the vulnerable sector. At present, there are some livelihood skills training included in the program of the centers. However, there are no Department-wide livelihood skills training program after PSCB. The specialization of the PSCB such as sewing craft, food processing & preservation, rattan craft, home aide service may no longer be in demand. While it is easier to just tap other agencies to provide trainings, these training should be tailored-fit to the target clients such as street families, urban and rural poor youth/women and PWDs. Developing a more relevant and appropriate livelihood skills training program would ensure this.

Prepared by:

VICTORIA N. NAVIDA
Chief, Policy Research Division

MANUEL R. BACLAGON
Planning Officer III

Conforme:

GERELYN J. BALNEG
Director
Policy Development and Planning Bureau
April 15, 2009