ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 4| April 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

AN ASSESSMENT OF LEARNING CONTINUITY AND RECOVERY PLAN OPERATIONALIZATION OF SELECT SCHOOLS IN PARAÑAQUE CITY: BASIS FOR PARTNERSHIP AND COLLABORATION PLAN

Angelica V. Feliciano
Olivarez College, Parañaque City

ABSTRACT

As a non-teaching personnel, the researcher believes that the complexity of educational institutions makes it impossible to produce and deliver education as a service in a centralized manner, posing serious challenges to governments' technical, financial, and managerial capacities. Therefore, the government implements Recovery Plans and Learning Continuity Plans to shift control to the school level. For the operations of the school, principals, teachers, parents, students, and other stakeholders take on accountability and decision-making. However, school administrators must operate under or adhere to a set of centrally defined policies that have been developed by the Department of Education.

This study was focused on the extent of LCRP operationalization in terms of learning environment, contextualizing learning strategies and modalities, Brigada Eskwela and Oplan Balik Eskwela, and monitoring and evaluation as well as the respondents support the learning continuity and recovery plan operationalization in terms of governance and accountability, human resources and team development, finance and resource management and mobilization, and budget allocation. The respondents of this study were the two hundred (200) teachers. The total sample size of two hundred (200) teachers was computed using the Slovin's Formula from the total population of two-hundred fifty-six (256). The descriptive research employing quantitative methods was used in the study. Research on demographic phenomena was recorded using descriptive research, often known as statistical research.

Purposive sampling was used to calculate the study's sample size. This kind of non-probability sampling, sometimes referred to as judgmental, selective, or subjective sampling, involves researchers using their own discretion to pick study participants from the public.

KEYWORDS: *Learning Continuity, Recovery Plan, Descriptive, Partnership And Collaboration Plan*

INTRODUCTION

The DepEd Order 34, Basic Education Sector Reform Agenda (BESRA) s. 2009, aimed to empower secondary school leaders, especially principals, by providing resources to improve decision-making and enhance education quality. This initiative emphasized decentralizing authority across government levels and fostering accountability between students, parents, teachers, and policymakers.

Post-pandemic, the Department of Education (DepEd) introduced Learning Continuity and Recovery Plans to address learning gaps caused by disruptions. These plans prioritize empowering school leaders, teachers, and communities, enhancing their independence and accountability while adhering to central policies. They involve tasks such as fund allocation, staff hiring, curriculum development, and performance evaluation. However, challenges persist, including inadequate teacher training, overburdened staff, and limited technical resources for online learning.

The plans advocate for decentralized school-based management (SBM), shared decision-making, and participatory governance to improve learning outcomes. Despite implementation challenges, they aim to build schools' capacity for self-management and innovation. Support for online education, technical training, and proper resources is critical to adapting to post-pandemic demands.

Global organizations like UNESCO and WHO emphasize the need for preventive measures and preparation for school reopening to ensure the well-being of students and staff. The pandemic exposed systemic inequities, such as limited internet access and resource misalignment, highlighting the urgency of decentralization. As a non-teaching personnel, the researcher believes decentralizing education delivery through Recovery and Continuity Plans is essential for addressing these challenges, with accountability shared among stakeholders while adhering to DepEd policies.

METHODOLOGY

Descriptive research employing quantitative methods will be used in the study. Research on demographic phenomena will be recorded using descriptive research, often known as statistical research. Purposive sampling will be used to calculate the study's sample size using Slovin's Formula. This study will be participated by selected teachers from the three (3) schools in the Division of Parañaque City. For analysis and interpretation, the data gathered through researcher-made instrument. The data gathered will be coded, tallied, and tabulated subjected to the following statistical treatment: Weighted Mean and Pearson Correlation.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 4| April 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1. Respondents of the Study

School	Population of Teachers	Sample Size	%
Parañaque Elementary School Central	143	103	51.0
San Dionisio Elementary School	55	47	24.0
Parañaque Elementary School Unit II	58	50	25.0
Total	**256**	**200**	**100.0**

Table 1 presents the total sample size of two hundred (200) teachers were computed using the Slovin's Formula. The sample size per school will be taken using simple random sampling.

Table 2. Reliability Test

Survey Questionnaire	No. of Items	Cronbach's Alpha (α)	Internal Consistency
Respondents' assessments on the extent of LCRP operationalization in terms of learning environment, contextualizing learning strategies and modalities, Brigada Eskwela and Oplan Balik Eskwela, and monitoring and evaluation.	20	.90	.91
Respondents' support on the learning continuity and recovery plan operationalization in terms of governance and accountability, human resources and team development, finance and resource management and mobilization, and budget allocation	20	.92	.91

Table 2 presents the test of reliability which evaluated two aspects of Learning Continuity and Recovery Plan (LCRP). The questionnaire is well designed, with both sections exbihiting excellent reliability (above.90) and strong internal consistency (.91). These results confirm the tool's effectiveness in capturing and assessing the intended dimensions of LCRP implementation and support.

Table 3. Assessment of the Respondents on the Extent of LCRP Operationalization in terms of Learning Environment

Indicators	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
1. School facilities support student learning by providing a healthy learning environment.	3.11	Observed
2. The school builds a positive school climate and ensures students are ready to learn.	3.01	Observed
3. The school promotes positive student relationships and works to keep more students in the classroom.	3.13	Observed
4. The learning environment encourages engagement among students and teachers.	3.21	Observed
5. The school nurtures connections by focusing on students' social and emotional learning.	3.33	Highly Observed
Over-all Mean	**3.16**	**Observed**

Legend: 3.25-4.00 –Highly Observed; 2.50-3.24 –Observed; 1.75-2.49 –Moderately Observed; 1.00-1.74 –Not Observed

Table 3 presents that the respondents generally observe the operationalization of the Learning Continuity and Recovery Plan (LCRP) in terms of the learning environment. The overall mean score of 3.16 suggests that, overall, the LCRP is observed to have a positive impact on the learning environment, with areas of notable effectiveness. Among the individual indicators, the school's efforts to nurture students' social and emotional learning received the highest score of 3.33, which was categorized as "Highly Observed." This suggests that the school is particularly successful in fostering connections through a focus on students' emotional well-being. Other indicators, such as the promotion of positive student relationships (mean of 3.13) and the encouragement of engagement between students and teachers (mean of 3.21), were also observed positively, indicating that these areas contribute to a conducive learning environment. The school's facilities, while considered to

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 4| April 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

support student learning in a healthy environment (mean of 3.11), and the creation of a positive school climate (mean of 3.01) were also observed but at slightly lower levels of effectiveness. Overall, the results demonstrate that while there is room for further enhancement in certain areas, the school is making significant strides in operationalizing the LCRP to create an environment that supports student learning, engagement, and emotional development.

Table 4. Assessment of the Respondents on the Extent of LCRP Operationalization in terms of Contextualizing Learning Strategies and Modalities

Indicators	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
1. Contextualized teaching and learning builds upon a similar concept of putting academic activities into perspective to achieve the best teaching and learning outcomes.	3.28	Highly Observed
2. Learning strategies and modalities recognize that by embedding instructions in contexts that adult learners are familiar with, learners more readily understand and assimilate those instructions.	3.08	Observed
3. Learning modalities encourage students to construct relevance between the instructions they receive.	3.17	Observed
4. Contextual learning activities are aligned with the mainstream pedagogical body of knowledge.	3.31	Highly Observed
5. Learning strategies and modalities design with the most relevant approach in mind.	3.43	Highly Observed
Over-all Mean	**3.25**	**Highly Observed**

Legend: 3.25-4.00 –Highly Observed; 2.50-3.24 –Observed; 1.75-2.49 –Moderately Observed; 1.00-1.74 –Not Observed

Table 4 reveals a generally positive assessment of the extent to which the Learning and Community Relationship Program (LCRP) has been operationalized in terms of contextualizing learning strategies and modalities. The overall mean score of 3.25 indicates that the program's implementation is highly observed, with a strong emphasis on designing learning strategies that are contextually relevant. Among the individual indicators, the design of learning strategies and modalities with the most relevant approach in mind received the highest mean score of 3.43, indicating that the school is particularly effective in tailoring learning methods to meet the needs of its learners. Similarly, the alignment of contextual learning activities with mainstream pedagogical knowledge (mean of 3.31) and the contextualization of teaching to improve outcomes (mean of 3.28) were both highly observed, suggesting that the school is committed to using familiar contexts to support effective learning. The incorporation of learning strategies that help adult learners understand and assimilate instructions more easily (mean of 3.08) and the encouragement of students to make connections between their learning and the instructions they receive (mean of 3.17) were observed as well, though these areas scored slightly lower, reflecting room for improvement. Overall, the findings demonstrate that the school effectively operationalizes contextualized learning strategies and modalities to enhance teaching and learning outcomes, with continued focus on refining these methods for greater impact.

Table 5. Assessment of the Respondents on the Extent of LCRP Operationalization in terms of Brigada Eskwela and Oplan Balik Eskwela

Indicators	Frequency	Percentage
1. It promotes collaboration between school's stakeholders.	3.37	Highly Observed
2. Brigada Eskwela provides a long-term relationship between school and the community.	3.41	Highly Observed
3. Oplan Balik Eskwela exhibits calibrated intentions among teachers and parents.	3.55	Highly Observed
4. The school considers Brigada Eskwela and Oplan Balik Eskwela as avenues for school improvement and safety.	3.50	Highly Observed
5. Provides additional opportunities to determine the level of awareness and the extent of challenges in implementing Brigada Eskwela and Oplan Balik Eskwela.	3.47	Highly Observed
Over-all Mean	**3.46**	**Highly Observed**

Legend: 3.25-4.00 –Highly Observed; 2.50-3.24 –Observed; 1.75-2.49 –Moderately Observed; 1.00-1.74 –Not Observed

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 4| April 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

The data presented in Table 5 shows a highly positive assessment of the operationalization of the Learning and Community Relationship Program (LCRP) in terms of Brigada Eskwela and Oplan Balik Eskwela. The overall mean score of 3.46 indicates that these initiatives are strongly observed and effectively implemented. The highest mean score of 3.55 was given to the indicator that assesses Oplan Balik Eskwela's ability to exhibit calibrated intentions among teachers and parents, highlighting the program's effectiveness in fostering alignment and cooperation between these key stakeholders. Similarly, the promotion of collaboration between the school's stakeholders (mean of 3.37) and the establishment of a long-term relationship between the school and the community through Brigada Eskwela (mean of 3.41) were both highly observed, suggesting strong community involvement and partnership. Furthermore, both Brigada Eskwela and Oplan Balik Eskwela are recognized as avenues for school improvement and safety (mean of 3.50), reinforcing their importance in enhancing the school environment. The program also provides valuable opportunities to assess the level of awareness and the challenges in implementing these initiatives, with a mean score of 3.47, indicating a solid understanding of the areas that need attention. Overall, the findings suggest that the school has effectively operationalized these programs, contributing significantly to community engagement, school improvement, and safety.

Table 6. Assessment of the Respondents on the Extent of LCRP Operationalization in terms of Monitoring and Evaluation

Indicators	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
1. School goals are constantly revisited to check if they are achievable.	3.11	Observed
2. Efficiency of everyone is assigned periodically to achieve the common goals of the organization.	3.18	Observed
3. Enhancement of strategies in achieving school's objectives is constantly improved.	3.33	Observed
4. Monitoring improvement on both the process and personnel at school.	3.21	Observed
5. Provides accurate assessment of the program.	3.22	Observed
6. **Over-all Mean**	**3.21**	**Observed**

Legend: 3.25-4.00 –Highly Observed; 2.50-3.24 –Observed; 1.75-2.49 –Moderately Observed; 1.00-1.74 –Not Observed

Table 6 presents the assessment of the respondents on the extent of LCRP operationalization in terms of monitoring and evaluation. The overall mean score of 3.21 indicates that the monitoring and evaluation practices are consistently observed. The results suggest that the school is actively engaged in revisiting its goals to ensure they are achievable, as reflected in the mean score of 3.11. Additionally, the periodic assessment of the efficiency of all members of the organization, with a mean of 3.18, demonstrates that the school regularly evaluates its personnel's contributions toward achieving the institution's common goals. The enhancement of strategies to achieve the school's objectives (mean of 3.33) was notably observed, showing a strong commitment to continuous improvement. Similarly, the monitoring of improvements in both the process and personnel, with a mean of 3.21, highlights the school's focus on tracking progress and identifying areas for development. Furthermore, the school's ability to provide an accurate assessment of the program, with a mean score of 3.22, indicates that evaluations are precise and reliable. Overall, these findings illustrate that the school has a well-implemented system for monitoring and evaluation, ensuring that strategies, personnel, and processes are consistently assessed and improved to meet organizational goals.

Table 7. Assessment of the Respondents on the Support of LCRP Operationalization in terms of Governance and Accountability

Indicators	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
1. School administration is focused on achieving a shared vision, and all understand their role in achieving the vision.	3.17	Observed
2. School heads believe that teachers and staff can learn and meet high standards.	3.28	Observed
3. Effective instructional and administrative leadership is required to implement change processes.	3.39	Observed
4. School nurtures an instructional program and school culture conducive to learning and professional growth.	3.41	Observed
5. Leaders have different styles and roles -- teachers and other staff often have a leadership role.	3.47	Observed
Over-all Mean	**3.34**	**Highly Observed**

Legend: 3.51-4.00 Highly Impacting; 2.51-3.50 Impacting; 1.51-2.50 Moderately Impacting; 1.00-1.50 No Impact

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 4| April 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

Table 7 presents the assessment of the respondents on the support of the Learning Continuity and Recovery Plan (LCRP) operationalization in terms of governance and accountability. The overall mean score of 3.34 suggests that the governance and accountability practices related to the LCRP are highly observed within the school. The findings indicate that the school administration is committed to achieving a shared vision, with all members understanding their role in accomplishing it, as reflected by a mean score of 3.17. This suggests a solid alignment of the staff and administration with the school's goals. The belief of school heads that teachers and staff can learn and meet high standards, by a mean of 3.28, further supports the idea that there is confidence in the capabilities of the school's personnel. The importance of effective instructional and administrative leadership in implementing change processes is highly recognized, with a score of 3.39, signifying that leadership is considered a key factor in driving educational improvements. Additionally, the school's commitment to nurturing an instructional program and school culture conducive to learning and professional growth is highlighted by a mean score of 3.41, demonstrating a strong focus on the professional development of its members. Finally, the recognition of diverse leadership styles and the involvement of teachers and staff in leadership roles, as indicated by a mean of 3.47, illustrates a collaborative leadership structure within the school, where all members contribute to decision-making and change processes. Overall, these results reflect a strong governance framework that promotes accountability, professional growth, and effective leadership to support the operationalization of the LCRP.

Table 8. Assessment of the Respondents on the Support of LCRP operationalization in terms of Human Resources and Team Development

Indicators	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
1. The school trains teachers how to do their job, and occasionally, provides training, perhaps to advance in their career or to learn new skills for their current position.	3.30	Highly Observed
2. The HR department often models the type of behavior that is expected, such as using problem-solving skills, having good communication, and being open-minded to changes.	3.35	Highly Observed
3. School principals serve as the key factors in education and are playing a crucial role in the implementation of educational reform and development.	3.49	Highly Observed
4. School administration ensures a rigorous, goal and data driven learning and teaching environment.	3.30	Highly Observed
5. Developing an achievement and belief based on school-wide culture is highly encouraged.	3.40	Highly Observed
Over-all Mean	**3.34**	**Highly Observed**

Legend: 3.25-4.00 –Highly Observed; 2.50-3.24 –Observed; 1.75-2.49 –Moderately Observed; 1.00-1.74 –Not Observed

Table 8 presents the assessment of the respondents on the support of the Learning Continuity and Recovery Plan (LCRP) operationalization in terms of human resources and team development. The overall mean score of 3.37 indicates that the operationalization of the LCRP in this area is highly observed. The findings suggest that the school places significant emphasis on training and development, as reflected by the mean score of 3.30 for the statement that the school trains teachers to perform their jobs and occasionally provides training to help them advance in their careers or develop new skills. This demonstrates the school's commitment to enhancing teacher performance and career growth. The Human Resources (HR) department also plays a vital role in modeling positive behavior, such as problem-solving skills, effective communication, and openness to change, which was highly observed with a score of 3.35. This reflects the HR department's role in fostering a positive, adaptable, and professional work environment. The importance of school principals in driving educational reform and development was highlighted with a mean of 3.49, suggesting that principals are seen as crucial figures in implementing educational change. Moreover, the school administration ensures a goal- and data-driven learning and teaching environment, as indicated by a mean score of 3.30, demonstrating the commitment to maintaining a rigorous, results-oriented approach to education. Lastly, the promotion of an achievement and belief-based school-wide culture was highly encouraged, with a score of 3.40, illustrating the school's focus on fostering a culture that supports high expectations and continuous improvement. Overall, these results indicate strong support for human resources and team development, contributing to the successful operationalization of the LCRP.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 4| April 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

Table 9. Assessment of the Respondents on the Support of LCRP in terms of Finance and Resource Management and Mobilization

Indicators	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
1. The school management has a better understanding of the criteria for judging the effectiveness with which an educational organization manages its resources and its budget.	3.39	Highly Observed
2. The school can assess their own resource management practice and that of the organization in relation to efficiency and effectiveness.	3.51	Highly Observed
3. Everyone appreciates the extent to which a rational approach to budgeting and resource management is appropriate to the organizational culture and environment.	3.62	Highly Observed
4. Every stakeholder can manage a unit budget more effectively and to be better informed about participating in team decision making about the unit's budget.	3.47	Highly Observed
5. There is a wider context in which resource management occurs - the school's external environment, its culture and the leadership style of the school head.	3.51	Highly Observed
Over-all Mean	**3.50**	**Highly Observed**

Legend: 3.25-4.00 –Highly Observed; 2.50-3.24 –Observed; 1.75-2.49 –Moderately Observed; 1.00-1.74 –Not Observed

Table 9 presents the assessment of the respondents on the support of the Learning Continuity and Recovery Plan (LCRP) operationalization in terms of finance, resource management, and mobilization. The overall mean score of 3.50 reflects that the operationalization of LCRP in this area is highly observed, indicating strong performance in managing financial and resource aspects within the school. Respondents noted that the school management has a solid understanding of the criteria for judging the effectiveness of resource and budget management, as evidenced by a mean score of 3.39. This suggests that the school leadership is proficient in managing financial resources. The school's ability to assess its resource management practices in relation to efficiency and effectiveness was highly observed, with a mean score of 3.51, highlighting the school's commitment to regularly evaluating its financial practices to ensure optimal use of resources. The rational approach to budgeting and resource management was highly appreciated by all stakeholders, with a mean score of 3.62, indicating that the approach is seen as fitting the organizational culture and environment. Moreover, the respondents observed that stakeholders are effectively involved in managing unit budgets and are well-informed about participating in team decision-making processes related to budgeting, reflected in a score of 3.47. Finally, the school's awareness of the wider context in which resource management occurs, including its external environment, culture, and the leadership style of the school head, was highly observed, with a mean of 3.51. This comprehensive understanding ensures that resource management is aligned with both internal and external factors, contributing to the effective operationalization of the LCRP. Overall, these findings demonstrate the school's strong capacity in financial management and resource mobilization, essential for sustaining educational goals and initiatives.

Table 10. Assessment of the Respondents on the Support of LCRP Operationalization in terms of Budget Application

Indicators	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
1. The management of the school is more aware of the standards used to assess how well an educational institution allocates its funds and manages its resources.	3.40	Highly Observed
2. The school could evaluate the efficacy and efficiency of both its own resource management procedures and those of the organization.	3.45	Highly Observed
3. Everyone understands how appropriate a logical approach to resource management and budgeting is given the organizational culture and environment.	3.25	Highly Observed
4. Each stakeholder could manage a unit budget more skillfully and to be more knowledgeable when it comes to contributing to team budget decisions.	3.27	Highly Observed
5. Resource management takes place within a larger framework that includes the school's external environment, culture, and head of school leadership style.	3.41	Highly Observed
Over-all Mean	**3.50**	**Highly Observed**

Legend: 3.25-4.00 –Highly Observed; 2.50-3.24 –Observed; 1.75-2.49 –Moderately Observed; 1.00-1.74 –Not Observed

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 4| April 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

Table 10 presents the assessment of the respondents on the support of the Learning Continuity and Recovery Plan (LCRP) operationalization in terms of budget allocation. The results indicate that the school's resource management and budgeting practices are perceived as highly effective, with an overall mean rating of 3.36, categorized as "Highly Observed." This reflects a strong alignment of the institution's financial and resource management processes with the best practices and stakeholder expectations.

Firstly, the management's awareness of standards for fund allocation and resource management is rated at 3.40, indicating a high level of understanding and adherence to established benchmarks. This awareness ensures that the institution remains accountable and efficient in utilizing its resources. Similarly, the school's ability to evaluate the efficacy and efficiency of its resource management processes, as well as those of the organization, is rated slightly higher at 3.45, highlighting robust mechanisms for assessment and continuous improvement.

The third indicator, with a mean of 3.25, shows that stakeholders understand the importance of a logical approach to resource management and budgeting, which aligns well with the organizational culture and environment. This suggests that the principles guiding resource management are well-integrated into the school's operational framework. Furthermore, the stakeholders' ability to manage unit budgets and contribute to team budget decisions is rated at 3.27, reflecting a reasonable level of competence and involvement in financial decision-making.

Lastly, the inclusion of external environmental factors, organizational culture, and leadership style in resource management processes received a mean rating of 3.41, emphasizing the school's recognition of broader influences on its budgeting and resource allocation strategies. Overall, the findings suggest a highly observed and effective resource management system that incorporates strategic awareness, evaluation, collaboration, and contextual adaptability, ensuring the efficient use of resources to achieve organizational goals.

Table 11. Relationship Between the Extent of Operationalization and the Support of the Learning Continuity Plan and Recovery Plan

Indicators	r	Sig.	Decision	Remarks
Governance and Accountability	3.115	.731	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Human Resource and Team Development	1.012	.641	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Finance and Resource Management and Mobilization	8.412	.043	Reject Ho	Significant
Budget Allocation	33.121	.021	Reject Ho	Significant

Legend: >0.05 – Accept Ho; < 0.05 – Reject Ho

Table 11 presents the relationship between the extent of operationalization and the support for the Learning Continuity Plan across various indicators using Pearson Correlation. For Governance and Accountability, the r value of 3.115 and a significance level of 0.731 indicate that the null hypothesis (Ho) is accepted, meaning there is no significant relationship between this indicator and the support for the Learning Continuity Plan. Similarly, for Human Resource and Team Development, the r-test value of 1.012 and a significance level of 0.641 also lead to the acceptance of the null hypothesis, showing no significant relationship.

However, for Finance and Resource Management and Mobilization, the r value of 8.412 and a significance level of 0.043 result in the rejection of the null hypothesis, indicating a significant relationship between this indicator and the support for the plan. Likewise, Budget Allocation shows a significant relationship, with an r value of 33.121 and a significance level of 0.021, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis. According to the significance level criteria (< 0.05 to reject Ho, > 0.05 to accept Ho), only Finance and Resource Management and Mobilization and Budget Allocation demonstrate a significant relationship with the Learning Continuity Plan.

Table 12. Challenges Encountered by the Schools in Improving the Learning Continuity and Recovery Plan Operationalization

Indicators	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
1. Limited learning modality executed by the teacher due to unavailable resources	2.78	Serious
2. Poor delivery of modality caused by teacher-student engagements	2.52	Serious
3. Untimely distribution and retrieval learning materials	2.65	Serious
4. Inconsistent assessment and monitoring of student progress	2.45	Serious
5. Not centralized school operation and management	2.45	Serious
6. Poor leadership and governance	2.23	Serious
7. Weak management of resources intended for school operations	2.34	Serious
8. Teachers are deprived of self-empowerment	2.38	Serious
9. Poor compliance on budget allocation procedures	2.41	Serious
10. Limited resources provision for academic programs and activities		Serious

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 4| April 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

	2.56	
11. Inconsistencies on student guidance and resource management.	2.53	Serious
12. Unprecedented changes of curriculum content.	2.50	Serious
13. Unmonitored learners' and teachers' emotional and mental health and well-being.	2.47	Serious
14. Lack of parental engagements/support.	2.51	Serious
15. Inaccessible equipment/resources/facilities necessary for lesson delivery.	2.52	Serious
OVERALL MEAN	**2.48**	**Serious**

Legend: 3.25-4.00 –Highly Serious; 2.50-3.24 – Serious; 1.75-2.49 –Moderately Serious; 1.00-1.74 –Not Serious

Table 12 outlines the challenges encountered by schools in improving the operationalization of the Learning Continuity and Recovery Plan (LCRP). Each indicator is assessed based on its severity, with the overall mean rating reflecting the general level of difficulty schools face in implementing the plan. The challenges listed, ranging from resource limitations to poor leadership, all have a mean score that falls within the "Serious" category (2.50–3.24).

The most notable challenges include the limited learning modalities executed by teachers due to unavailable resources (2.78), poor delivery of modalities caused by teacher-student engagement issues (2.52), and untimely distribution and retrieval of learning materials (2.65), all indicating serious obstacles to the effective execution of the LCRP. Other significant challenges include inconsistent assessment and monitoring of student progress (2.45), poor leadership and governance (2.23), and weak management of resources intended for school operations (2.34).

Furthermore, challenges such as teachers being deprived of self-empowerment (2.38), poor compliance with budget allocation procedures (2.41), and limited resource provision for academic programs (2.56) also affect the overall operational efficiency. Schools are also struggling with inconsistencies in student guidance and resource management (2.53), unprecedented changes in curriculum content (2.50), and unmonitored emotional and mental health of both learners and teachers (2.47). Additionally, a lack of parental engagement/support (2.51) and inaccessible equipment/resources/facilities necessary for lesson delivery (2.52) further exacerbate the situation.

The overall mean of 2.48 signifies that the challenges faced by schools in the operationalization of LCRP are categorized as serious. This indicates that while schools are making efforts to implement the plan, several barriers are hindering its full effectiveness. Addressing these challenges is crucial for the success of the LCRP and ensuring better learning continuity for students.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations are hereby presented:

1. To enhance the operationalization of the LCRP, schools should prioritize forming stronger partnerships with local government units, businesses, and community organizations. Collaborative initiatives can be designed to mobilize resources that support learning continuity, such as donations of learning materials, facilities, and technological resources. Establishing formal memorandums of agreement (MOUs) with these stakeholders will help ensure that the support remains consistent and aligned with the specific needs of the school. Community-driven events like donation drives, workshops, or educational fairs can further engage residents and businesses in sustaining the educational objectives of the LCRP. Such partnerships will not only improve resource availability but also foster a sense of shared responsibility for the success of the program.
2. The successful implementation of the LCRP depends heavily on consistent communication and collaboration between parents and teachers. Schools should develop structured mechanisms for engaging parents in their children's learning progress through regular meetings, workshops, and digital platforms that provide updates and feedback. Additionally, the development of Parent-Teacher Associations (PTAs) and collaborative committees focused on learning recovery initiatives can create an inclusive environment where parents can actively contribute to program improvements. Regular workshops that educate parents on how to support their children's emotional well-being, online learning, and overall educational growth can help bridge the gap between school and home, contributing to a more holistic approach to student development.
3. To address the need for continuous professional development among teachers, schools should partner with universities and other higher education institutions (HEIs) in Parañaque City. These institutions can provide specialized training on effective pedagogical strategies, innovative teaching methods, and the use of technology in remote learning. Joint workshops and seminars with HEIs can ensure that teachers are equipped with the necessary skills to implement the LCRP effectively, especially in areas like emotional support for students and creating flexible learning environments. Additionally, faculty members from these HEIs could be invited as guest speakers or mentors to guide teachers on effective teaching strategies, curriculum design, and research-based practices. These partnerships will improve the overall teaching quality, enhancing the success of the LCRP.
4. The emotional and mental health of students and teachers is a significant aspect of the LCRP's operationalization. Schools should collaborate with local health organizations, such as mental health professionals, clinics, and hospitals, to provide adequate support services for both students and teachers. Implementing programs like counseling, stress management workshops, and mental health awareness campaigns can help mitigate the challenges faced due to the COVID-19 pandemic

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 4| April 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

and other socio-emotional issues. Collaborating with these local health experts can ensure that both the social and emotional learning needs of students are met, while also supporting teachers in managing their own mental health and well-being. These efforts will create a safe and supportive environment, ensuring that all stakeholders are given the tools to cope with emotional and psychological stress.

5. For the continuous enhancement of the LCRP, schools should establish collaborative feedback platforms involving teachers, parents, students, and community stakeholders. These platforms, which can be in the form of regular surveys, focus group discussions, or digital platforms, will allow all parties to voice their concerns, suggestions, and observations regarding the program's effectiveness. Stakeholders can participate in decision-making processes related to the curriculum, teaching strategies, and resource allocation. Regularly integrating their feedback will ensure that the LCRP remains adaptable and responsive to the evolving needs of the community. Such an approach will also encourage a more transparent and accountable operationalization process, where the needs of all stakeholders are considered and addressed in a timely manner.

DISCUSSION

It can be concluded that the assessment of the LCRP's operationalization reveals that respondents generally view its impact on the learning environment as positive, especially in promoting social and emotional learning. This aligns with the goals of the program to foster strong, supportive relationships between students and teachers, contributing to the emotional well-being of learners. These positive relationships are seen as key to creating an environment where students feel safe, supported, and engaged in their learning. Notably, the school's emphasis on student-teacher engagement and the promotion of positive peer interactions further contributes to the program's success in enhancing students' overall educational experience. However, the slightly lower ratings for school facilities and the creation of a positive school climate indicate that physical resources and the general atmosphere in some schools may still require improvement. The infrastructure and environment of a school play a crucial role in the overall learning experience, and investing in these areas could further enhance the program's impact.

In terms of contextualizing learning strategies and modalities, the findings indicate that the LCRP has made significant strides in adapting learning methods to meet the specific needs of students. Respondents highlighted the strong focus on creating learning strategies that are relevant and tailored to the local context, ensuring that teaching methods align with both students' learning needs and current pedagogical practices. This alignment with mainstream pedagogical knowledge further enhances the program's effectiveness, as it promotes consistency and quality in teaching. While the program's emphasis on connecting learning to real-world applications and making learning relevant is seen as beneficial, there is an acknowledgment that some areas, particularly those related to adult learners, could benefit from further improvement. These insights suggest that the program could be refined to better address the diverse needs of different learner groups, ensuring that all students, including adult learners, can fully benefit from the program's offerings.

The operationalization of initiatives such as Brigada Eskwela and Oplan Balik Eskwela is another area where the findings are highly positive. These programs were recognized as effective tools for engaging the broader school community, including teachers, parents, and other stakeholders, in supporting students' learning. The active cooperation between various community members in these programs was seen as essential for fostering long-term relationships and ensuring the safety and well-being of students. The programs also provided valuable opportunities to assess the level of awareness among stakeholders about the challenges schools face in implementing the LCRP. This collaborative approach highlights the importance of community involvement in educational programs, as it strengthens the support system for students and creates a more holistic approach to addressing learning challenges.

The positive evaluation of the school's monitoring and evaluation practices further underscores the effectiveness of the LCRP. Respondents acknowledged that the school consistently reviews its goals, evaluates personnel performance, and works to improve strategies to meet institutional objectives. This commitment to continuous improvement is a critical factor in ensuring the long-term success of the program. The focus on monitoring progress and ensuring that evaluations are accurate and reliable suggests that the school is actively engaged in tracking the operational effectiveness of the LCRP. This proactive approach ensures that any necessary adjustments can be made in a timely manner, ensuring that the program remains aligned with its objectives and responsive to the needs of the students.

In terms of governance and accountability, the findings suggest that the operationalization of the LCRP is well-supported by the school leadership and administration. The strong alignment between the administration and staff in achieving shared goals reflects a solid governance structure that is committed to educational improvement. The leadership's emphasis on professional development, collaborative leadership, and diverse leadership styles has been essential in fostering a positive work environment where teachers feel empowered and involved in decision-making processes. This inclusive approach has proven effective in creating a supportive governance structure that encourages growth and development within the school system. It can also be concluded that a strong commitment to human resources and team development, with significant focus on teacher training and career development. This commitment to improving teacher performance and supporting career growth is a key factor in ensuring that the LCRP is effectively operationalized. The active involvement of school principals in driving educational reform and the administration's goal-oriented, data-driven approach to teaching further strengthens the school's focus on continuous improvement. By investing in professional development and ensuring that teachers have the necessary skills and resources, the school is better equipped to meet the diverse needs of students and provide high-quality education.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 4| April 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

In terms of finance, resource management, and mobilization, the findings highlight the effectiveness of the school's approach to managing financial resources. School leadership demonstrates a strong understanding of resource management, ensuring that budgeting practices align with both the school's internal needs and external context. This alignment between budgeting practices and the broader educational goals ensures that available resources are utilized efficiently, supporting the operationalization of the LCRP. The active involvement of stakeholders in budgeting decisions also contributes to a sense of ownership and responsibility, ensuring that resource management practices are both effective and transparent.

The study highlights that not all operational indicators significantly influence the support for the Learning Continuity Plan. Governance and Accountability, as well as Human Resource and Team Development, were found to have no significant relationship with the plan's support, suggesting that these aspects may not be critical determinants in its operationalization. On the other hand, Finance and Resource Management and Mobilization, along with Budget Allocation, demonstrated significant relationships, emphasizing their importance in ensuring the effective implementation and support of the Learning Continuity Plan. These findings underscore the need to prioritize financial and resource management strategies to strengthen the overall operationalization of the plan.

While the overall findings from the study are highly positive, they also highlight significant challenges that need to be addressed. The analysis reveals that, despite the strong support for the program across various domains, there are areas where the operationalization of the LCRP faces serious obstacles. Among the most pressing challenges are limited learning modalities due to resource shortages, difficulties in teacher-student engagement, and the untimely distribution and retrieval of learning materials. These barriers hinder the effective execution of the program and limit its ability to achieve its full potential. Other challenges, including inconsistent assessment and monitoring of student progress, weak governance, poor leadership, and inadequate resource management, further exacerbate the difficulties faced by schools in implementing the LCRP.

The study also revealed that the lack of self-empowerment among teachers, poor compliance with curriculum delivery, and insufficient resources for academic programs significantly impact the program's operational efficiency. Furthermore, inconsistencies in student guidance and resource management, as well as challenges related to changes in curriculum content, contribute to the difficulties faced by schools in operationalizing the LCRP. The emotional and mental health of both students and teachers, as well as the lack of parental engagement and inaccessible facilities, further complicate the situation.

In conclusion, the findings from the study provide valuable insights into the operationalization of the Learning Continuity and Recovery Plan. While the program has made significant strides in promoting a positive learning environment, fostering community involvement, and improving teacher performance, there are critical challenges that need to be addressed. By tackling these obstacles and investing in areas such as resource management, teacher empowerment, and community engagement, schools can better support the successful implementation of the LCRP and ensure better learning continuity for students. The commitment to continuous monitoring and improvement, as highlighted in the study, is key to ensuring that the LCRP remains effective and responsive to the evolving needs of the school community.

REFERENCES

1. *Abu Nasra M and Heilbrunn S (2018) Transformational Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behavior in the Arab Educational System in Israel: The Impact of Trust and Job Satisfaction. Educational Management Administration & Leadership 43(2): 1–17.*
2. *Balog, N. (2018). Impacts of the Learning Environment on Developer's Progress. Accessed 11/10/2022 from https://www.codingdojo.com/blog/impacts-of-the-learning-environment,)*
3. *Bandur, A. (2021). School-based management developments and partnership: Evidence from Indonesia. International Journal of Educational Development, 32(2), 316– 328.*
4. *Bautista, M. (2018). When Reforms Don't Transform: Reflections on Institutional Reforms in the Department of Education, HDN Monograph, Quezon City.*
5. *Buenconsejo, Y. (2018). Changing the Way, You Think About Self-Managing Schools, Educational Management, and Leadership*
6. *Caldwell B (2018) Impact of school autonomy on student achievement: Cases from Australia. International Journal of Educational Management 30(7): 1171–1187.*
7. *Cheng Y, Ko J and Lee T (2018) School autonomy, leadership and learning: A reconceptualization. International Journal of Educational Management 30(2): 177–196.*
8. *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)*
9. *Edizon, A. (2020). Networks as learning communities: Shaping the future of teacher development. Journal of Teacher Education, 51, 221–227.*
10. *Eimuhi, J.O. & Ogedegbe, B.G. (2018). The Effect of Environmental Factors in Teaching and Learning in Primary and Secondary Schools in Edo State of Nigeria: Journal of Emerging Trends in Educational Research and Policy Studies (JETERAPS)*
11. *Ezike, B.U. (2018) Classroom Environment And Academic Interest As Correlates Of Achievement In Senior Secondary School Chemistry In Ibadan South West Local Government Area, Oyo State, Nigeria. Global Journal Of Educational Research.Vol. 17, 2018: PP.61-71.*
12. *Fauzi, F. (2019). "Implementasi Manajemen Berbasis Sekolah (MBS) dalam Peningkatan Prestasi Belajar Siswa di SMP 10 Nopember Sidoarjo," J. tarbawi stai al fithrah, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 61–76, 2019*
13. *Federation University (2018), Principles of learning Environment: Accessed 11/11/2022 from: https://federation.edu.au/staff/learning-and-teaching/teachingpractice/development/principles-of-learning-environment*

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 4| April 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

14. *Frankii, M., Lipschuetz, A., and Santiague, L. (2020). Issues and Difficulties of Successfully Teaching Online Courses in Higher Education: A Review of the Literature.J. Educ. Technol. Syst. 46 (1), 4–29.*
15. *Gachago, D., Jones, B., and Edwards, S. (2018). "Towards Flexible Learning through Distance Learning: ND Real Estate Learners' Experiences," in ICEL 2018 13th International Conference on E-Learning (Capetown: Academic Conferences and publishing limited), 93.*
16. *Gilavand, A (2018). Investigating the Impact of Environmental Factors on Learning and Academic Achievement of Elementary Students: Review. International Journal of Medical Research & Health Sciences*
17. *Grinshtain Y and Gibton D (2018) Responsibility, authority, and accountability in school-based and nonschool-based management: Principals' coping strategies. Journal of Educational Administration 56(1): 2–17.*
18. *Hersey, P. (2018), Management of Organizational Behavior, (7th edition), Mahwah, NJ: Prentice-Hall.*
19. *Hijazi, S. (2020). International Outreach for university post-crisis. Quezon City, Philippines: QS Intelligence Unit.*
20. *Hogang, Zenaida (2018). The Kind of Administrator We Need in the 21st Century, The Modern Teacher, The Grade School's Inc., Valenzuela City.*
21. *Hoy, W (2018). Educational Administration: Theory Research and Practice,*
a. *Randsom House Inc., New York.*
22. *Hutchinson, I. (2018). The Wallace Foundation, Philadelphia, Successful School*
a. *Leadership: What it Is and How it Affects Student Learning.*
23. *Illanes, P., Law, J., Sarakatsannis, J., Sanghvi, S., and Mendy, A. (2020). Coronavirus and the Campus: How Can US Higher Education Organize to Respond?. Chicago, Illinois: McKinsey and Company.*
24. *Jaelani, A., & Masnun, M. (2019). The Implementation of School Based Management in Madrasah Ibtidaiyah. Al Ibtida: Jurnal Pendidikan Guru MI, 6(2), 256–270.*
25. *Johnson, P. (2018). Mistakes Educational Leaders Make, Digest Inc, West Virginia.*
26. *Karmila, N., & Wijaya, A. (2020). Implementation of School Based Management in Tambilung Elementary School. Jhss (Journal of Humanities and Social Studies), 4(1), 71–73.*
27. *Li L, Hallinger P and Walker A (2018) Exploring the mediating effects of trust on principal leadership and teacher professional learning in Hong Kong primary schools. Educational Management, Administration and Leadership 44(1): 20–42*
28. *Mawanda, V., Karta, I. W., & Zm, H. (2018). Effectiveness of Implementation of School-Based Management In Elementary School 1 Puyung Central Lombok. IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education (IOSR-JRME), 8(3), 55–61. https://doi.org/10.9790/7388-0803025561*
29. *Nacuspag, R. (2018). Effective School Management, Philippines Journal on Education, January 2018*
30. *Padilla, E. (2018). "An Analysis of the Instructional Leadership Management Skills of Middle Level School of Managers", Philippine Normal University, Manila.*
31. *Pepito, G. C., & Acibar, L. B. (2019). SchoolBased Management and Performance of Public Elementary School Heads : Basis for Technical Assistance Plan. International Journal of Innovation and Research in Educational Sciences, 6(1), 67–83.*
32. *Rini, R., Sukamto, I., Ridwan, R., & Hariri, H. (2019). School-Based Management in Indonesia: Decision-Making, Problems, and Problem-Solving Strategy.*
33. *Smalley, A. (2020). "Higher Education Responses to Coronavirus (COVID-19)," in National Conference of State Legislatures.*
34. *Study.Com, (2018).Types of Learning Environments: Accessed 11/11/2022 from ;https://study.com/academy/lesson/types-of-learning-nvironment.html#transcriptHeader*
35. *Sulasmi, E. (2020). The Development Strategy of Human Resources Management In Children's Social Welfare Institution (LKSA) (Case Study in LKSA AL-Mubaraak Orphanage Bengkulu). Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal). P. 562-569*
36. *Ulfatin, N., Mustiningsih, R. B. Sumarsono, and J. N. Yunus, "School-based management in marginal areas: Satisfying the political context and student needs," Manag. Educ., 2020, doi: 10.1177/0892020620959739. UNESCO, 2020*
37. *Usman, Y.D. (2018). "Why Teachers Need Professional Development". Daily Sun Newspaper. 26th Sep,P.14 .Available also at https://www.sunnewsonline.com › Opinion*
38. *Waldman, C (2018). The Four Elements for Creating a Positive Learning Environment.*
39. *Waruwu, H. et al. (2020). "The Role of Transformational Leadership, Organizational Learning and Structure on Innovation Capacity: Evidence from Indonesian Private Schools," EduPsyCouns J. Educ. Psychol. Couns., vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 378–397, 2020*
40. *Witziers, E. (2018). The Difficulties of Implementing School-Based Management in Indonesia 20(1), 85-106 Orientasi Baru.*