

Contextual Operationalization of the School Learning Continuity Plan: Its Correlation to School Heads' Performance

Rose Ann L. Lozano

roseann.lozano@deped.gov.ph

Pagsawitan Elementary School, Santa Cruz Laguna 4009 Philippines

Abstract

This study aimed to determine the significant correlation of Context Operationalization of School learning Continuity Plan on the School Heads' Performance in the Public Elementary Schools, Division of Laguna. This study made use of the descriptive correlational research design. The researcher-made questionnaire was used as a research instrument in data gathering. The data were treated using weighted mean, standard deviation, f-test, and the Spearman's Rho. The

There was a very high rating in terms of the principals' provision of learning resources, principals' safe operations, principals' focus on learning, and principals' reaching the marginalized for teachers. The level of school head's performance in instructional leadership, learning environment in the new normal, and school heads' performance in terms of principals' human resource management, principals' community, and stakeholder partnership were also very high.

The focus on learning was found no significant relationship with the performance of the school heads in terms of instructional leadership, learning environment, human resource management, community, and stakeholder partnership, leadership, and management. Ensuring quality of teaching and learning process was found *no significant relationship* with the school head's performance in terms of instructional, environment, human resource management, community, and stakeholder partnership, leadership, and management. There is a significant difference in the perceptions of the teachers and school heads in all indicators of school heads' context operationalization, school learning continuity, and perceptions of teachers and school heads on the school heads' performance.

The level of the context operationalization of school learning continuity plan in terms of the principals' provision of learning resources for teachers, principal' safe operations, principals' well-being and protection, principals' education financing, principals' reaching the marginalized, instructional leadership, learning environment, human resource management, community and stakeholder partnership were all very high. It is concluded that there is a significant relationship between the Context Operationalization of School Learning Continuity Plan and the school heads' performance in the Division of Laguna.

The following recommendation were provided: the school supervisors may provide technical assistance to the school heads having difficulties implementing the school learning continuity plan; school heads may create awareness among stakeholders about the school's current situation and involve them in all school activities and projects.

Keywords: New Normal; Learning ContinuityPlan; School Heads' Performance

1. INTRODUCTION

Distance learning resources constitute a significant component in providing academic continuity in the case of a disaster or crisis event. Schools in public and private have established distance learning as a necessary component for academic continuity. The increasing dependence and legitimacy of distance learning as an essential component of the basic education equation creates a unique opportunity for distance learning and shapes the role and responsibilities of teachers.

The Department of Education embarked on developing the School Learning Continuity Plan to enable learners of primary education to continue learning and for teachers to deliver instruction in a safe work and learning environment amid the threat of COVID-19. The inputs of the different strands, through their lead undersecretaries and assistant secretaries, and of the other regions, through their regional directors, were submitted to the Office of the Secretary (OSEC). In addition, collective inputs were generated through consultations conducted by the Philippine Forum for Inclusive Quality Basic Education or Educ Forum. There was also a consultative meeting between members of the DepEd Execom and the chairpersons of the House and Senate Committees on Basic Education, Rep. Roman Romulo, and Senator Sherwin Gatchalian, respectively. The process leveraged the internal talents and expertise of DepEd officials and personnel as well as the expertise, rich experience, and resources of partners.

A learning continuity plan seeks to ensure students' learning progresses even amidst disasters such as natural calamities, storms, fires, and pandemics. This plan overcomes obstacles created by the disasters through innovative means of teaching and learning, keeping students on track with their courses even in times of pandemics.

According to Miraglia (2018), without a plan in place to resume the educational process for students after an emergency, there is the possibility that students would be away from the learning environment for an extended period. This would be detrimental to the students' education and could result in the students being behind in their grades compared to other students who were unaffected by an emergency or had a continuity plan that accounted for continued education. Determining how many Northeast Arkansas schools are prepared to resume teaching their students after a crisis can provide an example of the preparedness of schools located in Northeast Arkansas. Examining schools' disaster preparedness and emergency decision-making skills is necessary to see where improvement is needed.

1.1. Objective of the Study

This study aimed to determine the significant correlation of Context Operationalization of School learning Continuity Plan on the School Heads' Performance in public elementary schools in the Division of Laguna.

Specifically, this study sought answers to the following questions:

1. What is the mean level of the Context Operationalization of School Learning Continuity Plan in terms of:
 - 1.1. Focus on Learning
 - 1.2. Ensuring Quality of Teaching and Learning Processes
 - 1.3. Provision of Learning Resources
 - 1.4. Safe Operations
 - 1.5. Well-being and Protection
 - 1.6. Education Financing
 - 1.7. Reaching the marginalized

2. What is the mean level of the school heads' performance in terms of:
 - 2.1. Instructional Leadership
 - 2.2. Learning Environment in the New Normal
 - 2.3. Human Resource Management
 - 2.4. Community and stakeholders' Partnership
 - 2.5. School Leadership and Management
3. Is there any significant correlation between the Context Operationalization of School Learning Continuity Plan to the school heads' performance in the Division of Laguna?
4. Is a significant difference between the school's head operationalization and performance based on the teachers' and school heads' perceptions?

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1. Research Design

This study made use of the descriptive correlational design research. Teachers and school heads were asked to answer a survey questionnaire. They rated their own school contextual operationalization of the school learning continuity plan and the school head's performance.

2.2 Respondents of the Study

The researcher used Slovin's Formula in this study to get the specific number of samples in each district. The total number of teachers in the Division of Laguna is 4681 and 260 elementary school heads using the margin of error of 0.05. The computed number of samples is 369 and 158, respectively. Each district's school heads and teachers were chosen using a simple random sampling technique.

2.2. Research Instrument

The instrument is composed of two parts: part I were questionnaires on the different contextual operationalization, namely, focus on learning which highlights the implementation of standardized policy for school curriculum, ensuring the quality of teaching and learning process that focuses on comprehensive plans in providing and assessing professional development, provision of learning resources about the system of delivery of distance learning materials whether digital or paper-based modules, safe operations which encourage routines to practice safe distancing and following good hand hygiene, well-being and protection which enables teachers to focus on delivering results and eliminate fatigue loads, reaching the marginalized focusing on the comprehensiveness of parent-school partnership program, and education funding that supports the school educational fund in providing distance learning.

Part II contains the school heads' performance in terms of instructional leadership, which aims to actively support day-to-day instructional activities and programs by consistently giving priority to instructional concerns, learning environment in the new normal about the development of significant opportunities for students' utmost learning amidst pandemic, human resource management focused in identifying available resources for more effective management of the staff's knowledge and skills, and community, stakeholders' partnership to provide guidance and direction to students, parents, and families on how to create a distraction-free learning environment at home and accommodations for students in need; and

school leadership and management that creates opportunities for school personnel in participating support groups.

2.3. Statistical Treatment

This study used the following Statistical tools to treat the gathered data for its purpose: Standard Deviation, Weighted Mean, Spearman Rho, and F-test.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the findings of the study. The data gathered and its analysis and interpretation are also presented. The study was conducted to determine the significant correlation of context operationalization of school learning continuity plan on the school heads' performance in public elementary schools in the division of Laguna. The presentation of the findings followed the order of the questions enumerated in the problem statement.

Level of the Context Operationalization of School Learning Continuity Plan

Table 1 presents the mean level of the context operationalization of the school learning continuity plan in terms of focus on learning.

Table 1

Level of the Context Operationalization of School Learning Continuity Plan in terms of Focus on Learning

| STATEMENT | PRINCIPAL | | | TEACHER | | |
|---|-----------|------|-----------|---------|------|-----------|
| | MEAN | SD | ANALYSIS | MEAN | SD | ANALYSIS |
| 1. Written specification of the school's curricular profile and educational goals | 3.87 | 0.33 | Very High | 3.76 | 0.43 | Very High |
| 2. Systematic recording of data of the teaching and non-teaching staff | 3.84 | 0.37 | Very High | 3.74 | 0.46 | Very High |
| 3. Systematic recording of the student test results and graduation rates | 3.85 | 0.35 | Very High | 3.79 | 0.41 | Very High |
| 4. Comprehensive program for learners' utmost learning | 3.78 | 0.42 | Very High | 3.73 | 0.45 | Very High |
| 5. Written feedback from the stakeholders | 3.77 | 0.44 | Very High | 3.66 | 0.50 | Very High |
| 6. Teacher mentoring | 3.84 | 0.40 | Very High | 3.74 | 0.47 | Very High |
| 7. Regular consultation that aimed at school improvement | 3.79 | 0.45 | Very High | 3.74 | 0.46 | Very High |
| 8. Implementation of standardized policy for school curriculum | 3.84 | 0.40 | Very High | 3.76 | 0.44 | Very High |
| 9. Distribution and utilization of self-learning modules | 3.88 | 0.35 | Very High | 3.82 | 0.39 | Very High |
| 10. Staff development and training | 3.89 | 0.34 | Very High | 3.75 | 0.45 | Very High |
| Overall Mean | 3.84 | | | 3.75 | | |

| | | |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|
| SD | 0.39 | 0.45 |
| Verbal Interpretation | Very High | Very High |

Legend

| Range | Verbal Interpretation |
|--------------|------------------------------|
| 3.51-4.00 | Very High |
| 2.51-3.50 | High |
| 1.51-2.50 | Moderately High |
| 1.00-1.50 | Low |

The principals perceived that the focus on learning in the context of operationalization of the school learning continuity plan was *very high* in terms of staff development and training ($M=3.89$, $SD=0.34$), utilization of self-learning modules ($M=3.88$, $SD=0.35$), educational goals ($M=3.87$, $SD=0.33$), recording of the student test result ($M=3.85$, $SD=0.35$), and standardized policies in the implementation of the curriculum ($M=3.84$, $SD=0.40$).

Likewise, the teachers perceived that the context operationalization of the school learning continuity plan in terms of focus on learning was *very high* as to distribution and utilization of self-learning modules ($M=3.82$, $SD=0.39$), recording of student test results ($M=3.79$, $SD=0.41$), standardized policies in the implementation of the curriculum ($M=3.76$, $SD=0.44$), specification of educational goals ($M=3.76$, $SD=0.43$), and mentoring teacher ($M=3.74$, $SD=0.47$).

Table 2 illustrates the mean level of the context operationalization of the school learning continuity plan to ensure the learning process quality.

Table 2

Level of the Context Operationalization of School Learning Continuity Plan in terms of Ensuring Quality of Teaching and Learning Process

| STATEMENT | PRINCIPAL | | | TEACHER | | |
|---|------------------|-----------|-----------------|----------------|-----------|-----------------|
| | MEAN | SD | ANALYSIS | MEAN | SD | ANALYSIS |
| 1. Sufficient access of teachers to instructional materials | 3.86 | 0.35 | Very High | 3.73 | 0.47 | Very High |
| 2. Regular monitoring of classes to document teaching and learning | 3.89 | 0.32 | Very High | 3.78 | 0.43 | Very High |
| 3. Attendance of teachers to co-curricular activities of the school | 3.85 | 0.36 | Very High | 3.79 | 0.42 | Very High |
| 4. Participation of teachers in professional development | 3.87 | 0.33 | Very High | 3.82 | 0.39 | Very High |
| 5. Implementation of time-on-task strategies in doing school work | 3.85 | 0.35 | Very High | 3.78 | 0.43 | Very High |
| 6. Comprehensive plans for providing and assessing professional development | 3.83 | 0.38 | Very High | 3.77 | 0.42 | Very High |
| 7. Encouragement to teachers in improving classroom/teaching | 3.85 | 0.35 | Very High | 3.83 | 0.38 | Very High |

practices

| | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|------|-----------|-----------|------|-----------|
| 8. Comprehensive program in solving issues that are related to student discipline | 3.80 | 0.40 | Very High | 3.75 | 0.44 | Very High |
| 9. Provision of feedback on learners' output | 3.85 | 0.36 | Very High | 3.76 | 0.44 | Very High |
| 10. Communication of student's performance to parents | 3.91 | 0.29 | Very High | 3.79 | 0.42 | Very High |
| Overall Mean | 3.86 | | | 3.78 | | |
| SD | 0.35 | | | 0.42 | | |
| Verbal Interpretation | Very High | | | Very High | | |

Legend

| Range | Verbal Interpretation |
|-----------|-----------------------|
| 3.51-4.00 | Very High |
| 2.51-3.50 | High |
| 1.51-2.50 | Moderately High |
| 1.00-1.50 | Low |

The principals were perceived to perform very high in that they are ensuring the quality of teaching and learning process in terms of communication of student's performance to parents ($M=3.91$, $SD=0.29$), monitoring of classes to document teaching and learning ($M=3.89$, $SD=0.32$), teachers' professional development ($M=3.87$, $SD=0.33$), sufficient instructional materials ($M=3.86$, $SD=0.35$), and implementation of time-on-task strategies ($M=3.85$, $SD=0.35$).

Similarly, the teachers were also perceived to perform *very high* in ensuring the quality of teaching and learning process as to improving teachers' classroom/teaching practices ($M=3.83$, $SD=0.38$), teachers' professional development ($M=3.82$, $SD=0.39$), communication of student's performance to parents ($M=3.79$, $SD=0.42$), teachers attending co-curricular activities ($M=3.79$, $SD=0.42$), and monitoring of classes to document teaching and learning ($M=3.78$, $SD=0.43$).

The overall mean of 3.86 indicates that the principals were *very high* in ensuring the quality of teaching and learning process as a context operationalization of the school learning continuity plan. The teachers showed the same level of perception as revealed by the overall mean of 3.75.

Table 3 illustrates the mean level of the context operationalization of the school learning continuity plan regarding the provision of learning resources.

Table 3

Level of the Context Operationalization of School Learning Continuity Plan in terms of Provision of Learning Resource

| STATEMENT | PRINCIPAL | | | TEACHER | | |
|--|-----------|------|-----------|---------|------|-----------|
| | MEAN | SD | ANALYSIS | MEAN | SD | ANALYSIS |
| 1. System of delivery of distance learning materials, whether digital or paper-based modules | 3.85 | 0.35 | Very High | 3.72 | 0.48 | Very High |
| 2. Assistance of the school in using the resources at home | 3.87 | 0.33 | Very High | 3.67 | 0.52 | Very High |
| 3. Assistance of co-workers while | 3.89 | 0.32 | Very High | 3.72 | 0.47 | Very High |

teaching and performing duties from home

| | | | | | | |
|--|------|------|-----------|------|------|-----------|
| 4. School's stress avoidance program while teaching and learning remotely during the COVID-19 pandemic | 3.82 | 0.38 | Very High | 3.69 | 0.49 | Very High |
| 5. Maintenance of work-life balance while teaching remotely | 3.85 | 0.36 | Very High | 3.66 | 0.53 | Very High |
| 6. Fulfillment of the teaching-learning competencies of students remotely | 3.85 | 0.36 | Very High | 3.70 | 0.49 | Very High |
| 7. Quality of response or output of learners in distance learning | 3.80 | 0.40 | Very High | 3.63 | 0.53 | Very High |
| 8. General environment at home while teaching and learning | 3.80 | 0.40 | Very High | 3.66 | 0.51 | Very High |
| 9. Availability of technology in teaching and learning | 3.81 | 0.39 | Very High | 3.62 | 0.56 | Very High |
| 10. Support of parents in learners' remote learning | 3.84 | 0.37 | Very High | 3.67 | 0.51 | Very High |

| | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|-----------|--|--|-----------|--|--|
| Overall Mean | 3.84 | | | 3.67 | | |
| SD | 0.37 | | | 0.51 | | |
| Verbal Interpretation | Very High | | | Very High | | |

Legend

| Range | Verbal Interpretation |
|-----------|-----------------------|
| 3.51-4.00 | Very High |
| 2.51-3.50 | High |
| 1.51-2.50 | Moderately High |
| 1.00-1.50 | Low |

The principals perceived that the provision of learning resources was *very high* in terms of assistance of co-workers while teaching and performing duties from home ($M=3.89$, $SD=0.32$), the assistance of the school in using the resources at home ($M=3.87$, $SD=0.33$), delivery of distance learning materials. ($M=3.85$, $SD=0.35$), work-life balance and fulfilment of the teaching-learning competencies of students remotely ($M=3.85$, $SD=0.36$).

Likewise, the teachers perceived that the provision of learning resources was *very high* as to the delivery of distance learning materials ($M=3.72$, $SD=0.48$), the assistance of co-workers while teaching and performing duties from home ($M=3.72$, $SD=0.47$), fulfillment of the teaching-learning competencies of students remotely ($M=3.70$, $SD=0.49$), program while teaching and learning remotely ($M=3.69$, $SD=0.49$), and support of parents in learners ($M=3.67$, $SD=0.51$).

The level of the context operationalization of the school learning continuity plan in terms of the principals' provision of learning resources for teachers was *very high*, as disclosed by the overall mean of 3.84. The teachers showed their level of perception revealed by the overall mean of 3.67 and interpreted as *very high*.

Table 4 illustrates the mean level of the context operationalization of the school learning continuity plan regarding safe operations.

Table 4

Level of the Context Operationalization of School Learning Continuity Plan in terms of Safe Operations

| STATEMENT | PRINCIPAL | | TEACHER | | | |
|---|-----------|------|-----------|-----------|------|-----------|
| | MEAN | SD | ANALYSIS | MEAN | SD | ANALYSIS |
| 1. Practice safe distancing | 3.91 | 0.29 | Very High | 3.83 | 0.39 | Very High |
| 2. Use physical barriers, such as Plexiglas shields and partition | 3.82 | 0.42 | Very High | 3.62 | 0.59 | Very High |
| 3. Wear of cloth face masks should be a priority | 3.88 | 0.33 | Very High | 3.73 | 0.53 | Very High |
| 4. Schools should encourage routines that encourage frequent hand-washing and following good hand hygiene practices | 3.94 | 0.24 | Very High | 3.83 | 0.38 | Very High |
| 5. Daily temperature readings as a part of COVID-19 symptom screening | 3.88 | 0.33 | Very High | 3.83 | 0.38 | Very High |
| Overall Mean | 3.88 | | | 3.77 | | |
| SD | 0.33 | | | 0.47 | | |
| Verbal Interpretation | Very High | | | Very High | | |

Legend

| Range | Verbal Interpretation |
|--------------|------------------------------|
| 3.51-4.00 | Very High |
| 2.51-3.50 | High |
| 1.51-2.50 | Moderately High |
| 1.00-1.50 | Low |

The principals perceived that in the context of operationalization of school learning continuity plan in terms of safe operation was *very high* as to encourage routines of frequent handwashing and following good hand hygiene practices ($M=3.94$, $SD=0.24$), safe distancing ($M=3.91$, $SD=0.29$), wearing of face mask and daily reading temperature daily ($M=3.88$, $SD=0.33$), and use of plexiglass shield ($M=3.82$, $SD=0.42$).

Similarly, the teachers perceived that the safe school operation was *very high* in terms of safe distancing ($M=3.83$, $SD=0.39$), encouraged routines of frequent handwashing and following good hand hygiene practices, and daily reading of temperature ($M=3.83$, $SD=0.38$), wearing of face masks ($M=3.73$, $SD=0.53$), and use of plexiglass shield ($M=3.62$, $SD=0.59$).

The level of the context operationalization of the school learning continuity plan in terms of the principal's safe operations was *very high*, as revealed by the overall mean of 3.88. Similarly, the teachers showed the same level of perception as disclosed by the overall mean of 3.77.

Table 5 illustrates the mean level of the context operationalization of the school learning continuity plan regarding well-being and protection.

Table 5

Level of the Context Operationalization of School Learning Continuity Plan in terms of Well-Being and Protection

| STATEMENT | PRINCIPAL | | TEACHER | | | |
|--|-----------|------|-----------|-----------|------|-----------|
| | MEAN | SD | ANALYSIS | MEAN | SD | ANALYSIS |
| 1. Give employees a voice and increase engagement with a simple, scalable solution. | 3.84 | 0.37 | Very High | 3.73 | 0.50 | Very High |
| 2. School heads Improve engagement levels of the employees. | 3.86 | 0.35 | Very High | 3.74 | 0.48 | Very High |
| 3. Eliminate fatigue loads and boost productivity. | 3.83 | 0.38 | Very High | 3.67 | 0.54 | Very High |
| 4. Boost the teachers' performance. | 3.88 | 0.33 | Very High | 3.76 | 0.48 | Very High |
| 5. Increase productivity in the workplace. | 3.84 | 0.37 | Very High | 3.73 | 0.49 | Very High |
| 6. Get real-time actionable insights to develop strategies & resolve recurring problems. | 3.81 | 0.39 | Very High | 3.72 | 0.49 | Very High |
| 7. School treated teachers fairly in all aspects. | 3.84 | 0.37 | Very High | 3.72 | 0.49 | Very High |
| 8 Make efforts in the right direction and pull the right levers to increase the engagement of unhappy employees. | 3.81 | 0.39 | Very High | 3.72 | 0.51 | Very High |
| 9. Enables teachers to focus only on delivering results. | 3.78 | 0.41 | Very High | 3.66 | 0.55 | Very High |
| 10. Staff development and training are planned. | 3.85 | 0.35 | Very High | 3.72 | 0.50 | Very High |
| Overall Mean | 3.83 | | | 3.72 | | |
| SD | 0.37 | | | 0.50 | | |
| Verbal Interpretation | Very High | | | Very High | | |

Legend

| Range | Verbal Interpretation |
|--------------|------------------------------|
| 3.51-4.00 | Very High |
| 2.51-3.50 | High |
| 1.51-2.50 | Moderately High |
| 1.00-1.50 | Low |

The principals' perception of the operationalization of the school learning continuity plan in terms of well-being and protection was *very high* in terms of boosting the teachers' performance ($M=3.88$, $SD=0.33$), engagement levels of the employees ($M=3.86$, $SD=0.35$), staff development training ($M=3.85$, $SD=0.35$), employees voice, productivity in the workplace, and teachers are pretty treated ($M=3.84$, $SD=0.37$), and eliminating fatigue loads ($M=3.83$, $SD=0.38$).

The teachers also perceived that well-being and protection were *very high* as to boost the teachers'

performance ($M=3.76$, $SD=0.48$), engagement levels of the employees ($M=3.74$, $SD=0.48$), employees' voice ($M=3.73$, $SD=0.50$), productivity in the workplace ($M=3.73$, $SD=0.49$), and resolve recurring problems ($M=3.72$, $SD=0.49$).

The overall mean of 3.83 demonstrated that the level of context operationalization of the school learning continuity plan in terms of principals' well-being and protection was *very high*. The teachers displayed the same degree of perception as yielded with an overall mean of 3.72.

Table 6 illustrates the mean level of the context operationalization of the school learning continuity plan regarding education financing.

Table 6

Level of the Context Operationalization of School Learning Continuity Plan in terms of Education Financing

| STATEMENT | PRINCIPAL | | TEACHER | | | |
|--|-----------|------|-----------|-----------|------|-----------|
| | MEAN | SD | ANALYSIS | MEAN | SD | ANALYSIS |
| 1. Provision of the school budget | 3.85 | 0.35 | Very High | 3.64 | 0.54 | Very High |
| 2. Stakeholders support printing out modules and activity sheets for learners. | 3.78 | 0.43 | Very High | 3.57 | 0.59 | Very High |
| 3. Support from the School Education Fund in delivering modular distance learning is evident | 3.84 | 0.38 | Very High | 3.65 | 0.52 | Very High |
| 4. Volunteerism is manifested to lessen school expenses | 3.80 | 0.43 | Very High | 3.63 | 0.56 | Very High |
| 5. Welcoming NGO's support, such as the provision of printers for printing purposes. | 3.87 | 0.35 | Very High | 3.71 | 0.49 | Very High |
| Overall Mean | 3.83 | | | 3.64 | | |
| SD | 0.39 | | | 0.54 | | |
| Verbal Interpretation | Very High | | | Very High | | |

Legend

| <i>Range</i> | <i>Verbal Interpretation</i> |
|--------------|------------------------------|
| 3.51-4.00 | Very High |
| 2.51-3.50 | High |
| 1.51-2.50 | Moderately High |
| 1.00-1.50 | Low |

The principals' perception of the context operationalization school learning continuity plan in terms of education financing was *very high* as to welcoming NGO's support ($M=3.87$, $SD=0.35$), provision of the school budget ($M=3.85$, $SD=0.35$), help from the school education fund in delivering modular distance learning ($M=3.84$, $SD=0.38$), volunteerism is manifested to lessen school expenses ($M=3.80$, $SD=0.43$), and stakeholders' support in the printing out of modules ($M=3.78$, $SD=0.43$).

Furthermore, the teachers' perception of the context operationalization of school learning continuity plan in terms of education financing was *very high* as to welcoming NGO's support ($M=3.71$, $SD=0.49$), support from the school education fund in delivering modular distance learning ($M=3.65$, $SD=0.52$), provision of the school budget ($M=3.64$, $SD=0.54$), volunteerism is manifested to lessen school expenses

($M=3.63$, $SD=0.56$), and stakeholders' support in the printing out of modules ($M=3.57$, $SD=0.59$).

The overall mean of 3.83 showed that the context operationalization of the school learning continuity plan in terms of principals' education financing was *very high*. The teachers displayed the same degree of perception as the overall mean of 3.64. The pandemic truly affects the availability of educational funding. Donations from the stakeholders for providing students learning resources are much appreciated.

Table 7 illustrates the mean level of the context operationalization of the school learning continuity plan for reaching the marginalized community.

Table 7

Level of the Context Operationalization of School Learning Continuity Plan in terms of Reaching the Marginalized

| STATEMENT | PRINCIPAL | | TEACHER | | | |
|--|-----------|------|-----------|-----------|------|-----------|
| | MEAN | SD | ANALYSIS | MEAN | SD | ANALYSIS |
| 1. Openness and transparency of the school to the community | 3.89 | 0.32 | Very High | 3.78 | 0.44 | Very High |
| 2. Partnership of service-learning in the school and in the community | 3.85 | 0.36 | Very High | 3.75 | 0.45 | Very High |
| 3. Trust between teachers and families | 3.84 | 0.37 | Very High | 3.75 | 0.44 | Very High |
| 4. Families' support for students' education at home | 3.82 | 0.39 | Very High | 3.72 | 0.47 | Very High |
| 5. Families' attendance at school-wide events and parent-teacher conferences | 3.82 | 0.39 | Very High | 3.70 | 0.48 | Very High |
| 6. Community's participation in school decision-making | 3.87 | 0.34 | Very High | 3.69 | 0.48 | Very High |
| 7. Availability of in-school and out-of-school programs | 3.84 | 0.37 | Very High | 3.70 | 0.49 | Very High |
| 8. Comprehensiveness of parent-school partnership programs | 3.80 | 0.41 | Very High | 3.72 | 0.47 | Very High |
| 9. Stakeholders' moral, physical and financial support for school projects | 3.85 | 0.35 | Very High | 3.74 | 0.44 | Very High |
| 10. Parents', community, and stakeholders' feedback on school projects | 3.89 | 0.31 | Very High | 3.75 | 0.45 | Very High |
| Overall Mean | 3.85 | | | 3.73 | | |
| SD | 0.36 | | | 0.46 | | |
| Verbal Interpretation | Very High | | | Very High | | |

Legend

| Range | Verbal Interpretation |
|-----------|-----------------------|
| 3.51-4.00 | Very High |
| 2.51-3.50 | High |
| 1.51-2.50 | Moderately High |
| 1.00-1.50 | Low |

The principals perceived that the context operationalization of the school learning continuity plan in terms of reaching the marginalized was *very high* as to the transparency of the school to the community ($M=3.89$, $SD=0.32$), stakeholders' feedback on school projects ($M=3.89$, $SD=0.31$), community's participation in school decision-making ($M=3.87$, $SD=0.34$), the partnership of service learning in the school ($M=3.85$, $SD=0.36$), and trust between teacher and families and availability of in-school and out-of-school programs ($M=3.84$, $SD=0.37$).

Similarly, the teachers also perceived that reaching the marginalized was *very high* in terms of transparency of the school to the community ($M=3.78$, $SD=0.44$), a partnership of service-learning in the school, and stakeholders' feedback on school projects ($M=3.75$, $SD=0.45$), trust between teachers and families ($M=3.75$, $SD=0.44$), stakeholder's support to the school project ($M=3.74$, $SD=0.44$), families support to students education at home and parent-school partnership programs ($M=3.72$, $SD=0.47$).

The level of the context operationalization of the school learning continuity plan in terms of principals' reaching the marginalized was *very high*, as disclosed by the overall mean of 3.85. The teachers' perception levels were similar, as shown by the general standard of 3.73.

Level of the School Heads' Performance

Table 8 illustrates the mean level of the school heads' performance in terms of instructional leadership.

Table 8

Level of the School Heads' Performance in terms of Instructional Leadership

| The Principal/School Head... | PRINCIPAL | | | TEACHER | | |
|--|-----------|------|-----------|---------|------|-----------|
| | MEAN | SD | ANALYSIS | MEAN | SD | ANALYSIS |
| 1. attends conferences or seminars featuring new research on instructional practices. | 3.91 | 0.29 | Very High | 3.75 | 0.46 | Very High |
| 2. Ensures teachers have the materials, facilities, and budget necessary to perform their duties adequately. | 3.91 | 0.31 | Very High | 3.66 | 0.52 | Very High |
| 3. ensures that faculty and staff know the most current theories and practices regarding effective schooling. | 3.91 | 0.29 | Very High | 3.72 | 0.48 | Very High |
| 4. actively supports day-to-day instructional activities and programs by consistently prioritizing instructional concerns. | 3.93 | 0.26 | Very High | 3.71 | 0.50 | Very High |
| 5. systematically develop new and better ways of doing things. | 3.92 | 0.27 | Very High | 3.67 | 0.52 | Very High |
| 6. provides opportunities for new teachers to observe master teachers at work. | 3.90 | 0.30 | Very High | 3.69 | 0.51 | Very High |
| 7. has clear goals for the school | 3.90 | 0.30 | Very High | 3.70 | 0.51 | Very High |

and articulates those goals to faculty and staff.

| | | | | | | |
|---|------|------|-----------|------|------|-----------|
| 8. recognizes and rewards individual accomplishments. | 3.91 | 0.29 | Very High | 3.71 | 0.51 | Very High |
| 9. uses hard work and results as the basis for rewards and recognition. | 3.89 | 0.31 | Very High | 3.70 | 0.50 | Very High |
| 10. establishes policies that enable others to be effective. | 3.87 | 0.33 | Very High | 3.70 | 0.52 | Very High |

| | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|-----------|--|--|-----------|--|--|
| Overall Mean | 3.90 | | | 3.70 | | |
| SD | 0.30 | | | 0.50 | | |
| Verbal Interpretation | Very High | | | Very High | | |

Legend

| Range | Verbal Interpretation |
|-----------|-----------------------|
| 3.51-4.00 | Very High |
| 2.51-3.50 | High |
| 1.51-2.50 | Moderately High |
| 1.00-1.50 | Low |

The principals claimed that their level of instructional leadership was *very high* in terms of actively supporting day-to-day instructional activities and programs ($M=3.93$, $SD=0.26$), developing new and better ways of doing things ($M=3.92$, $SD=0.27$), attending conferences or seminars featuring new research on instructional practices and recognizes and rewards individual accomplishments ($M=3.91$, $SD=0.27$), and ensures teacher's budget to adequately perform their duty ($M=3.91$, $SD=0.31$). On the other hand, establishing policies ($M=3.87$, $SD=0.33$) has the lowest mean yet was also interpreted as *very high*.

In addition, the teachers perceived that the principal's instructional leadership was *very high* as to attend conferences or seminars featuring new research on instructional practices ($M=3.75$, $SD=0.46$), ensuring that faculty and staff are aware of the most current theories and practices regarding effective schooling ($M=3.72$, $SD=0.48$), actively supports day-to-day instructional activities and programs ($M=3.71$, $SD=0.50$), recognizes and rewards individual accomplishments ($M=3.71$, $SD=0.51$), uses hard work and results for rewards and recognition ($M=3.70$, $SD=0.50$), and establish policies ($M=3.70$, $SD=0.52$).

The level of the school head's performance in terms of instructional leadership was very high, as revealed by the overall mean of 3.90. The teachers showed the same level of perception as disclosed by the general standard of 3.70.

Table 9 illustrates the mean level of the school heads' performance in terms of the learning environment in the new normal.

Table 9

Level of the School Heads' Performance in terms of Learning Environment in the New Normal

| The Principal/School Head... | PRINCIPAL | | | TEACHER | | |
|---|-----------|------|-----------|---------|------|-----------|
| | MEAN | SD | ANALYSIS | MEAN | SD | ANALYSIS |
| 1. establishes a crisis management team promptly. | 3.89 | 0.32 | Very High | 3.67 | 0.51 | Very High |
| 2. identifies key standard technology platforms for | 3.90 | 0.30 | Very High | 3.69 | 0.50 | Very High |

communication between teachers, parents, learners, and other stakeholders.

| | | | | | | |
|---|------|------|-----------|------|------|-----------|
| 3. guides and empowers the team to devise creative and innovative solutions to learners' difficulties. | 3.89 | 0.32 | Very High | 3.70 | 0.49 | Very High |
| 4. develops significant opportunities for students' utmost learning amidst pandemic. | 3.89 | 0.32 | Very High | 3.70 | 0.49 | Very High |
| 5. provides opportunities for teachers' development that they can use in the learning modality chosen by the school and the stakeholder | 3.88 | 0.33 | Very High | 3.70 | 0.49 | Very High |
| 6. initiates continuous communication between the teachers, parents, and learners. | 3.92 | 0.27 | Very High | 3.73 | 0.49 | Very High |
| 7. develops care and committee programs for staff, students, and families. | 3.91 | 0.29 | Very High | 3.69 | 0.51 | Very High |
| 8. facilitates appropriate recovery strategies for students who are lagging behind. | 3.87 | 0.33 | Very High | 3.60 | 0.51 | Very High |
| 9. celebrates achievements and success both for teachers and learners for them to feel valued | 3.87 | 0.35 | Very High | 3.68 | 0.51 | Very High |
| 10. develops a holding environment where stakeholders feel safe to express their opinions. | 3.88 | 0.33 | Very High | 3.71 | 0.49 | Very High |

| | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|-----------|--|--|-----------|--|--|
| Overall Mean | 3.89 | | | 3.70 | | |
| SD | 0.32 | | | 0.50 | | |
| Verbal Interpretation | Very High | | | Very High | | |

Legend

| Range | Verbal Interpretation |
|-----------|-----------------------|
| 3.51-4.00 | Very High |
| 2.51-3.50 | High |
| 1.51-2.50 | Moderately High |
| 1.00-1.50 | Low |

The principals perceived that the learning environment in the new normal was *very high* in terms of continuous communication between the teachers, parents, and the learners ($M=3.92$, $SD=0.27$), developing care and committee programs for staff, students, and families ($M=3.91$, $SD=0.29$), identifies platform to communicate teachers, parents, learners and stakeholders ($M=3.90$, $SD=0.30$), establish management team, empowers the team and develops opportunities for students' utmost learning amidst pandemic ($M=3.89$, $SD=0.32$), teachers' development in using learning modality chosen by the school and develops safe environment ($M=3.88$, $SD=0.33$), celebrates achievements and success both for teachers and learners for them to feel valued ($M=3.87$, $SD=0.35$), and facilitates appropriate recovery strategies for students who are

lagging behind ($M=3.87$, $SD=0.33$).

Similarly, the teachers observed that the school head's performance in the learning environment in the new normal was *very high* in terms of continuous communication between the teachers, parents, and the learners ($M=3.73$, $SD=0.49$), developing a safe environment ($M=3.71$, $SD=0.49$), teachers' development in using learning modality chosen by the school, empowers the team and creates opportunities for students' utmost learning amidst pandemic and empowers the team to come up with creative and innovative solutions ($M=3.70$, $SD=0.49$), and develops care and committee programs ($M=3.69$, $SD=0.51$).

The level of the school heads' performance in a learning environment in the new normal was *very high*, as shown by the overall mean of 3.89. The teachers showed their level of perception as disclosed by the general standard of 3.70.

Table 10 illustrates the mean level of the school heads' performance in human resource management.

Table 10

Level of the School Heads' Performance in terms of Human Resource Management

| The Principal/School Head... | PRINCIPAL | | TEACHER | | | |
|--|-----------|------|-----------|------|------|-----------|
| | MEAN | SD | ANALYSIS | MEAN | SD | ANALYSIS |
| 1. initiate activities necessary for the maintenance of the workforce within the institution. | 3.92 | 0.28 | Very High | 3.71 | 0.50 | Very High |
| 2. administers and attends to teachers' and staff's work-life needs. | 3.89 | 0.32 | Very High | 3.68 | 0.50 | Very High |
| 3. identifies staffing requirements and ensure the proper selection of workforce. | 3.89 | 0.31 | Very High | 3.69 | 0.51 | Very High |
| 4. encourages educational and professional development among staff. | 3.84 | 0.37 | Very High | 3.72 | 0.47 | Very High |
| 5. leads in a holistic and fair performance appraisal. | 3.92 | 0.28 | Very High | 3.69 | 0.50 | Very High |
| 6. leads in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of school projects and programs. | 3.89 | 0.32 | Very High | 3.70 | 0.50 | Very High |
| 7. leads in the realization of the school's mission and vision. | 3.93 | 0.26 | Very High | 3.71 | 0.48 | Very High |
| 8. maintains high visibility (even in the virtual platform) to maintain work encouragement and direction | 3.91 | 0.29 | Very High | 3.72 | 0.48 | Very High |
| 9. develops programs for incentives for workforce dedication and achievement | 3.93 | 0.26 | Very High | 3.70 | 0.51 | Very High |
| 10. identifies available resources for more effective management of staff's knowledge and skills. | 3.92 | 0.28 | Very High | 3.71 | 0.49 | Very High |
| Overall Mean | 3.90 | | | 3.70 | | |

| | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| SD | 0.30 | 0.49 |
| Verbal Interpretation | Very High | Very High |
| Legend | | |
| Range | Verbal Interpretation | |
| 3.51-4.00 | Very High | |
| 2.51-3.50 | High | |
| 1.51-2.50 | Moderately High | |
| 1.00-1.50 | Low | |

The principals perceived that their performance in human resource management was *very high* in terms of leading in the realization of the mission and vision of the school and developing programs for incentives for workforce dedication and achievement ($M=3.93$, $SD=0.26$), initiating activities for the maintenance of the workforce within the institution and leads in a holistic and fair performance appraisal and identifies available resources for more effective management of staff's knowledge and skills ($M=3.92$, $SD=0.28$), maintain work encouragement and direction ($M=3.91$, $SD=0.29$), and identifies staffing requirements ($M=3.89$, $SD=0.32$).

Furthermore, the teachers observed that the school head's performance in terms of human resource management was *very high* as to encourage educational and professional development among staff ($M=3.72$, $SD=0.47$), maintain work encouragement and direction, *and* ($M=3.72$, $SD=0.48$), maintenance of the workforce within the institution ($M=3.71$, $SD=0.50$), leads in the realization of the mission and vision of the school ($M=3.71$, $SD=0.48$), identifies available resources for more effective management of staff's knowledge and skills ($M=3.71$, $SD=0.49$).

The school heads' performance in terms of the principals' human resource management was *very high*, as disclosed by the overall mean of 3.90. The teachers showed the same level of perception as revealed by the general standard of 3.70.

Table 11 illustrates the mean level of the school heads' performance in community and stakeholders' partnership.

Table 11

Level of the School Heads' Performance in terms of Community and Stakeholders' Partnership

| The Principal/School Head... | PRINCIPAL | | | TEACHER | | |
|---|-----------|------|-----------|---------|------|-----------|
| | MEAN | SD | ANALYSIS | MEAN | SD | ANALYSIS |
| 1. identifies who the stakeholders are and what are the goals for engaging with them. | 3.91 | 0.29 | Very High | 3.71 | 0.48 | Very High |
| 2. engages stakeholders by seeking to harness their insights. | 3.90 | 0.30 | Very High | 3.70 | 0.47 | Very High |
| 3. influences the stakeholders' attitudes. | 3.91 | 0.29 | Very High | 3.68 | 0.50 | Very High |
| 4. constantly monitors communication outcomes with stakeholders and reassess plans where necessary. | 3.92 | 0.27 | Very High | 3.69 | 0.49 | Very High |
| 5. makes thoughtful gestures with stakeholders and pays them genuine | 3.94 | 0.23 | Very High | 3.70 | 0.49 | Very High |

compliments.

| | | | | | | |
|---|------|------|-----------|------|------|-----------|
| 6. builds communities of interest and promotes those stakeholders whose impact on the school's initiative is most significant. | 3.94 | 0.24 | Very High | 3.71 | 0.48 | Very High |
| 7. advocates respect among school staff towards stakeholders. | 3.91 | 0.29 | Very High | 3.72 | 0.47 | Very High |
| 8. provides guidance and direction to students, parents, and families on how to create distraction-free learning environments at home that are conducive to learning. | 3.91 | 0.29 | Very High | 3.71 | 0.48 | Very High |
| 9. develops and communicates to staff and parents/families the protocols for providing special education services and accommodations for students in need. | 3.91 | 0.29 | Very High | 3.71 | 0.48 | Very High |
| 10. taps community partners and shares with them the institutions' mission and vision. | 3.91 | 0.29 | Very High | 3.71 | 0.48 | Very High |

| | | |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|
| Overall Mean | 3.91 | 3.70 |
| SD | 0.28 | 0.48 |
| Verbal Interpretation | Very High | Very High |

Legend

| Range | Verbal Interpretation |
|-----------|-----------------------|
| 3.51-4.00 | Very High |
| 2.51-3.50 | High |
| 1.51-2.50 | Moderately High |
| 1.00-1.50 | Low |

The principals distinguished that their performance related to community and stakeholders' partnership was *very high* in terms of making thoughtful gestures with stakeholders and paying them genuine compliments ($M=3.94$, $SD=0.23$), building communities of interest, and promoting those stakeholders whose impact on the school's initiative are greatest ($M=3.94$, $SD=0.24$), monitors the outcomes of communication with stakeholders ($M=3.92$, $SD=0.27$), identifies the goals engaging them, influences the stakeholders' attitudes, advocates respect among school staff towards stakeholders, create distraction-free learning environments at home, taps community partners ($M=3.91$, $SD=0.29$), and engages stakeholders by seeking to harness their insights ($M=3.90$, $SD=0.30$).

In addition, the teachers perceived that the school head's performance related to community and stakeholders' partnership was *very high* as to advocates respect from among school staff towards stakeholders ($M=3.72$, $SD=0.47$), identifies the goals engaging them, builds communities of interest and promote those stakeholders, create distraction-free learning environments at home, develops and communicate to staff and parents/families the protocols for providing special education services and accommodations for students in need, and taps community partners ($M=3.71$, $SD=0.48$), and monitors the outcome of communication with stakeholders ($M=3.69$, $SD=0.49$).

The overall mean of 3.91 revealed that the school heads' performance in terms of principals' community and stakeholder partnership was very high. Similarly, the teachers displayed the same level of

perception with an overall mean of 3.70.

Table 12 illustrates the mean level of the school heads' performance in school leadership and management.

Table 12

Level of the School Heads' Performance in terms of School Leadership and Management

| The Principal/School Head... | PRINCIPAL | | | TEACHER | | |
|--|-----------|------|-----------|-----------|------|-----------|
| | MEAN | SD | ANALYSIS | MEAN | SD | ANALYSIS |
| 1. understands what resources are available and when to utilize them. | 3.89 | 0.32 | Very High | 3.71 | 0.48 | Very High |
| 2. assesses the skills of each person and whether additional skills (or people) need to be added | 3.92 | 0.27 | Very High | 3.69 | 0.50 | Very High |
| 3. knows where people are already committed and if those allocations are appropriate | 3.89 | 0.31 | Very High | 3.68 | 0.51 | Very High |
| 4. understands actual capacity to do work, recognizing that not all time can be utilized | 3.90 | 0.29 | Very High | 3.69 | 0.51 | Very High |
| 5. identifies those prioritized initiatives and specialized skills with the most attention | 3.87 | 0.33 | Very High | 3.68 | 0.52 | Very High |
| 6. sees, monitors, and attains what is required to deliver projects. | 3.88 | 0.33 | Very High | 3.68 | 0.50 | Very High |
| 7. minimizes both idle time and overutilization of resources. | 3.89 | 0.32 | Very High | 3.67 | 0.50 | Very High |
| 8. is open to employees by discussing important issues such as finances, plans, teachers' morale, and staff ideas. | 3.92 | 0.28 | Very High | 3.69 | 0.51 | Very High |
| 9. creates opportunities for school personnel to participate in support groups. | 3.89 | 0.31 | Very High | 3.70 | 0.49 | Very High |
| 10. communicates specific changes and next steps that need to be made as a result of the feedback obtained. | 3.91 | 0.29 | Very High | 3.69 | 0.49 | Very High |
| Overall Mean | | | | 3.69 | | |
| SD | 0.31 | | | 0.50 | | |
| Verbal Interpretation | Very High | | | Very High | | |

Legend

| <i>Range</i> | <i>Verbal Interpretation</i> |
|--------------|------------------------------|
| 3.51-4.00 | Very High |
| 2.51-3.50 | High |

1.51-2.50 Moderately High
1.00-1.50 Low

The principals perceived that the school performance related to school leadership and management was *very high* as to assess the skills of each person and whether additional skills (or people) need to be added ($M=3.92, SD=0.27$), is open to employees by discussing important issues such as finances, plans, teachers' morale, and staff ideas ($M=3.92, SD=0.28$), communicates specific changes and next steps that need to be made as a result of the feedbacks obtained score ($M=3.91, SD=0.29$), understands actual capacity to do work ($M=3.90, SD=0.29$), and minimizes both idle time and overutilization of resources and understands what resources are available ($M=3.89, SD=0.32$).

In addition, the teachers observed that the school head's performance in terms of school leadership and management was *very high* as to understanding what resources are available and when to utilize them ($M=3.71, SD=0.48$), creating opportunities for school personnel to participate in support groups ($M=3.70, SD=0.49$), understands the capacity to do work and is open to employees by discussing important issues such as finances, plans, teachers' morale, and staff ideas ($M=3.69, SD=0.51$), assesses the skills of each person and whether additional skills (or people) need to be added ($M=3.69, SD=0.50$), and prioritized initiatives and specialized skills with the most attention($M=3.68, SD=0.52$).

The level of the school heads' performance in principals' school leadership and management was revealed by the overall mean of 3.90 and a standard deviation of 0.31 and interpreted as *very high*. Similarly, the teachers' perception has an overall mean of 3.69 and a standard deviation of 0.50 and is interpreted as *very high*.

Relationship between the Context Operationalization of School Learning Continuity Plan and the School Heads' Performance in the Division of Laguna

Table 13 presents the Relationship between Focus on Learning and School Heads' Performance.

Table 13

Relationship between the Context Operationalization of School Learning Continuity Plan and the School Heads' Performance in the Division of Laguna

| School Learning Continuity Plan | Instructional Leadership | | | Learning Environment in New Normal | | | Human Resource Management | | | Community Stakeholder's Partnership | | | School Leadership and Management | | |
|---|--------------------------|---------|----------|------------------------------------|---------|----------|---------------------------|---------|----------|-------------------------------------|---------|----------|----------------------------------|---------|----------|
| | r-value | p-value | Analysis | r-value | p-value | Analysis | r-value | p-value | Analysis | r-value | p-value | Analysis | r-value | p-value | Analysis |
| Focus on Learning | 0.085 | 0.286 | NS | 0.089 | 0.264 | NS | 0.051 | 0.524 | NS | -0.001 | 0.988 | NS | 0.013 | 0.867 | NS |
| Ensuring Quality of Teaching and Learning Process | 0.126 | 0.114 | NS | 0.095 | 0.234 | NS | 0.042 | 0.601 | NS | 0.012 | 0.884 | NS | 0.004 | 0.960 | NS |
| Provision of Learning Resources | 0.199 | 0.012 | S | 0.125 | 0.117 | NS | 0.130 | 0.103 | NS | 0.080 | 0.319 | NS | 0.045 | 0.571 | NS |
| Safe Operation | 0.076 | 0.342 | NS | 0.131 | 0.101 | NS | 0.178 | 0.025 | S | 0.146 | 0.067 | NS | 0.070 | 0.383 | NS |
| Well-Being and Protection | 0.273 | 0.001 | S | 0.200 | 0.012 | S | 0.193 | 0.015 | S | 0.118 | 0.139 | NS | 0.066 | 0.411 | NS |
| Education Financing | 0.318 | 0.000 | S | 0.159 | 0.045 | S | 0.152 | 0.057 | NS | 0.117 | 0.143 | NS | 0.149 | 0.062 | NS |
| Reaching the Marginalized | 0.539 | 0.000 | S | 0.333 | 0.000 | S | 0.250 | 0.002 | S | 0.116 | 0.147 | NS | 0.118 | 0.140 | NS |
| Degree of Correlation: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ±0.80 – ±1.00 <i>Very strong</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ±0.60 – ±0.79 <i>Strong</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ±0.40 – ±0.59 <i>Moderate</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ±0.20 – ±0.39 <i>Weak</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ±0.00 – ±0.19 <i>Very weak</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| p ≤ 0.05 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

The focus on learning has *no significant relationship* with the performance of the school heads in terms of instructional leadership ($r=0.085$, $p=0.286$), learning environment ($r=0.089$, $p=0.264$), human resource management ($r=0.051$, $p=0.524$), community and stakeholder's partnership ($r=-0.001$, $p=0.988$), leadership and management ($r=0.013$, $p=0.867$). Furthermore, the p-values obtained were greater than the significance alpha of 0.05, indicating that no significance was found.

In ensuring the quality of the teaching and learning process, *no significant relationship* was observed with the school head's performance in terms of instructional leadership ($r=0.126$, $p=0.114$), learning environment ($r=0.095$, $p=0.234$), human resource management ($r=0.045$, $p=0.601$), community and stakeholder's partnership ($r=0.012$, $p=0.884$), leadership and management ($r=0.004$, $p=0.960$), and since the p-values obtained were more significant than the significance alpha 0.05.

Moreover, the provision of learning resources has *a significant relationship* with the school head's performance regarding instructional leadership ($r=0.199$, $p=0.012$) and a p-value less than the significance alpha of 0.05. However, in terms of learning environment ($r=0.125$, $p=0.117$), human resource management ($r=0.130$, $p=0.103$), community and stakeholder's partnership ($r=0.080$), leadership and management ($r=0.045$, $p=0.571$) with p-values were greater than significance alpha 0.05 indicating that *no significant relationship* was identified.

Furthermore, there is a *significant relationship* between the safe operation and the school head's performance in human resource management ($r=0.178$, $p=0.025$); which p-value is less than the significance alpha of 0.05. In addition, in terms of instructional leadership ($r=0.076$, $p=0.342$), learning environment ($r=0.131$, $p=0.101$), community and stakeholder's partnership ($r=0.146$, $p=0.067$), and leadership and management ($r=0.070$, $p=0.383$) *no significant relationship* was observed since p-values were greater than significance alpha 0.05.

Well-being and protection have a *significant relationship* in school head's performance in terms of instructional leadership ($r=0.273$), learning environment ($r=0.200$), human resource management ($r=0.193$) with p-values of 0.001, 0.012 and 0.015 respectively, which are less than the significance alpha 0.05. On the other hand, in terms of community and stakeholder partnership ($r=0.118$, $p=0.139$) and leadership and management ($r=0.066$, $p=0.411$), *no significant relationship* was observed since p-values were greater than significance alpha 0.05.

Education financing has a *significant relationship* with the school head's performance in instructional leadership ($r=0.318$, $p=0.000$) and learning environment ($r=0.159$, $p=0.045$) with p-values that were less than the significance alpha 0.05. Furthermore, no significant relationship was found in terms of human resource management ($r=0.152$, $p=0.057$), community and stakeholder partnership ($r=0.117$, $p=0.143$), and leadership and management ($r=0.149$, $p=0.062$) with p-values greater than the significance alpha 0.05.

In reaching the marginalized, *a significant relationship* was observed with the school head's performance in terms of instructional leadership ($r=0.539$, $p=0.000$), learning environment ($r=0.33$, $p=0.000$), and human resource management ($r=0.250$, $p=0.002$), since p-values were less than the significance alpha 0.05. In community and stakeholder's partnership ($r=0.016$, $p=0.147$), leadership, and management ($r=0.118$, $p=0.140$), *no significant relationship* was found since the p-values were greater than the significance alpha of 0.05.

The difference in the Context Operationalization School Learning Continuity Plan and School Head's Performance the Teachers' and School Heads' Perception

Table 14 presents the difference in the context operationalization of school learning continuity plans based on the teachers' and school heads' perceptions.

Table 14

The difference in the Context Operationalization School Learning Continuity Plan is based on the Teachers' and School Heads' Perceptions.

| | Mean | Computed F-value | p-value | Analysis |
|--|-------|------------------|---------|-------------|
| Focus on Learning | | | | |
| School Heads | 3.835 | 7.230 | 0.007 | Significant |
| Teachers | 3.751 | | | |
| Ensuring Quality of Teaching and Learning Process | | | | |
| School Heads | 3.857 | 7.025 | 0.008 | Significant |
| Teachers | 3.779 | | | |
| Provision of Learning Resources | | | | |
| School Heads | 3.838 | 22.397 | 0.000 | Significant |
| Teachers | 3.672 | | | |
| Safe Operations | | | | |
| School Heads | 3.884 | 14.859 | 0.000 | Significant |
| Teachers | 3.770 | | | |
| Well-being and Protection | | | | |
| School Heads | 3.834 | 10.218 | 0.001 | Significant |
| Teachers | 3.716 | | | |
| Education Financing | | | | |
| School Heads | 3.830 | 22.628 | 0.000 | Significant |
| Teachers | 3.641 | | | |
| Reaching the Marginalized | | | | |
| School Heads | 3.862 | 11.984 | 0.001 | Significant |
| Teachers | 3.731 | | | |

$p \leq 0.05$

It shows a *significant difference* in the perceptions of the teachers and school heads in all indicators of school heads' context operationalization of school learning continuity. This was revealed by the computed F values for all the indicators, which were more significant than the critical F value of 3.859. Furthermore, p-values were all less than the significance alpha of 0.05, indicating that a *significant difference* was identified.

It implies that school leaders were also considerate about the struggle experienced by the teachers in the new normal. Even though they advise the teachers to employ active learning in teaching, they are not pressuring the teachers. It is a good sign that they are using appreciative inquiry in the conduct of virtual observation. Because of the struggles brought about by the COVID-19 pandemic, the Department of Education is pursuing different measures to provide quality education. Enclosure to DepEd Order No. 012, s. 2020 is the Learning Continuity Plan which will be used during the time of the pandemic. This LCP aims to ensure the continuity of learning delivery by offering different learning delivery modalities (Donato, N. M., 2021).

Table 15 presents the difference in the school heads' performance based on the teachers' and school heads' perceptions.

Table 15

The difference between the School Heads' Performance based on the Teachers' and School Heads' Perception

| | Mean | Computed F-value | p-value | Analysis |
|--|-------|------------------|---------|-------------|
| Instructional Leadership | | | | |
| School Heads | 3.904 | 32.350 | 0.000 | Significant |
| Teachers | 3.702 | | | |
| Learning Environment in the New Normal | | | | |
| School Heads | 3.889 | 27.759 | 0.000 | Significant |
| Teachers | 3.607 | | | |
| Human Resource Management | | | | |
| School Heads | 3.903 | 31.321 | 0.000 | Significant |
| Teachers | 3.702 | | | |
| Community and Stakeholders' Partnership | | | | |
| School Heads | 3.703 | 35.910 | 0.000 | Significant |
| Teachers | 3.914 | | | |
| School Leadership and Management | | | | |
| School Heads | 3.896 | 32.489 | 0.000 | Significant |
| Teachers | 3.688 | | | |

$p \leq 0.05$

This implies that the perceptions of teachers and school heads *significantly differ* in the school heads' performance, as disclosed by the computed F-values of all indicators that were more important than the critical F value of 3.859. Moreover, p-values were all less than the significance alpha of 0.05, indicating that a *significant difference* was identified.

Thus, from the findings above, it can be inferred that at a 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis stating that "There is no significant difference in the school heads' operationalization and performance based on the teachers' and school heads' perception" is rejected. The alternative should be accepted, which incites that there is a significant difference.

4. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings, the following conclusions were drawn.

There is no significant relationship between Context Operationalization of School Learning Continuity Plan and the School Heads' Performance in the Division of Laguna, and the null hypothesis is accepted.

There is no significant difference in the school's head operationalization and performance based on the teachers' and school heads' perceptions, and the null hypothesis are rejected.

Through the conclusions drawn from the findings, the following recommendations are made: 1. The Department of Education Officials should strengthen their training, seminars, and conferences for the

supervisors and principals to improve their skills in contingency planning. Training for the faculty, students, and stakeholders should be conducted to match the pace of change in the school environment. As the education sector is changing insanely fast, schools need to develop a creative thinking process and a logical point of view with a forward vision. 2. The school supervisors should give technical assistance to the school heads having difficulties implementing a school learning continuity plan. The supervisor should also check the teachers/students' performance and evaluate the plan's effectiveness. 3. The school heads may create awareness among stakeholders about the current situation of the schools and involve them in all school activities and projects. School heads should explain their vision for the school, which can then be shared with stakeholders. By communicating with these groups, school heads can better understand the needs of the school, which will help them plan for the future. 4. School leaders should continue inspiring and coordinating their teams to take collective action to address challenges. This is important because it gives the school's leadership a sense of unity, which helps them make decisions that align with the needs of the school. It also allows them to gather information from their team members, which will help them address issues as they arise. 5. The school heads should encourage teachers to participate and give their planning opinions. The school heads need to understand the teachers' views, as they will be working with the students. It is also vital for them to know what teachers think about the school's goals to help them attain those goals. 6. To support the plan, the school should consider the necessary equipment, resources, and technology. The school should ensure that there are enough resources available so that there is no disruption caused by a lack of materials or materials not being available for use because they are needed elsewhere. 7. When faced with challenging circumstances, the institution should ensure academic continuity by adopting decisive decisions. This can be done by having teachers and staff work together to keep the school functioning as normal during a crisis or by using their knowledge of the curriculum to help students in distress.

5. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to extend appreciation to the participants of the study.

6. REFERENCES

- Abad, M. (2020, July 02). Printed materials, online classes 'most preferred.' for distance learning – DepEd. Rappler. Retrieved from <https://rappler.com/nation/>
- Al-Samarrai, S., Gangwar, M., & Gala, P. (2020). The Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Education Financing. Economic Impact of COVID-19. World Bank, Washington, DC. © World Bank. Retrieved from <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/33739> License: CC BY 3.0 IGO.”
- Alenezi, A. (2020, January) The Role of e-Learning Materials in Enhancing Teaching and Learning Behaviors. *International Journal of Information and Education Technology*, Vol. 10, No. 1. Retrieved from <http://www.ijiet.org/vol10/1338-JR373.pdf>
- Alrefaie, Z., Hassanien, M. & AlHayani, A. (2020). Monitoring Online Learning During COVID-19 Pandemic; Suggested Online Learning Portfolio (COVID-19 OLP). MedEdPublish. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.15694/mep.2020.000110.1>
- Algonquin 2019 Algonquin College --Academic Continuity. Retrieved

from:http://www3.algonquincollege.com/col/files/2011/12/Academic_Continuity_Tips_for_Faculty_V31.pdf.

Andreasen, R. E. (2017, December). Continuity of operations plans: Policy and strategy for k-12 schools in the state of Florida. Monterey, California, United States: Naval Postgraduate School. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/10945/10725>

Ashby, C. M. (2017, May). Emergency management: Status of school districts' planning and preparedness. Washington, D.C. Retrieved from <http://www.gao.gov/assets/120/116698.pdf>.

Aureada, J., (2021). The Instructional Leadership Practices of School Heads. International Journal of Educational Management and Development Studies. Retrieved from https://iiari.org/journal_article/v2-2-142/

Banayo, A., Barleta, C., (2021). Online Education as an Active Learning Environment in the New Normal. *International Journal of Educational Management and Development Studies*. Retrieved from <https://www.deepdyve.com/lp/unpaywall/online-education-as-an-active-learning-environment-in-the-new-normal>

Banda, M. (2020). Deped- Sta.Catalina Integrated National High School Majayjay, L., Laguna State Polytechnic University. Leadership of the School Heads and Level of Teachers Performance Among the Secondary Schools in The Division of Laguna. International Journal of Advanced Research, Retrieved from <http://www.journalijar.com/article/32692/leadership-of-the-school-heads-and-level-of-teachers-performance-among-the-secondary-schools-in-the-division-of-laguna/>

Barrett, N. (2020, April). What Charter Schools Need to Know Covid and Education Finance: Acting During the Impending Fiscal Downturn. National Alliance for Public Charter School. Retrieved From <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED609753.pdf>

Bates, R.2016 The Seasonal Resort Community: Structural Adjustments to Population Undulation. Dissertation, The University of Delaware.

Bourque, L. (2018). Correlates of school disaster preparedness: main effects of funding and coordinator role. *National Hazards Rev.*, I(9), 49-59.

Boyko, M, et al. (2021). The Quality of Training Future Teachers during the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Case from TNPU. *Education Sciences* 11, no. 11: 660. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci11110660>

Buban, L. & Digo, G. (2021). Management Beliefs and Practices of Elementary School Heads on Instructional Leadership. International Journal of Research - Granthaalayah. Retrieved from <https://www.granthaalayahpublication.org/journals/index.php/granthaalayah/article/view/4088>

Charvat, S. (2017, December 21). Continuity of school operations: identifying and training substitute personnel for incident command roles. Washington, D.C.: Department of Homeland Security.

Retrieved from <https://www.hsdl.org/?view&did=231798>

- Chavez, L. (2020, April 03). For Philippines' displaced indigenous students, COVID-19 is one of many threats. *Mongabay*. Retrieved from <https://news.mongabay.com/>
- Clerk to Governors. (2016, October 30). What does a school business continuity plan look like? Clerk of governors. Retrieved from <http://www.clerktogovernors.co.uk/what-does-a-school-business-continuity-plan-look-like/>
- Collins, C. A. (2019). Factors influencing school closure and dismissal decisions: influenza A (H1N1), Michigan, 2009. *Journal of School Health*, 56-62.
- Copolla, D. (2017). Introduction to International Disaster Management, Second Edition. Boston, Elsevier. CSU 2017 Institutional Technology Strategic Plan. Clayton State University
- De Villa, J. & Manalo, F. (2020, September). Secondary Teachers' Preparation, Challenges, and Coping Mechanism in the Pre-Implementation of Distance Learning in the New Normal. *IOER International Multidisciplinary Research Journal, Volume 2, Issue 3, pp. 144 – 154*. Retrieved from https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3717608
- De Vera, D. E. (2017). Indigenous Peoples in the Philippines: A country case study. Presented at the RNIP Regional Assembly Hanoi, Vietnam. Retrieved from <http://www.iapad.org/wp-content/uploads/>
- Department of Education (2020). DepEd Basic Education Learning Continuity Plan in the time of COVID-19. Retrieved from <https://www.teacherph.com/>
- Dibner, K, Schweingruber, H., & Christakis D. (2020). Reopening K-12 Schools During the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Report from the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. *JAMA*. 2020;324(9):833–834. Retrieved from doi:10.1001/jama.2020.14745
- Dziuban, C., Graham, C.R., Moskal, P.D. *et al.* (2018). Blended learning: The New Normal and Emerging Technologies. *Int J Educ Technol High Educ* 15, 3. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-017-0087-5>
- Esquith, A. D. (2018). Guide for developing high-quality school emergency operations plans. *fbi.gov*. # Retrieved from <https://www.fbi.gov/about-us/office-of-partner-engagement/active-shooter-incidents/emergency-plans-for-schools>
- Faherty, L. et al. (2019). School and Preparedness Officials' Perspectives on Social Distancing Practices to Reduce Influenza Transmission During a Pandemic: Considerations to Guide Future Work. *Science Direct Journal*. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pmedr.2019.100871>
- Foundation for the Philippine Environment (2013). Where are Indigenous Peoples Distributed in the Philippines? Retrieved from <https://fpe.ph/indigenous-communities.html/view/>
- Georgetown 2017 Academic Continuity. Retrieved from:

<https://blogs.commonsgorgetown.edu/academiccontinuity/> FEMA 2012 Federal Emergency Management Agency. <http://www.fema.gov>

Grant, T. et al., (2020). Transformation to Learning from a Distance. *MedEd Publish: An Official Journal*. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.15694/mep.2020.000076.1>

Grigg, J. (2017). School enrollment changes and student achievement growth: a case study in educational disruption and continuity. *Sociology of Education*, 85 (4),388-404.

Hernando-Malipot, M. (2020, July 03). DepEd: Most students prefer ‘modular’ learning over online. Manila Bulletin. Retrieved from <https://mb.com.ph/>

Hew, K.F., Jia, C., Gonda, D.E. et al. (2020). Transitioning to the “new normal” of learning in unpredictable times: pedagogical practices and learning performance in *fully online* flipped classrooms. *Int J Educ Technol High Educ* 17, 57. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-020-00234-x>

Hine, S. N. (2015). Investment for education in emergencies: A review of evidence. London: ODI.

International Finance Corporation. (2020). Disaster and emergency preparedness: guidance for schools. International Finance Corporation. Retrieved from <http://www.ifc.org/wps/wcm/connect/8b796b004970c0199a7ada336b93d75f/DisERHandbook.pdf?MOD=AJPERES>

Hopkins, V. C. (2019, April 8). In the face of danger: comprehensive emergency preparedness and response for schools. Penn GSE Perspectives on urban education. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ835618.pdf>

Kuusimaki, A., Malmivaara, L. & Tirri, K. (2019). Parents’ and Teachers’ Views on Digital Communication in Finland. *Education Research International*, Article ID 8236786, 7 pages, 2019. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1155/2019/8236786>

JBHE 2018 Hurricane Katrina. The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education. Retrieved from: www.jbhe.com/features/49_hurricane_katrina.html.

Kimble-Hill, C., et al. (2020). Insights Gained into Marginalized Students Access Challenges During the COVID-19 Academic Response. *Journal of Chemical Education* 97 (9), 3391-3395. Retrieved from DOI: 10.1021/acs.jchemed.0c00774

Kingsley, P. (2020, April 17). In Denmark, the rarest of sights: Classrooms full of students. New York Times. <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/04/17/world/europe/>

Lawless, C. (2020, April 23). Synchronous vs asynchronous learning: Which is right for your learners? LearnUpon. Retrieved from <https://www.learnupon.com/blog/>

Liu, S. & Hallinger, P. (2018). Principal Instructional Leadership, Teacher Self-Efficacy, and Teacher Professional Learning in China: Testing a Mediated-Effects Model. *SAGE Journal* Volume: 54 issue: 4, page(s): 501-528. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X18769048>

- McCullar, S. 2017 Crisis Management Post Hurricane Katrina: A Qualitative Study of a Higher Education Institution's Administrator's Response to Crisis management. Dissertation. Louisiana State University.
- McEntire, D. A. (2007). Disaster response and recovery: strategies and tactics for resilience. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- McFadden, J. J. (2007). The business continuity plan: outline for school disaster recovery. *International management review*, 3(4), 5-11.
- McLeod, S. & Dulsky, S. (2021). Resilience, Reorientation, and Reinvention: School Leadership During the Early Months of the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Frontier in Education*. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2021.637075>
- Meador, D. (2019, August). How School Leaders Can Help Improve Teacher Quality. Retrieved from <https://www.thoughtco.com/improving-teacher-quality-3194527>
- Melnick, H., Darling-Hammond, L., Leung, M., Yun, C., Schachner, A., Plasencia, S., & Ondrasek, N. (2020, May 15). Reopening schools in the context of COVID-19: Health and safety guidelines from other countries. Learning Policy Institute. Retrieved from <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/>
- Mercer, C. 2015 Issues Raised by Hurricane Katrina: A Focus on Education and Training. Congressional Research Service, 9/16/2005.
- Microsoft Philippines Communications Team (2018). Empowering the indigenous learners in the Philippines through education. Retrieved from <https://news.microsoft.com/en-ph/>
- Natividad, N. & Natividad, E. (2020, April). Preparedness of Elementary School Teachers in the Implementation of Blended Distance Learning: Basis for Technical Assistance. Retrieved from <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3889400> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3889400>
- OECD iLibrary (2017). The Funding of School Education Connecting Resources and Learning. Retrieved From <https://www.oecd.org/education/the-impact-of-covid-19-on-education-insights-education-at-a-glance-2020.pdf>
- Omar (2020, April 21). Afghan students move to remote classes to fill gap caused by coronavirus. *Salaam Times*. Retrieved from <https://afghanistan.asia-news.com/>
- Pendergast, D., et al. (2018). Engaging Marginalized, “At-Risk” Middle-Level Students: A Focus on the Importance of a Sense of Belonging at School. *Education Sciences*, 8(3), 138. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci8030138>
- Peralta, J. (2017, August 27). Over 2.3 million households remain without electricity – NEA. *CNN Philippines*. Retrieved from <https://www.cnn.ph/news/>
- Quarantelli, E. 1999 Disaster-Related Social Behavior: A Summary of 50 Years of Research Findings. University of Delaware Disaster Research Center, Preliminary Paper #280.

- Roberts, T. & Hernandez, K. (2019). Digital access is not binary: The 5'A's of technology access in the Philippines. *The Electronic Journal of Information Systems in Developing Countries*, 85(4), 1-14
<https://doi.org/10.1002/isd2.12084>
- Roskvist, R., Eggleton, K. & Goodyear-Smith, F. (2020). Provision of e-learning programmes to replace undergraduate medical students' clinical general practice attachments during COVID-19 stand-down, *Education for Primary Care*, 31:4, 247-254, DOI: 10.1080/14739879.2020.1772123
- Sabates, R., Carter, E., & Stern, J., (2021). Using educational transitions to Estimate Learning Loss due to COVID-19 School Closures: The case of Complementary Basic Education in Ghana. *International Journal of Educational Development Volume 82*. Retrieved from <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0738059321000304>
- Schleicher, A. (2020). The Impact of Covid-19 On Education Insights from Education At A Glance 2020. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED616315>
- Schweber, C. 2018 Determined to Learn: Accessing Education Despite Life-threatening Disasters. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, Vol. 12: Issue 1.
- Senner, J. 2018 Academic Continuity and Institutional Resilience in Higher Education. Retrieved :<http://www.academiccontinuity.org/node/288>.
- Smith, T. & Sheridan, S. (2019). The Effects of Teacher Training on Teachers' Family-Engagement Practices, Attitudes, and Knowledge: A Meta-analysis, *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 29:2, 128-157, Retrieved from DOI: 10.1080/10474412.2018.1460725
- Stephens, K. (2011, August 8). Social Media in School Emergency Management: Using New Media Technology to Improve Emergency Management Communications. ERIC. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED543578>
- Sujasan, S. & Wibowo, U. (2021). The Survival of School Financing Management in COVID-19 Pandemic. *Journal of Education and Learning (EduLearn)*, v15 n4 p563-570. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1324932>
- Sundaram, N. et al. (2021, June). Implementation of preventive measures to prevent COVID-19: a national study of English primary schools in summer 2020, *Health Education Research*, Volume 36, Issue 3, Pages 272–285, <https://doi.org/10.1093/her/cyab016>
- Sweet, K. (2020). What is an educational module? Classroom. Retrieved from <https://classroom.synonym.com/>
- Tamayo, B. (2018, March 28). 2.4-M households are still without electricity – senator. *The Manila Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.manilatimes.net/2018/03/28/news/national/>
- Templeton, D. 2016 Maintaining Institutional Academic Continuity in an Emergency or Crisis Event. Retrieved from: <http://www.educause.edu/southeast--regional--conference/2010/maintaing--institutional--academic--continuity--efforts>.

Texas A&M 2018 Texas A&M Strategic Plan, Appendix J. Retrieved from:
<http://www.tamus.edu/offices/strategicplan/appendixj>.

Texas School Safety Center. (2018). School continuity of operations preparedness. TexasState. Retrieved from <https://txssc.txstate.edu/topics/emergency-management/articles/school-continuity-of-operations>

Ul Hassan, U. & Parveen, I. (2019). Schools' Leadership and Employees' Work-engagement: Evidences from Secondary Schools. January 2019 Pakistan Journal of Education 31(2) Retrieved from DOI:10.30971/pje.v31i2.69

UNESCO (2020). COVID-19 education response. Retrieved from <https://en.unesco.org/covid19/educationresponse/globalcoalition>

Yeap, C., Suhaimi, N., Khalid M., & Nasir, M. (2021, August).: Issues, Challenges, and Suggestions for Empowering Technical Vocational Education and Training Education during the COVID-19 Pandemic in Malaysia. Creative Education Vol.12 No.8. Retrieved from <https://www.scirp.org/journal/paperinformation.aspx?paperid=111136>

Ying Hu, B. et al. (2022) Profiles of Provision for Learning in Preschool Classrooms in Rural China: Associated Quality of Teacher-child Interactions and Teacher Characteristics, Early Education and Development, 33:1, 121-138, DOI: 10.1080/10409289.2020.1802567

Zuniga-Tonio, J. (2021) Google Classroom as a Tool of Support for Flexible Learning in the New Normal. Journal of Education, Management and Development Studies. Vol. 1 No. 2. Retrieved from <https://journals.cspc.edu.ph/index.php/jemds/article/view/20>