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The Context
PPP in Higher Education
  • National/system-wide level
  • Institutional level
    - Teaching-related e.g. PAC
    - RDE related e.g. VSU, USM, TCA-CLSU, CaVSU, UP

Gains and Challenges
Way forward
The Context

State recognition of role of private sector as main engine for national growth and development

PPP – core program of Aquino government
# The PHEI System, 2011-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Type/AY</th>
<th>No. of HEIs 2011/12</th>
<th>Enrolment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total HEIs (excluding SUCs campuses)</td>
<td>1,856</td>
<td>2,566,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total HEIs (including SUCs campuses)</td>
<td>2,282</td>
<td>3,033,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Universities and Colleges (SUCs)</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>657,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUCs Campuses</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>467,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Universities and Colleges (SUCs)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>150,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (include OGS, CSI, Special HEI)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>1,636</td>
<td>1,751,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sectarian</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>484,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Sectarian</td>
<td>1,297</td>
<td>1,267,118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public vs. Private HEIs

- Private HEIs: 88%
- SUCs: 6%
- LUCs: 5%
- Other Gov't Institutions: 1%
Public vs. Private

Enrolment

Private HEIs 57.74%
SUCs 37.09%
Other Gov't Institutions 0.22%
LUCs 4.95%
PPP at system-wide level

“Any form of joint effort or undertaking of public and private players for achieving common objectives” (Wang 2001)
PPPs at institutional level

26 PPPs involving 24 SUCs

“a formal relationship between partners, most often in the form of contracts with defined outcomes for a specified period of time” (LaRoque and Lee 2011)
Instruction-related PPPs

- OJT
- Student scholarships
- Faculty immersion
- Curriculum development/program delivery
- Sharing/donation of facilities
- Work placement of graduates
R&D related

2 party-academe-industry partnerships
e.g. VSU R&D projects
RDE related

Tri-multi-party partnerships
  e.g. USM palm oil production
    TAC, CLSU sweet potato based enterprises
  CaVSU – LAPS for coffee industry
  UP – Ayala Land Techno Hub
Gains(+)  

PPP at national/sector wide level  
+ improved GER  
  25 %
Challenges(-)

PPP at national/sector wide level
- duplication/crowding out
  (“sibling rivalry”?)
- external (in)efficiencies
- quality assurance
Gains(+)  

PPP at institutional level  
+ enhanced capacities for instruction, RDE  
+ improved skills and employment outcomes of graduates  
+ increased research productivity and extension services
Challenges

PPP at institutional level
- Informal arrangements (associated with undesirable practices)
- “not fair” arrangements
- IPR issues
- QA
- management structures and procedures
(only)

Is PPP the way to go?