



SCHOOL STAKEHOLDERS' LEVEL OF ENGAGEMENT AND PERFORMANCE ON MODULAR DISTANCE LEARNING

Bonifacio H. Rivera, Jr.^{1*}

¹Master of Arts in Education Major in Educational Management, Eastern Samar State University, Borongan City, Philippines

*School Head, Head Teacher-III, Hilabaan Elementary School, Brgy. Hilabaan, Dolores, Eastern Samar, Philippines

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra14130>

DOI No: 10.36713/epra14130

ABSTRACT

This study determined the relationship between the school stakeholders' level of engagement and the level of school performance of Public Elementary Schools of Dolores District on Modular Distance Learning for the school year 2020-2021. A correlation research design was used to find the relationship between school stakeholders' level of engagement and the level of school performance of Public Elementary Schools using an adopted survey questionnaire. A total of 462 respondents were utilized in the study to get the data required. The statistical tools used in the analysis of the data were frequency, percentage, mean, grand mean, Pearson r , and t -test. Based on the findings of the study, the level of engagement of stakeholders of public elementary schools in Dolores District during Modular Distance learning as perceived by internal and external stakeholders are very satisfactory. The school performance as assessed by teachers in terms of the school overall mean percentile scores are very satisfactory; school-based management level of implementation is developing; learning delivery modality implementation are very satisfactory; and learning continuity plan implementation obtain very satisfactory performance. There was a significant relationship between the level of School Stakeholders' Engagement and the School performance of Public Elementary Schools in the Dolores district during modular distance learning. There is no significant difference between the internal and external stakeholders before and after the engagement. Based on the results of the study, there is a need for a national standard for the assessment and evaluation of school performance to determine significant issues, problems, gaps and needs to support and strengthen the competencies of school heads and teachers to enjoy their work and be satisfied in the new normal.

KEYWORDS: School Stakeholders, Performance, Modular Distance Learning

INTRODUCTION

School partnerships and engagements are mutually beneficial relationships between school administrators, staff, students, organizations, the private sector, and local businesses (Eubanks, 2017). As a result, they are dedicated to cooperating and sharing responsibility to progress students' holistic and credible advancement. It has the potential to influence learners' and schools' achievement, which will advantage the school. Hill et al. (2018) highlight how teachers' professional perspectives can result in them making a judgment and criticizing family members for their educational, social, and economic difficulties, exacerbating educational disparities for the learners and families. If efficient school-School partnerships are to be established, genuine, trusting relationships must be developed and institutionalized within and across schools. Mostly every industry in the world was impacted by the Covid-19 pandemic. COVID19 had a negative financial impact on business, modes of communication, health, and, inevitably, school shutdown, according to Upoalpajor and Upoalpajor (2020). According to the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO,

2020), school shutdowns in 180 countries affected 87 percent of learners. In an attempt to contain COVID-19 growth, most educational institutions worldwide, such as the Philippines, postponed face-to-face teaching and shifted to digital classrooms in January 2020, according to Randall et al. (2021). According to Chang and Yano (2020), the government was compelled to undertake an unprecedented job of guaranteeing educational consistency. The call for survival becomes essential and a primary concern in health, schooling, social lives of students, and the school. This massive, multidimensional abhorrence to the school and school processes calls for an instant and rapid reinvigorating of collaboration and school engagement and participation. Tizon (2019) and Nagda et al. (2006), put emphasis on the need for both human resources and financial assets in the conduct of school programs, activities, and projects. The level of participation of the school stakeholders to the different school-initiated activities can be significantly affected by the level of SBM implementation (Cabardo, 2016; Huber and Helm (2020). However, despite such efforts to assist school principals to lead education during difficult times, educational



leadership at present is fraught with many challenges (Cahapay, 2020; Chi-Kin Lee, 2020). Mailizar et al. (2020) and Rasmitadila et al. (2020) found that teacher, school, curriculum and student were the four components of problems experienced by teachers in the Covid-19 period. In the Philippines, where there is a dearth of literature on parents' educational beliefs, parents raise their children with authoritarian behavior (Bartolome, et al, 2017). Similarly, Jeynes (2005) states that a genuine partnership is one in which parents partake in profound ways with teachers in schools, such as instructional decision-making and teaching and learning. On the other hand, SBM practice has alerted the community's enthusiasm to become highly engaged in education on the ground (Maca, 2019; World Bank 2016). Fonte et al. (2021) and Davis (2020) claim that educators' school performance reflects an elevated tier of learning delivery modality implementation. During the pandemic, alternative learning models should be backed by a well-designed technical and logistical implementation plan (Edizon, 2020; Dayagbil et al., 2021). In a related study, Abril and Callo (2021) and Oswald et al. (2014) found that LCP implementation had a significant impact on both participants' "learning delivery modalities, learning assessment, and learning resources" as an essential component of the school's performance. The Department of Education (DepEd) has been using this school-based mechanism to enforce multiple "projects, programs, and activities (PPA)" that recognize school partnerships and bridge the deficit for the Department's sound philosophical and legal structures. In this regard, it has been noted that, despite schools' best efforts to connect with various school stakeholders, schools have disclosed decreasing outcomes on some of the school-initiated activities. As a result, the investigator examines the function of internal and external stakeholders in the Dolores District's implementation of the new normal modular learning modality. Internal and external stakeholders' levels of participation and engagement, as well as their relationship to overall school performance, must be empirically determined, as this will serve as a basis for making decisions in the coming year. As a result, empirical research is required to determine how school involvement affects program success.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The study aims to assess the relationship between the school stakeholders' level of engagement and the level of school performance of Public Elementary Schools of Dolores District on Modular Distance Learning for the school year 2020-2021. Specifically, this study explored out the following objectives.

1. What is the School Stakeholders Level of Engagement of Public elementary Schools of Dolores district during Modular Distance learning as perceived by internal and external stakeholders in terms of?

1.1. Public Understanding of School Operations;

1.2. Responsibility for Quality Education;

1.3. Attainment of Objectives of Learning Continuity Plan amidst Covid-19 Pandemic;

1.4. Resolution of School and Educational Problems; and
1.5. Linkage and Networking?

2. What is the school Performance of Public Elementary Schools of Dolores District on Modular Distance Learning in terms of;

2.1. School Overall Mean Percentile Scores;

2.2. School-Based Management level of Implementation;

2.3. Learning Delivery Modality Implementation; and

2.4. Learning Continuity Plan Implementation?

3. Is there a significant relationship between the level of School Stakeholders' Engagement and the School performance of Public Elementary Schools in the Dolores district during modular distance learning?

4. Is there a significant difference in the level of School engagement as perceived by internal and by external stakeholders?

METHODOLOGY

This study used a descriptive-correlational research design to investigate the predictive variables' relatedness and relationship to the descriptive variables. This research looked at the relationship between school stakeholder engagement and school performance in the Dolores District Public Elementary Schools on Modular Distance Learning for the school year 2020-2021. The respondents of the study were 231 internal stakeholders and 231 external stakeholders from 42 public elementary schools in Dolores District. A purposive sampling to determine the two hundred thirty-one (231) internal and external stakeholders in Dolores District by using the slovin's formula sampling. In this study, data were collected using an adapted survey questionnaire from Tomacas, (2012) unpublished dissertation, and benchmark statements were taken from the DepEd School Operational Manual 2000 and the SBM operations handbook. The survey instrument consists of 50 benchmark statements to determine internal and external stakeholders' perceptions and observations on the level of community stakeholder engagement using a Likert-type scale to gather data in Dolores District. The data were tabulated, organized, analyzed, and interpreted with the use of descriptive as well as inferential statistical tools, including mean, standard deviation Spearman's rank correlation for the degree of relationship, and t-test for the test of difference.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Level of engagement of stakeholders of public elementary schools in Dolores District during Modular Distance learning as perceived by internal and external stakeholders. Public Understanding of School Operations.

Table 2 shows the level of engagement of stakeholders in terms of public understanding of school operations as perceived by internal and external stakeholders. As reflected in the table, the grand mean of 4.51 is perceived internal, which is interpreted as always observed.

Meanwhile, as perceived by external stakeholders, obtained a 4.37, which was interpreted as always observed. This study



implies that the school operation fulfills the criteria of child-friendly school systems, as they are always in need of both human and financial assets in the conduct of school programs, activities, and projects in the Covid-19 pandemic, as asserted by Tizon (2019). The regulation of stakeholder partnerships by community officials, according to Nagda et al. (2006), was highlighted as a major concern.

Responsibility for Quality Education

Table 3 shows the level of engagement of stakeholders in terms of responsibility for quality education as perceived by internal and external stakeholders. As reflected in the table, the grand mean of 4.43 as perceived by internal stakeholders is interpreted as always observed. Meanwhile, as perceived by external stakeholders, obtained a 4.35, which is interpreted as always observed. This implies that both stakeholders responsible for quality education prioritize the needs of both the learners and the teachers as two important key players of the educational system in promoting access, equity, quality, excellence and relevance, and responsiveness. Cabardo (2016) Huber and Helm (2020) and support this by stating that stakeholders' requirements must be assessed for their students to have good access to basic education programs.

Attainment of Objectives of Learning Continuity Plan Amidst Covid-19 Pandemic

Table 4 shows the level of engagement of stakeholders in terms of the attainment of objectives of the learning continuity plan as perceived by internal and external stakeholders. As reflected in the table, the grand mean of 4.50 as perceived by internal stakeholders is interpreted as always observed. Meanwhile, as perceived by external stakeholders, obtained a 4.41, which was interpreted as always observed. This finding, supported by Cahapay's (2020) and Chi-Kin Lee (2020) study, states that understanding the COVID-19 crisis is critical so that suitable learning delivery modes can be cautiously framed from any learning continuity plan.

Resolution of School and Educational Problems

Table 5 shows the level of engagement of stakeholders in terms of the resolution of school and educational problems as perceived by internal and external stakeholders. As reflected in the table, the grand mean of 4.34 as perceived by internal stakeholders is interpreted as always observed. Meanwhile, as perceived by external stakeholders, obtained a 4.27, which is interpreted as always observed. In the study, which was carried out with a qualitative approach, the educational problems faced by both stakeholders were collected under the implementation of a learning continuity plan in school in the new normal. This means that the indicator stated is manifested and observed on some occasions, and the indicator stated is sometimes felt and occurs in the resolution of school and educational problems. Similarly, Mailizar et al. (2020) studied teachers during the Covid-19 pandemic and looked at the constraints from four perspectives: educator, school, curriculum, and student. Technical constraints, student conditioning, student

participation in education, and online education experience were identified as the difficulties faced by teachers during the Covid-19 pandemic by Rasmitadila et al. (2020). Educators face a variety of issues during the Covid-19 pandemic, according to Fauzi et al. (2020), including limited opportunities in web-based learning applications, network and internet use, teacher planning, implementation, evaluation, and collaboration with parents.

Linkage and Networking

Table 6 shows the level of engagement of stakeholders in terms of linkage and networking as perceived by internal and external stakeholders. As reflected in the table, the grand mean of 4.29 as perceived by internal stakeholders is interpreted as always observed. Meanwhile, as perceived by external stakeholders, obtained a 4.34, which was interpreted as always observed. This shows that the school had a good relationship with the stakeholder. It implies that the big challenge for the school is to keep very good relationships with external stakeholders. Having very good relations is an essential function for strengthening and extending the work of external stakeholders during the pandemic. This discovery supports Bartolome, Mamat, and Masnan's (2017) assertion that both parties' full engagement can enhance the relationship's ability to achieve the preferred partnership goals. Similarly, Jeynes (2005) states that a genuine partnership is one in which parents partake in profound ways with teachers in schools, such as instructional decision-making and teaching and learning.

This sub-section summarizes the level of engagement of stakeholders of public elementary schools as assessed by internal and external stakeholders. To examine, the highest engagement of internal stakeholders as perceived by respondents obtained from public understanding of school operation, with 4.51 mean which interpreted as "Always Observed". Meanwhile, the lowest level of engagement of internal stakeholders, belong to the "Linkage and Networking", with mean of 4.29 which is interpreted as "Always Observed". In addition, the weighted mean of 4.41 as assessed by the internal stakeholders, which is interpreted as "Always Observed". It implies that these manifestations of teachers show initiatives that partnership with the community is more engaged in learning during the Covid 19 pandemic crisis.

Furthermore, Table 7 shows the level of engagement of external stakeholders revealed that the highest engagement of external stakeholders as perceived by respondents obtained from "Attainment of Objectives of Learning Continuity Plan", with 4.41 mean which interpreted as "Always Observed". Concisely, the lowest level of engagement of external stakeholders, belong to the "Resolution of School and Educational Problems" with mean of 4.27 which is interpreted as "Always Observed". It implies that the engagement of external stakeholders need support from teachers and this support plays an important role in students' learning efforts and



outcomes in the pandemic. To sum up, the effects of COVID-19 pose challenges for stakeholders themselves and for the processes that support the most inclusive and meaningful engagement.

School Performance of Public Elementary Schools of Dolores District on Modular Distance Learning School Overall Mean Percentile Scores

Table 8 shows the frequency distribution of mean percentile scores of the public elementary school in Dolores district. The school performance scores on the mean percentage score showed that most of them, 33 or (78.57%) had ranged from 85 to 89. Most of them were in the area of very satisfactory performance. There were nine participating schools (21.43%) that scored satisfactory in performance, and no schools scored outstanding, fairly satisfactory, and did not meet expectations in performance. This finding revealed that schools have high mastery of skills in all learning areas despite the Covid 19 Pandemic. It shows that school performance can still acquire the competencies without face-to-face interaction with pupils. This finding supports the total performance of the schools, indicating that they have met the DepEd national target of 75 percent MPS in the National Achievement Test (NAT) (Luz, 2007).

School-Based Management level of implementation

Table 9 shows the scores of school performance in terms of school-based management level of implementation. The scores of school performance on the school-based management level of implementation showed that most of them, 28 or (66.67%), had ranged from 0.5 – to 1.49. Most of them were in Level 1 (Developing performance level. There were 14 participating schools (33.33%) that scored Level 1 (Developing) in performance level, and no schools scored in Level III (Advanced) performance level. This means that the school performance in implementing school-based management has not gone very far in improving learning outcomes in the new normal. In which the teaching-learning process is affected by the progress of their outputs and whether they did well in their tasks. This finding is in line with the World Bank (2016) statement that fewer than 10 percent of schools reported being at the highest level of SBM implementation in the Philippines. On the other hand, SBM practice has alerted the community's enthusiasm to become highly engaged in education on the ground, according to Maca. (2019).

Learning Delivery Modality Implementation

As shown in Table 10 shows the scores of school performance in terms of learning delivery modality implementation. The scores of school performance on the school-based management level of implementation showed that 42 or (100%) had a range from 3.50 – to 4.499. All of them were in the area of Very Satisfactory performance level. There were no schools that scored in Outstanding, Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory, and Poor performance levels. This further suggested that the teachers experienced different challenges in the new normal setup of

education. In the learning process, learners are still the priority of the school and their teachers. They make contingencies and solutions to address the different challenges and difficulties that the learning modality is consistently implemented, monitored, and evaluated. This finding is consistent with Fonte et al. (2021), who claim that educators' school performance reflects an elevated tier of learning delivery modality implementation. Similarly, Davis (2020) claims that educators can shape legitimate collaborative teams in which they communicate anticipations, take part in mutually advantageous professional learning, utilize communal devices to facilitate learner achievement, and progress their skills, expertise, and beliefs about student learning. Finally, as Collie et al. (2018) point out, provided the continuously changing requirements of teaching work, educators' adaptability has been highlighted as critical.

Learning Continuity Plan Implementation

Table 11 shows the scores of school performance in terms of learning continuity plan implementation. The scores of school performance on learning continuity plan implementation showed that most of them 37 or (88.10%) had ranged from 3.50 – to 4.499. Most of them were in the area of Very Satisfactory school performance level. Five participating schools (11.90%) ranged from 4.50 – to 5.00 in outstanding performance levels, and no schools scored in Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory, and Poor performance levels. The findings reveal that education is still pursued in economically challenging settings but with more challenges to the capability-building of teachers to facilitate the teaching-learning process amid the pandemic. This finding is consistent with Dayagbil et al. (2021). They found that in times of crisis, learning continuity plan implementation must be constantly evaluated, altered, and improved to react to turbulent, ambiguous, and shifting circumstances. As a result, during the pandemic, alternative learning models should be backed by a well-designed technical and logistical implementation plan (Edizon, 2020).

Table 12 shows the summary of the level of school performance as assessed by teachers. It revealed that respondents had observed that the highest percentage is Learning Delivery Modality Implementation. Based on the finding, the percentage of the variable indicators obtained a 100%, which is interpreted as "very satisfactory. "On the other hand, the lowest percentage of performance was on the School-Based Management level of implementation, which obtained 66.67, interpreted as "Developing" performance. This study revealed that school performance in the Dolores District today is very much involved in ensuring the safety and well-being of learners, teachers, and personnel and the continuity of learning in the new normal. This finding is similar to that of Abril and Callo (2021), who found that LCP implementation had a significant impact on both participants' "learning delivery modalities, learning assessment, and learning resources" as an essential component of the school's performance. Similarly, Oswald et al. (2014) point out that for a school to optimize



performance, it must recognize the quality of its services and other educational programs.

Relationship between the Stakeholder's Engagement and the School Performance of Public Elementary Schools in Dolores district during modular distance learning

As the variables were not normally distributed and the assumption of linearity was markedly violated, Pearson r Coefficient of Correlation was computed to examine the inter-correlations of the variables.

Table 13 shows that the computed r values signify a positive estimate for the stakeholder engagement as assessed by internal stakeholders. They are significantly correlated with the school-based management, $p = .002$; learning delivery modality, $p = .001$, and learning continuity plan; $p = .000$. This is an implication that the stakeholder engagement as assessed by internal stakeholders was significantly associated with the school performance implementation. Therefore, the null hypothesis, which states that there is no significant relationship between the level of School Stakeholders' Engagement and the School performance of Public elementary Schools in Dolores district during modular distance learning, was rejected. This means that all the activities to be implemented by the schools follow the needs of the learners and internal and external stakeholders. This finding is similar to that of Abril and Callo (2021), who discovered that the application of LCP-related factors has a substantial impact on school achievement.

Furthermore, school performance implementation proved to be not significantly correlated with the engagement with external stakeholders. The computed p-values of MPS, $p = .396$; SMB; $p = .320$; LDM; $p = .483$; and LCP, $p = .128$ respectively, proved to be not significant because they were higher than 0.05 alpha level. Therefore, the null hypothesis, which states that there is no significant relationship between the level of School Stakeholders' Engagement and the School performance of Public elementary Schools in the Dolores district during modular distance learning, was rejected. Hence, in this situation, the level of school performance of the engagement faced by the external stakeholders does not vary alongside the application of the strategies they employed in the school. This finding contradicts Cabardo (2016), who discovered a substantial link between the level of participation of school stakeholders in various school-initiated exercises. As a result, this discovery disclosed that school implementation of SBM strategies is not particularly difficult. Since then, internal and external stakeholders have faced a unique situation during the COVID-19 pandemic. This one-of-a-kind incident is probable to provoke some anxiety and stress, as they must acclimate to a different manner of living during the pandemic and its unpredicted difficulties.

Difference between level on the level of Stakeholder Engagement as perceived by internal and external stakeholders

Table 14 replicates the finding of values for testing the significant difference between the level of stakeholder engagement as perceived by internal and external stakeholders showing that out of fifty- items test, the mean score of the respondents in the internal stakeholder is 4.4140 with a standard deviation of .09711 while the mean scores in the external stakeholders are 4.3480 with a standard deviation of 0.05911. The standard deviation in the internal stakeholder is higher than that of the external stakeholder since the accumulated scores during the engagement process is of lesser dispersion than the implementation of the SBM program. Likewise, the standard deviations show the minimum distribution of scores from the mean of each subscale.

To determine if the difference is significant, the t-test was utilized. The computed t-stat of 2.102 was computed to the p-value of 0.103 at a 0.05 level of significance. Since the t-test value is more than the tabular p-value, it is proven that there is no significant difference between the internal and external stakeholders before and after the engagement; therefore, the null hypothesis is failed to reject.

It should also be noted that there is no significant difference in the level of engagement of schools in Dolores District after the implementation of internal and external stakeholders. The findings imply that the engagement has no significant effect on the implementation of the district's internal and external stakeholders in the SMB program. These findings differ from those of Cabardo (2016), who found a significant link between the execution of school-based management and the level of stakeholder involvement in various school-initiated activities. As a result, the research results suggest that the level of implementation of school-based management has no bearing on stakeholder involvement in various school-initiated activities. Blank (2004), on the other hand, claims that School-Based Management can enhance student learning by fostering relationships between schools and various community organizations. Similarly, Sheldon and Voorhis (2004) assert that community and parental support for school-based management programs can strengthen schools, children's educational quality, and pupils' educational achievement.

**Table 2. Level of engagement of stakeholders of public elementary schools in Dolores District during Modular Distance learning as perceived by internal and external stakeholders in terms of Public Understanding of school operation.**

Statement	Internal Stakeholder		External Stakeholder	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
The school promotes public awareness of its use of MOOE and other public funds	4.58	Always Observed	4.36	Always Observed
The school ensures that its policies ensure the public of the effectiveness of the school's operation	4.63	Always Observed	4.48	Always Observed
Community Stakeholder engagement help enhance accountability and transparency in school operation	4.41	Always Observed	4.36	Always Observed
School reports and functions are used to inform stakeholders of the performance of the school and its constituents	4.61	Always Observed	4.47	Always Observed
The school develops intelligent citizens' understanding of school operations	4.45	Always Observed	4.38	Always Observed
The school allows the community to express what they wish the school to accomplish	4.50	Always Observed	4.43	Always Observed
The school fosters public understanding of its need for adequate financial support.	4.51	Always Observed	4.33	Always Observed
The school informs the public of the broad school issues and its day-to-day operation.	4.52	Always Observed	4.32	Always Observed
Strong alliance fosters sound academic practices in the school and civic-mindedness in the community.	4.42	Always Observed	4.29	Always Observed
The community stakeholder's engagement creates a wholesome climate for mutual gains and benefits.	4.45	Always Observed	4.26	Always Observed
Grand Mean	4.51	Always Observed	4.37	Always Observed

Table 3. Level of engagement of stakeholders of public elementary schools in Dolores District during Modular Distance learning as perceived by internal and external stakeholders in terms of Responsibility for Quality Education

Statement	Internal Stakeholder		External Stakeholder	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
The school shows the importance of stakeholder's involvement in attaining quality education and continuity of learning even amidst the pandemic.	4.72	Always Observed	4.54	Always Observed
The stakeholders make the school the center of community improvement.	4.35	Always Observed	4.33	Always Observed
The stakeholders are part of making the school as a democratic social center.	4.49	Always Observed	4.31	Always Observed
The parents, government and non-government organizations are partners of the school in developing and improving educational processes.	4.51	Always Observed	4.39	Always Observed
The Local School Board and Barangay Council are social partners of the school in attaining quality education.	4.24	Always Observed	4.33	Always Observed
The PTA serves as a reliable partner of the school in educational matters.	4.47	Always Observed	4.42	Always Observed
The Local School Board (LSB) helps determine the supplemental budgetary needs for the operation and maintenance of public schools within its jurisdiction.	4.18	Always Observed	4.16	Always Observed
The Local Government Unit (LGU) allocates fund for school activities and programs through the Special Education Fund (SEF).	3.90	Usually Observed	3.99	Usually Observed
The parents and other stakeholders are well-informed of their duties and responsibilities to their children and to the school.	4.66	Always Observed	4.47	Always Observed
The school head and the teachers encourage the community to serve the school for the benefits of the learners.	4.78	Always Observed	4.59	Always Observed
Grand Mean	4.43	Always Observed	4.35	Always Observed

**Table 4. Level of engagement of stakeholders of public elementary schools in Dolores District during Modular Distance learning as perceived by internal and external stakeholders in terms of Attainment of Objectives of Learning Continuity Plan.**

Statement	Internal Stakeholder		External Stakeholder	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
The community and Stakeholders were consulted and involved in the crafting and formulation of the school road map and learning continuity plan	4.56	Always Observed	4.39	Always Observed
The community's motivation to participate in new normal school activities redound to surviving the education processes, uplifting of morale and continuity of educative process.	4.48	Always Observed	4.39	Always Observed
The parents, stakeholders, and the school forged a kind of commitment to get engage in the best interest of the learners during the health emergencies/ pandemic.	4.47	Always Observed	4.46	Always Observed
Parents and stakeholders offered support and commitment in terms of resources to the school.	4.32	Always Observed	4.36	Always Observed
Teachers are committed to spending time, effort and expertise in serving the learners in the new normal setting.	4.77	Always Observed	4.63	Always Observed
The teachers went out to the community and conducted regular home visitation to learners and families.	4.70	Always Observed	4.48	Always Observed
The modular distance learning/self-learning modules strengthen the values and personal traits and characteristics of learners initially developed at home.	4.40	Always Observed	4.32	Always Observed
The collaborative efforts of parents and teachers in the learner's education under the new normal is accorded recognition and acknowledgment by the members of the community.	4.46	Always Observed	4.40	Always Observed
The community residents have high regards for the personal, professional and collective efforts and capabilities of the members of the academe.	4.35	Always Observed	4.31	Always Observed
The community recognizes the crucial importance of the school and the continuity of education amidst the current health crises.	4.47	Always Observed	4.36	Always Observed
Grand Mean	4.50	Always Observed	4.41	Always Observed

**Table 5. Level of engagement of stakeholders of public elementary schools in Dolores District during Modular Distance learning as perceived by internal and external stakeholders in terms of Resolution of School and Educational Problems**

Statement	Internal Stakeholder		External Stakeholder	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
The participation and involvement of key stakeholders in the decision-making processes increase accountability in school management	4.42	Always Observed	4.32	Always Observed
The stakeholders were consulted and are involved in the crating of Road Map, Revised SIP-AIP, Learning Continuity Plan, and other education-related programs and contingencies.	4.48	Always Observed	4.30	Always Observed
The stakeholders participate in the formulation of new normal educational policies and contingent reforms.	4.43	Always Observed	4.37	Always Observed
The stakeholders are involved in the monitoring, evaluation, and assessment of school effectiveness.	4.32	Always Observed	4.30	Always Observed
The stakeholder's involvement in decision-making processes enhances transparency in school management.	4.41	Always Observed	4.26	Always Observed
The stakeholder's involvement provides internal checks and balance of school operations.	4.30	Always Observed	4.23	Always Observed
The school allows balanced information to the public to make decisions on how to deal with risks.	4.47	Always Observed	4.32	Always Observed
The stakeholders are involved in planning, development and implementation of contextualized educational programs.	4.26	Always Observed	4.26	Always Observed
There is public participation in the study and resolution of educational problems and school-community problems.	4.17	Always Observed	4.20	Always Observed
Parents and stakeholders are involved in sourcing out funds and other related activities whose to finance school improvement projects and activities.	4.09	Always Observed	4.16	Always Observed
Grand Mean	4.34	Always Observed	4.27	Always Observed

**Table 6. Level of engagement of stakeholders of public elementary schools in Dolores District during Modular Distance learning as perceived by internal and external stakeholders in terms of Linkage and Networking**

Statement	Internal Stakeholder		External Stakeholder	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
Parents and stakeholders join the teacher in all sorts of school activities	4.29	Always Observed	4.33	Always Observed
There is a positive parental involvement and engagement that significantly influences learner's academic performance.	4.29	Always Observed	4.35	Always Observed
Parents and stakeholders voluntarily involve themselves in school activities where there presence and support are needed.	4.21	Always Observed	4.33	Always Observed
The community understands the need for adequate financial support for quality education.	4.19	Always Observed	4.35	Always Observed
The stakeholders support the schools formulated programs to adapt to the current needs to meet learners need amidst the pandemic.	4.28	Always Observed	4.35	Always Observed
The partnership has developed strategies of coordinating and linking the array of support opportunities for learner development.	4.25	Always Observed	4.26	Always Observed
The school and community join hands together in achieving the school's mission and vision.	4.38	Always Observed	4.46	Always Observed
The partnership ensures that all members understand and accepts their roles and responsibilities in the organizational structure.	4.40	Always Observed	4.40	Always Observed
The school establishes linkage with local stakeholders, including the LGU, and ensures that network actively engages in governance and school operation.	4.31	Always Observed	4.25	Always Observed
Mechanisms for mutual linkage and support within and across community organizations are put in place.	4.30	Always Observed	4.26	Always Observed
Grand Mean	4.29	Always Observed	4.34	Always Observed

Table 7. Summary of engagement of stakeholders of public elementary schools as assessed by internal and external stakeholders

Engagement of Stakeholder	Assessed by Internal Stakeholders		Assessed by External Stakeholders	
	Arithmetic Mean	Interpretation	Arithmetic Mean	Interpretation
Public Understanding of School Operation	4.51	Always Observed	4.37	Always Observed
Responsibility for Quality Education	4.43	Always Observed	4.35	Always Observed
Attainment of Objectives of Learning Continuity Plan	4.50	Always Observed	4.41	Always Observed
Resolution of School and Educational Problems	4.34	Always Observed	4.27	Always Observed
Linkage and Networking	4.29	Always Observed	4.34	Always Observed
Weighted Mean	4.41	Always Observed	4.34	Always Observed

**Table 8. School Performance of Public Elementary Schools of Dolores District on Modular Distance Learning in terms of School Over All Mean Percentile Scores**

MPS	Frequency (N = 42 schools)	Percent	Performance level
90 – 100	0	0	Outstanding
85 - 89	33	78.57%	Very Satisfactory
80 – 84	9	21.43%	Satisfactory
75 – 79	0	0	Fairly Satisfactory
Below 75	0	0	Did Not Meet Expectations

Table 9. School Performance of Public Elementary Schools of Dolores District on Modular Distance Learning in terms of School-Based Management level of implementation

SBM	Frequency (N = 42 schools)	Percent	Performance level
2.5 – 3.0	0	0	Level III (Advanced)
1.5 – 2.49	14	33.33%	Level II (Maturing)
0.5 – 1.49	28	66.67%	Level 1 (Developing)

Table 10. School Performance of Public Elementary Schools of Dolores District on Modular Distance Learning in terms of Learning Delivery Modality Implementation

Range	Frequency (N = 42 schools)	Percent	Performance level
4.50 – 5.00	0	0	Outstanding
3.50 – 4.499	42	100%	Very Satisfactory
2.50 – 3.499	0	0	Satisfactory
1.50 – 2.499	0	0	Unsatisfactory
1.0 – 1.499	0	0	Poor

**Table 11. School Performance of Public Elementary Schools of Dolores District on Modular Distance Learning in terms of Learning Continuity Plan Implementation**

Range	Frequency (N = 42 schools)	Percent	Performance level
4.50 – 5.00	5	11.90%	Outstanding
3.50 – 4.499	37	88.10%	Very Satisfactory
2.50 – 3.499	0	0	Satisfactory
1.50 – 2.499	0	0	Unsatisfactory
Below 1.499	0	0	Poor

Table 12. Summary of the level of school performance

School Performance	Percentage	Performance Level
School Over All Mean Percentile Scores	78.57	Very Satisfactory
School-Based Management level of implementation	66.67	Developing
Learning Delivery Modality Implementation	100	Very Satisfactory
Learning Continuity Plan Implementation	88.10	Very Satisfactory

Table 13. Test on the significant relationship between the level of Stakeholder's Engagement and the School Performance of Public Elementary Schools in Dolores district during modular distance learning.

Performance	Stakeholder	p-value	Decision	Interpretation
MPS	Internal	.056	Fail to reject H ₀	Not significant
SBM		.002	Reject H ₀	Significant
LDM		.001	Reject H ₀	Significant
LCP		.000	Reject H ₀	Significant
MPS	External	.396	Fail to reject H ₀	Not significant
SBM		.320	Fail to reject H ₀	Not significant
LDM		.483	Fail to reject H ₀	Not significant
LCP		.128	Fail to reject H ₀	Not significant

** highly significant; * significant; ns, not significant

Table 14. Test on significant difference in the level of Stakeholder's Engagement as perceived by internal and external stakeholders

	Mean	df	t Stat	p-value	Interpretation	Decision
Internal	4.4140	4	2.102	0.103	Not Significant	Fail to Reject Null Hypothesis
External	4.3480					



CONCLUSION

Therefore, the researcher came up with the following conclusions:

1. The level of engagement of stakeholders of public elementary schools in Dolores District during Modular Distance learning as perceived by internal and external stakeholders is very satisfactory.
2. The school performance as assessed by teachers in terms of the school's overall mean percentile scores are very satisfactory; school-based management level of implementation is developing; learning delivery modality implementation is very satisfactory, and learning continuity plan implementation obtain very satisfactory performance.
3. There was a significant relationship between the level of School Stakeholders' Engagement and the School performance of Public elementary Schools in the Dolores district during modular distance learning.
4. There is no significant difference between the internal and external stakeholders before and after the engagement.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The foregoing conclusions served as the basis for the following recommendations:

1. The internal and external stakeholders may work collaboratively to review the school-based management program implementation for effective and efficient practices.
2. School administration may devise a scheme for monitoring quality assurance to satisfy basic needs and requirements in the modular distance learning in the new normal.
3. The school administration extends collaboration to parents and other stakeholders for the improvements of school performance amidst to Covid-19 pandemic.
4. There is a need for the assessment and evaluation of school performance to determine the significant issues and gaps to strengthen the competencies of school heads and teachers in the new normal.
5. Another related study or research should be conducted to further verify the findings of the current study using a much bigger population and locale.

REFERENCES

1. Abril, E. & Callo, E. C. (2021). *Implementation of Learning Continuity Plan (LCP) Related Variables Amidst Pandemic and Performance of the Secondary Schools, Division of San Pablo City: Input to Quality Assurance*. Retrieved from https://issuu.com/internationalresearch8/docs/implementation_of_learning_continuity_plan_lcp_r
2. Bartolome, Melissa & Mamat, Nordin & Masnan, Abdul Halim. (2017). Parental involvement in the Philippines: A review of literatures. *Southeast Asia Early Childhood Journal*. 6. 10.37134/saecj.vol6.5.2017.
3. Blank, M.J. (2004). *How Community Schools Make a Difference. Schools as Learning Communities*, 61 (8), 62-65
4. Cabardo, J. R. O. (2016). *Levels of Participation of the School Stakeholders to the Different School-Initiated Activities and the Implementation of School-Based Management*. *Journal of Inquiry & Action in Education*, 8(1), <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1133596.pdf>
5. Cahapay, Michael. (2020). *Philippine Basic Education Learning Continuity Plan: Creating Space for Indigenous Peoples toward Inclusive post-COVID-19 Education*. 2. ep2102. 10.30935/ijpdll/9294.
6. Chang, G. & Yano, S., 2020. *How are Countries Addressing the COVID-19 Challenges in Education? A Snapshot of Policy Measures*. [Online] Available at: <https://www.ukfiet.org/>
7. Chi-Kin Lee, J. (2020). "Managing and Leading university Response to Support Psychosocial Health during COVID-19 Pandemic," in *Webinar Series 2 in SEAMEO's Response to Pandemic COVID-19 (SEAMWO)*.
8. Davis (2020). *Teacher Collaboration: How to Approach It In 2020*. <https://www.schoology.com/blog/teacher-collaboration>
9. Dayagbil, F. T., Palompon, D. R., Garcia, L. L., & Olvido, M. J. (2021). *Teaching and Learning Continuity Amid and Beyond the Pandemic*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2021.678692>
10. Edizon, F. (2020). *Rewiring Higher Education in the Time of COVID-19 and beyond*.
11. Eubanks, K. (2017). "The Relationship of School-Community Partnerships with ACT Benchmark Scores in Rural Tennessee Schools" (2017). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 3334. <https://dc.etsu.edu/etd/3334>
12. Fonte, R. J. B., Yazo, A. D., Tan, C. S., Buenvinida, L. P., & Bando, M. M. (2021). *Distance Learning Delivery Modalities Implementation, Resilience Quotient, and Work Performance of Teachers: A Correlational Study in The Philippines*. *International Journal of Theory and Application in Elementary and Secondary School Education*, 3(2), 171–181. <https://doi.org/10.31098/ijtaese.v3i2.684>
13. Fonte, R. J. B., Yazo, A. D., Tan, C. S., Buenvinida, L. P., & Bando, M. M. (2021). *Distance Learning Delivery Modalities Implementation, Resilience Quotient, and Work Performance of Teachers: A Correlational Study in The Philippines*. *International Journal of Theory and Application in Elementary and Secondary School Education*, 3(2), 171–181. <https://doi.org/10.31098/ijtaese.v3i2.684>
14. Hill, N. E., Witherspoon, D. P., & Bartz, D. (2018). *Parental Involvement in Education during Middle School: Perspectives of Ethnically Diverse Parents, Teachers, and Students*. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 111(1), 12–27. doi:10.1080/00220671.2016.1190910
15. Huber, S.G., & Helm, C. (2020). *COVID-19 and Schooling: Evaluation, Assessment and Accountability in Times of Crises—Reacting Quickly to Explore Key Issues for Policy, Practice and Research with the School Barometer*. *Educ. Assess. Eval. Account*. 2020, 32, 237–270.
16. Jeynes, W.H. (2016). A meta-analysis: The relationship between parental involvement and African American student outcomes. *Journal of Black Studies*, 47(3), 195–216. doi: 10.1177/0021934715623522
17. Luz, J. M. (2007). *A nation nonreaders* Philippine Center for Investigative Journalism report. Retrieved from <http://pcij.org/stories/a-nation-of-nonreaders/>
18. Maca, Mark. (2019). *School-based Management in the Philippines: Fostering Innovations in the Public Education System*. 2. 35-59.
19. Mailizar, Almanthari, A., Maulina, S., & Bruce, S. (2020). *Secondary School Mathematics Teachers' Views on e-learning Implementation Barriers during the Covid-19 Pandemic: The*



- Case of Indonesia. *Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education*, 16(7), em1860.
20. Nagda, B., McCoy, M., & Barrett, M. (2006). Mix it up: Crossing Social Boundaries as a Pathway to Youth Civic Engagement. *National Civic Review*, 95, 47-56. doi:10.1002/ncr.131
 21. Oswald, A. J., Proto, E. and Sgroi, D. (2014). "Happiness and Productivity", University of Warwick mimeo. Forthcoming in the *Journal of Labor Economics*
 22. Randall, K., Ford, T. G., Kwon, K. A., Sisson, S. S., Bice, M. R., Dinkel, D., & Tsotsoros, J. (2021). Physical activity, physical well-being, and psychological well-being: Associations with life satisfaction during the COVID-19 pandemic among early childhood educators. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18, 9430. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18189430>
 23. Rasmitadila, Aliyyah, R. R., Rachmadtullah, R., Samsudin, A., Syaodih, E., Nurtanto, M., & Tambunan, A. R. S. (2020). The Perceptions of Primary School Teachers of Online Learning During the COVID-19 Pandemic period: A case Study in Indonesia. *Journal of Ethnic and Cultural Studies*, 7(2), 90-109.
 24. Sheldon, S.B., & Voorhis, F.L. (2004). Partnership Programs in U.S. Schools: Their Development and Relationship to Family Involvement Outcomes. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 15 (2), 125-
 25. Tizon, R. (2019). Cascading the National Disaster Risk Reduction Management in the Decentralized School Level. Dissertation. Cebu Technological University
 26. Tomacas, D. (2012). School-community Partnership in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools in the Island of Samar. Unpublished Dissertation. Graduate School. Northwest Samar State University 2012.
 27. Upoalkpajor, J. L. N., & Upoalkpajor, C. B. (2020). The impact of COVID-19 on education in Ghana. *Asian journal of education and social studies*, 9(1): 23-33.
 28. UNESCO. (2020) Education: from disruption to recovery. <https://en.unesco.org/covid19/education response> [20 May].
 29. World Bank (2016). Assessing School-based Management in the Philippines. Retrieved from <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/24743/Assessing0scho0t0in0the0Philippines.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>