The School Learning Action Cell (Slac): Its Influence on Teachers' Proficiency and School Performance From the Perspectives of Teachers and School Heads

Mark Anthony Esguerra Gahite [a]

markanthony.gahite001@deped.gov.ph
Laguna State Polytechnic University Sta. Cruz Laguna 4009 PHILIPPINES

Abstract

This study aims to determine the relationship of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) to teachers' proficiency and school performance. This study also answers the following: (1) The Level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) in terms of Planning and Management, (2) The Level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) in terms of Classroom Management, (3) The Level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) in terms of Classroom Instruction, (4) The Level of Teachers' Proficiency, (5) The Level of School Performance, (6) Relationship between School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) and Teachers' Proficiency, and (7) Relationship between School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) and School Performance.

In this study, descriptive-correlation research design was used to examine the relationship of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) to teachers' proficiency and school performance among the Junior High School in the Schools Division Office of San Pedro City. There are five hundred thirty-nine (539) randomly selected teachers and school heads from the SDO- San Pedro City was used in this study. Random sampling was one of the simplest forms of collecting data were used in this research. In order to analyze and interpret the given data, mean, standard deviation, and pearson-r correlation was used.

Based on the findings, for the level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) in terms of Planning and Management were very great extend in all indicators. However, as to resources, it was great extent. In terms of level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) in terms of Classroom Management were very great extent. On the other hand, when it comes to level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) in terms of Classroom Instruction were also very great extent. For the level of teachers' proficiency, it was remarkable as very great extent. Lastly, the significant relationship between School Learning Action Cell and teachers' proficiency has significant and lastly Significant relationship between School Learning Action Cell and school performance has significant.

Based on the findings, it is concluded that there is a significant relationship between School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) and teachers' proficiency. Therefore, the null hypothesis stated that, "There is no significant relationship between School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) and teachers' proficiency were accepted and the alternative hypothesis were rejected. On the other hand, it is also concluded that school performance in terms of drop-out rate, graduation rate, and MPS result were not directly affected by the School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) in terms of planning and management, classroom management, and classroom instruction. Therefore, the null hypothesis stated that, "There is no significant relationship between School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) and school performance is partially rejected. This only indicates that School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) only affects the enrollment rate and partially affects the drop-out rate but not the graduation rate and the MPS result.

Based on the drawn conclusions, it is recommended that School Heads and Leaders may continue to prepare programs and activities that may help teachers to improve their proficiency level and professional development.

Keywords: School Heads; Performance; Action

1. Introduction

Teaching is a noble and essential profession that plays a critical role in shaping the future of individuals and society as a whole. The complexities of the teaching profession require a lifelong learning perspective to adapt on the fast changes and evolving constraints or needs. Teachers and their professional development have shown that so far, in-service training is considered as a professional duty in the academe, but it is in practice optional in many of them.

Professional growth has gained more and more notice lately. Teachers require professional development more than ever because of the quick pace of change, the need for high standards, and the calls to improve quality. One could find that their own techniques and activities for professional development have evolved through time in terms of organization and procedures as they think back on their own experiences Binauhan (2019).

In addition to this, In the realm of education, teachers bear the main responsibility of imparting knowledge, skills, and values to their students. They have a vital role in shaping the future of society and therefore must consistently update their knowledge and skills to stay current. However, the educational leaders were also able to draw initiative and enthusiasm from the teachers to perform various tasks and nurture a climate of openness and trust to increase the organization's performance. (Mendoza J. & Lyrma H, 2020). Professional development serves as the means through which teachers acquire new knowledge, skills, and expertise to improve their effectiveness in the classroom. This article seeks to delve into the significance of professional development for teachers, its advantages, and effective implementation strategies. Professional development holds great importance for teachers as it enriches their knowledge and skills, empowering them to enhance their teaching methods and ultimately achieve improved learning outcomes for their students. The subsequent points outline the key reasons why professional development is crucial for teachers: (1) staying abreast of the most recent advancements in the field of education; (2) enhancing the efficacy of teachers; and (3) fostering improved academic achievements for students.

In connection with this, DepEd has been formulated the School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) which is used in the context of education and school improvement initiatives. It is the venue for in-service training and teacher development that is both ongoing and cost-effective. To this end, the Department of Education fully supports its teachers' ongoing professional development, which is based on the principle of lifelong learning and recognition of teaching as a profession in which teachers must possess expert knowledge and specialized abilities, which they must acquire and maintain through continuous study (UNESCO, 2006) as cited by Aclan & Ching (2022). The researcher wants to further explore the relationship of school learning action cell (SLAC), teachers' proficiency and school performance.

Moreover, DepEd Order No. 035, s. 2016 also known as "The Learning Action Cell as a K to 12 Basic Education Program School-Based Continuing Professional Development Strategy for the Improvement of Teaching and Learning", it is stated that, the Department of Education fully supports the continuing professional development of its teaching personnel based on the principles of lifelong learning and DepEd's commitment to the development of teachers potential aimed towards their success in the profession.

The researcher wants to further explore the relationship of school learning action cell (SLAC), teachers'

proficiency and school performance.

1.1 Statement of the problem

The primary aim of this study was to determine the relationship of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) in the teachers' proficiency and school performance. This study sought particularly the following questions:

1. What is the level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) Planning and Management in terms of:
    1.1 objectives;
    1.2 preparation;
    1.3 resources;
    1.4 implementation; and
    1.5 monitoring and feedback?
2. What is the level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) Classroom management in terms of:
    2.1 teaching-learning process;
    2.2 classroom discipline; and
    2.3 feedback mechanism?
3. What is the level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) Classroom instruction in terms of:
    3.1 content mastery;
    3.2 teaching skills; and
    3.3 assessment skills?
4. What is the level of teachers' proficiency in terms of:
    4.1 content knowledge and pedagogy;
    4.2 instructional delivery;
    4.3 assessment and evaluation;
    4.4 research and innovation; and
    4.5 ethics and professionalism?
5. What is the level of school performance in terms of:
    5.1 enrollment rate;
    5.2 drop-out rate;
    5.3 graduation rate; and
    5.4 MPS result?

6. Is there a significant relationship between School Learning Action Cell and teachers' proficiency?

7. Is there a significant relationship between School Learning Action Cell and school performance?

2. Methodology

Descriptive- correlation design was used to examine the relationship of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) to teacher's proficiency and school performance among teachers in the Schools Division Office of San Pedro City.

Descriptive correlational research is a research method that aims to elucidate the connection between two or more variables without asserting any causal relationship. It involves the collection and analysis of data pertaining to at least two variables in order to determine if there is a correlation between them. Descriptive correlational research involves the collection of data to understand the variables of interest and their interrelationship. The primary objective is to provide a comprehensive understanding of the variables and their associations, without manipulating them or making assumptions about causation (Bhat, 2022).

3. Results and Discussion

This chapter enumerates the different results and discusses the results that were yielded from the treatment of the data that was gathered in this study. The following tabular presentations and discussions will further characterize the relationship of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) to teachers' proficiency and school performance.

Level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) Planning and Management

Table 1. *Level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) Planning and Management in terms of Objectives*

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
1. Identify higher levels of goals and objectives.	4.35	0.64	Always
2. Track goals in a visible place and create distinctive spaces.	4.26	0.63	Always
3. Connect projects to milestones and goals.	4.28	0.66	Always
4. Share progress updates and celebrate culture.	4.24	0.67	Always
5. Encourage cooperation among the school members in terms of formulating the objectives.	4.37	0.66	Always
Weighted Mean **SD** **Verbal Interpretation**	*4.30* *0.57* *Very Great Extent*		

Table 1 illustrates the level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) Planning and Management in terms of objectives. From the statements, "*Encourage cooperation among the school members in terms of formulating the objectives*" yielded the highest mean score (M=4.37, SD=0.66) and was remarked as Always. On the other hand, "*Share progress updates and celebrate culture*" received the lowest mean score of responses with (M=4.24, SD=0.67) yet was also remarked as Always.

The level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) Planning and Management in terms of objectives attained a weighted mean score of 4.30 and a standard deviation of 0.57 and was Very Great Extent among the respondents. Based on the results, it can be concluded that the level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) planning and management in terms of objectives is very high. The respondents consistently rated all statements with high mean scores, indicating a strong agreement. They believe that higher levels of goals and objectives are identified, goals are tracked visibly, projects are connected to milestones and goals, progress updates are shared, and cooperation among school members is encouraged in formulating objectives. The overall agreement level is "Always," indicating a consistent and strong belief in the effectiveness of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) planning and management in achieving objectives.

Level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) Planning and Management

Table 2 exemplifies the level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) Planning and Management in terms of preparation. From the statements, "Schedule meetings and monitoring plans for each activity" produced the highest mean score (M=4.32, SD=0.65) and was remarked as Always. On the other hand, "Prepare the line-item budget for the planned program" received the lowest mean score of responses with (M=4.11, SD=0.74) yet was also remarked as Often.

Table 2. *Level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) Planning and Management in terms of Preparation*

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
1. Create programs that are suitable for the formation year.	4.30	0.69	Always
2. Schedule meetings and monitoring plans for each activity.	4.32	0.65	Always
3. Prepare the line-item budget for the planned program.	4.11	0.74	Often
4. Assess progress and identify the areas that need to be improved.	4.27	0.69	Always
5. Identify obstacles and possible challenges, then develop prior solutions for them.	4.27	0.67	Always
Weighted Mean	*4.25*		
SD	*0.59*		
Verbal Interpretation	*Very Great Extent*		

The level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) Planning and Management in terms of preparation reached a weighted mean score of 4.25 and a standard deviation of 0.59 and was Very Great Extent among the respondents.

Based on the results, it can be concluded that the level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) planning and management in terms of preparation is very high. The respondents consistently rated all statements with high mean scores, indicating a strong agreement. They believe that programs suitable for the formation year are created, meetings and monitoring plans are scheduled for each activity, progress is assessed and areas for improvement are identified, and obstacles and challenges are identified with prior solutions developed. However, the preparation of the line-item budget for the planned program is rated as "Often," which suggests that there may be room for improvement in this aspect.

Table 3. *Level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) Planning and Management in terms of Resources*

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
1. Delegates, empower people for projects based on their skills, previous experience, availability, or project budget.	4.20	0.68	Often
2. Establish good communication with the	4.17	0.76	

community to get support from the various social organizations.			Often
3. Provide and manage transparency, efficiency and timeliness within the school.	4.18	0.71	Often
4. Make a strategic plan for organizing and using school resources.	4.19	0.72	Often
5. Evaluate, liquidate utilize and maximize resources for school activities and projects.	4.18	0.72	Often
Weighted Mean **SD** **Verbal Interpretation**	*4.18* *0.63* *Great Extent*		

Table 3 shows the level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) Planning and Management in terms of resources. From the statements, "*Delegates, empower people for projects based on their skills, previous experience, availability, or project budget*" bore the highest mean score *(M=4.20, SD=0.68)* and was remarked as Often. On the other hand, "*Establish good communication with the community to get support from the various social organizations*" received the lowest mean score of responses with *(M=4.17, SD=0.76)* yet was also remarked Often.

The level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) Planning and Management in terms of resources achieved a weighted mean score of 4.18 and a standard deviation of 0.63 and was Great Extent among the respondents.

Based on the results, it can be concluded that the level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) planning and management in terms of resources is high. The respondents consistently rated all statements with mean scores above 4, indicating a positive agreement. They often delegate and empower people for projects based on their skills, establish good communication with the community for support, provide transparency and efficiency within the school, make strategic plans for organizing and using resources, and evaluate and maximize resources for school activities and projects.

Level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) Planning and Management

Table 4 shows the level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) Planning and Management in terms of implementation. From the statements, "*Projects and activities are collaboratively made by the school head, faculty members, and stakeholders to sustain continuous improvement and initiatives*" borne the highest mean score *(M=4.31, SD=0.66)* and was remarked as Always. On the other hand, "*Improving physical environments, classroom settings, and/or virtual classrooms to support various kinds of learning*" received the lowest mean score of responses with *(M=4.24, SD=0.68)* yet was also remarked as Always.

Table 4. *Level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) Planning and Management in terms of Implementation*

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
1. Implement projects and activities that are carefully crafted to attain the school's goals.	4.26	0.64	Always
2. Projects and activities are collaboratively made by the school head, faculty members, and stakeholders to sustain continuous improvement and initiatives.	4.31	0.66	Always
3. Provide clear, transparent, and inclusive programs for both teachers and learners.	4.28	0.68	Always
4. Improving physical environments, classroom settings, and/or virtual classrooms to support various kinds of learning.	4.24	0.68	Always
5. Evaluate and measure the outcomes of every activity, program, and service and take responsibility	4.26	0.66	Always

for addressing the feedback.			
Weighted Mean	*4.27*		
SD	*0.57*		
Verbal Interpretation	*Very Great Extent*		

The level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) Planning and Management in terms of implementation accomplished a weighted mean score of 4.27 and a standard deviation of 0.57 and was Very Great Extent among the respondents.

Based on the results, it can be concluded that the level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) planning and management in terms of implementation is very high. The respondents consistently rated all statements with mean scores above 4, indicating a positive agreement. They always implement projects and activities that are carefully crafted to attain the school's goals, collaboratively make projects and activities, provide clear and inclusive programs, improve physical environments, and evaluate outcomes while taking responsibility for addressing feedback.

Level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) Planning and Management

Table 5 proves the level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) Planning and Management in terms of monitoring and feedback. From the statements, "*Ensure that the learner's concerns are being addressed*" generated the highest mean score *(M=4.37, SD=0.70)* and was remarked as Always. On the other hand, "*Monitor expected and actual performance that continually addresses the gaps in education and ensures a venue for feedback and redress*" and "*Solve shared challenges encountered in the school facilitated by the school head or a designated LAC Leader*" received the lowest mean score of responses with *(M=4.21, SD=0.66, 0.67)* yet was also remarked as Always.

The level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) Planning and Management in terms of monitoring and feedback objectives conquered a weighted mean score of 4.27 and a standard deviation of 0.59 and was Very Great Extent among the respondents.

Table 5. *Level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) Planning and Management in terms of Monitoring and Feedback*

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
1. Monitor expected and actual performance that continually addresses the gaps in education and ensures a venue for feedback and redress.	4.21	0.66	Always
2. Solve shared challenges encountered in the school facilitated by the school head or a designated LAC Leader.	4.21	0.67	Always
3. Ensure that the learner's concerns are being addressed.	4.37	0.70	Always
4. Monitor expected and actual performance to continually address the gaps in education and to ensure a venue for feedback and redress.	4.26	0.67	Always
5. Allow feedback and criticism to see what can be changed and improved.	4.29	0.71	Always
Weighted Mean	*4.27*		
SD	*0.59*		
Verbal Interpretation	*Very Great Extent*		

Based on the results, the respondents indicate that the school's School Learning Action Cell planning and management in terms of monitoring and feedback is consistently practiced at a high level. The respondents strongly agree with all the statements, indicating that monitoring, feedback, and redress mechanisms are always

in place. The overall weighted mean of 4.27 suggests that the respondents perceive the level of School Learning Action Cell planning and management in terms of monitoring and feedback to be at a very great extent.

Level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) Classroom Management

Table 6 explains the level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) Classroom management in terms of teaching-learning process. From the statements, "*Encourage cooperative learning*" returned the highest mean score *(M=4.52, SD=0.62)* and was remarked as Always. On the other hand, "*Set expectations and model engagement*" received the lowest mean score of responses with *(M=4.35, SD=0.65)* yet was also remarked as Always.

Table 6. *Level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) Classroom Management in terms of Teaching-Learning Process*

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
1. Encourage cooperative learning.	4.52	0.62	Always
2. Create a welcoming environment that boosts the interest of the students in learning.	4.42	0.67	Always
3. Set expectations and model engagement.	4.35	0.65	Always
4. Build engagement and motivation with course content and activities.	4.41	0.64	Always
5. Initiate interaction and create faculty presence.	4.42	0.66	Always
Weighted Mean **SD** **Verbal Interpretation**	*4.42* *0.56* *Very Great Extent*		

The level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) Classroom management in terms of teaching-learning process got a weighted mean score of 4.42 and a standard deviation of 0.56 and was Very Great Extent among the respondents.

Based on the results, the respondents indicate that the School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) classroom management in terms of the teaching-learning process is consistently implemented at a high level. The respondents strongly agree with all the statements, indicating that cooperative learning, creating a welcoming environment, setting expectations, building engagement and motivation, and initiating interaction are always practiced. The overall weighted mean of 4.42 suggests that the respondents perceive the level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) classroom management in terms of the teaching-learning process to be at a very great extent.

Table 7. *Level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) Classroom Management in terms of Classroom Discipline*

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
1. Foster interaction between students and create a productive and positive learning community.	4.42	0.64	Always
2. Establish connection among the students.	4.46	0.65	Always
3. Teacher uses discipline to ensure routine is maintained, school rules are enforced, and the students are in a safe learning environment.	4.50	0.60	Always
4. Develop self-discipline among students.	4.48	0.59	Always
5. Make the students realize their responsibilities and	4.48	0.58	

feel accountable for their actions.			Always
Weighted Mean	*4.47*		
SD	*0.54*		
Verbal Interpretation	*Very Great Extent*		

Table 7 illustrates the level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) Classroom management in terms of classroom discipline. From the statements, "*Teacher uses discipline to ensure routine is maintained, school rules are enforced, and the students are in a safe learning environment*" yielded the highest mean score *(M=4.50, SD=0.60)* and was remarked as Always. On the other hand, "*Foster interaction between students and create a productive and positive learning community*" received the lowest mean score of responses with *(M=4.42, SD=0.64)* yet was also remarked as Always.

The level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) Classroom management in terms of classroom discipline attained a weighted mean score of 4.47 and a standard deviation of 0.54 and was Very Great Extent among the respondents.

Based on the results, the respondents indicate that the School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) classroom management in terms of classroom discipline is consistently implemented at a high level. The respondents strongly agree with all the statements, indicating that fostering interaction, establishing connections, using discipline, developing self-discipline, and promoting accountability are always practiced. The overall weighted mean of 4.47 suggests that the respondents perceive the level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) classroom management in terms of classroom discipline to be at a very great extent.

Level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) Classroom Management

Table 8. *Level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) Classroom Management in terms of Feedback Mechanism*

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
1. Focus on the positive approach on how the feedback is given.	4.36	0.66	Always
2. Provide specific feedback that can be constructive.	4.29	0.63	Always
3. Make the feedback consistent, which may help in the continuous development.	4.31	0.69	Always
4. Offer continuing support for those who need it.	4.26	0.68	Always
5. Provide feedback to motivate and inspire.	4.34	0.65	Always
Weighted Mean	*4.31*		
SD	*0.59*		
Verbal Interpretation	*Very Great Extent*		

Table 8 exemplifies the level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) Classroom management in terms of feedback mechanism. From the statements, "Focus on the positive approach on how the feedback is given" produced the highest mean score (M=4.36, SD=0.66) and was remarked as Always. On the other hand, "Offer continuing support for those who need it" received the lowest mean score of responses with (M=4.26, SD=0.68) yet was also remarked as Always.

The level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) Classroom management in terms of feedback mechanism reached a weighted mean score of 4.31 and a standard deviation of 0.59 and was Very Great Extent among the respondents.

Based on the results, the respondents indicate that the School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) classroom management in terms of the feedback mechanism is consistently implemented at a high level. The respondents

strongly agree with all the statements, indicating that focusing on a positive approach, providing specific and constructive feedback, maintaining consistency in feedback, offering continuing support, and providing feedback for motivation and inspiration are always practiced. The overall weighted mean of 4.31 suggests that the respondents perceive the level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) classroom management in terms of the feedback mechanism to be at a very great extent.

Level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) Classroom Instruction

Table 9 demonstrates the level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) Classroom instruction in terms of content mastery. From the statements, "*Integrate modern technology for a better teaching-learning process*" bore the highest mean score *(M=4.44, SD=0.64)* and was remarked as Always. On the other hand, "*Personalize the learning experience of the students*" received the lowest mean score of responses with *(M=4.28, SD=0.67)* yet was also remarked as Always.

Table 9. *Level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) Classroom Instruction in terms of Content Mastery*

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
1. Integrate modern technology for a better teaching-learning process.	4.44	0.64	Always
2. Empower students to be active learners through different learning activities that are suited to the needs of the students.	4.38	0.68	Always
3. Personalize the learning experience of the students.	4.28	0.67	Always
4. Conduct activities that promote multidisciplinary courses.	4.29	0.69	Always
5. Encourage learning that aids the learners' diversity and promote inclusive education.	4.37	0.64	Always
Weighted Mean **SD** **Verbal Interpretation**	*4.31* *0.58* *Very Great Extent*		

The level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) Classroom instruction in terms of content mastery achieved a weighted mean score of 4.31 and a standard deviation of 0.58 and was Very Great Extent among the respondents.

Based on the results, the respondents indicate that the School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) classroom instruction in terms of content mastery is consistently implemented at a high level. The respondents strongly agree with all the statements, indicating that integrating modern technology, empowering students, personalizing learning experiences, promoting multidisciplinary courses, and encouraging inclusive education are always practiced. The overall weighted mean of 4.31 suggests that the respondents perceive the level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) classroom instruction in terms of content mastery to be at a very great extent.

Level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) Classroom Instruction

Table 10 shows the level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) Classroom instruction in terms of teaching skills. From the statements, "*Align objectives for every lesson and activity*" borne the highest mean score *(M=4.53, SD=0.57)* and was remarked as Always. On the other hand, "*Align objectives for every lesson and activity*" received the lowest mean score of responses with *(M=4.46, SD=0.62)* yet was also remarked as Always.

Table 10. *Level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) Classroom Instruction in terms of Teaching Skills*

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS

1. Employ a positive personality.	4.50	0.60	Always
2. Use appropriate instructional materials for every lesson.	4.49	0.62	Always
3. Act professional and teach students according to what they need to learn.	4.50	0.63	Always
4. Align objectives for every lesson and activity.	4.53	0.57	Always
5. Keep enthusiasm and confidence along with the teaching.	4.46	0.62	Always
Weighted Mean	*4.50*		
SD	*0.55*		
Verbal Interpretation	*Very Great Extent*		

The level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) Classroom instruction in terms of teaching skills accomplished a weighted mean score of 4.50 and a standard deviation of 0.55 and was Very Great Extent among the respondents.

Based on the results, the respondents indicate that the School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) classroom instruction in terms of teaching skills is consistently implemented at a high level. The respondents strongly agree with all the statements, indicating that employing a positive personality, using appropriate instructional materials, acting professionally, aligning objectives, and maintaining enthusiasm and confidence are always practiced. The overall weighted mean of 4.50 suggests that the respondents perceive the level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) classroom instruction in terms of teaching skills to be at a very great extent.

Table 11. *Level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) Classroom Instruction in terms of Assessment Skills*

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
1. Know how learners develop their knowledge of concepts.	4.36	0.63	Always
2. Notice where students are in learning.	4.39	0.65	Always
3. Identify common misconceptions and select appropriate interventions.	4.34	0.69	Always
4. Appropriate design assessments of high quality.	4.34	0.64	Always
5. Conduct a range of assessments to gather multiple sources of evidence of student learning.	4.36	0.68	Always
Weighted Mean	*4.36*		
SD	*0.58*		
Verbal Interpretation	*Very Great Extent*		

Table 11 proves the level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) Classroom instruction in terms of assessment skills. From the statements, "*Notice where students are in learning*" generated the highest mean score *(M=4.39, SD=0.65)* and was remarked as Always. On the other hand, "*Identify common misconceptions and select appropriate interventions*" and "*Appropriate design assessments of high quality*" received the lowest mean score of responses with *(M=4.34, SD=0.69, 0.64)* yet was also remarked as Always.

The level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) Classroom instruction in terms of assessment skills conquered a weighted mean score of 4.36 and a standard deviation of 0.58 and was Very Great Extent among the respondents.

Based on the results, the respondents indicate that the School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) classroom instruction in terms of assessment skills is consistently implemented at a high level. The respondents strongly agree with all the statements, indicating that knowing how learners develop their knowledge, noticing where

students are in their learning, identifying misconceptions, designing high-quality assessments, and conducting a range of assessments are always practiced. The overall weighted mean of 4.36 suggests that the respondents perceive the level of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) classroom instruction in terms of assessment skills to be at a very great extent.

Level of Teachers' Proficiency in terms of Content Knowledge and Pedagogy

Table 12 explains the level of teachers' proficiency in terms of content knowledge and pedagogy. From the statements, "*Integrate technology and use differentiated instructions for every activity*" and "*Allow learners to be involved in various tasks that can develop their skills*" returned the highest mean score *(M=4.46, SD=0.64, 0.63)* and was remarked as Always. On the other hand, "*Use a range of teaching strategies that enhance learner achievement in literacy and numeracy skills*" received the lowest mean score of responses with *(M=4.40, SD=0.66)* yet was also remarked Always. The level of teachers' proficiency in terms of content knowledge and pedagogy got a weighted mean score of 4.44 and a standard deviation of 0.56 and was Very Great Extent among the respondents.

Table 12. *Level of Teachers' Proficiency in terms of Content Knowledge and Pedagogy*

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
1. Engage students with challenges and performance activities.	4.42	0.64	Always
2. Use different approaches and instructional materials.	4.44	0.62	Always
3. Integrate technology and use differentiated instructions for every activity.	4.46	0.64	Always
4. Allow learners to be involved in various tasks that can develop their skills.	4.46	0.63	Always
5. Use a range of teaching strategies that enhance learner achievement in literacy and numeracy skills.	4.40	0.66	Always
Weighted Mean	*4.44*		
SD	*0.56*		
Verbal Interpretation	*Very Great Extent*		

Level of Teachers' Proficiency

Table 13 illustrates the level of teachers' proficiency in terms of instructional delivery. From the statements, "*Promote positive learning environment for students*" produced the highest mean score *(M=4.51, SD=0.62)* and was remarked as Strongly Agree. On the other hand, "*Provide materials other than visuals to enhance the multiple intelligence of students*" received the lowest mean score of responses with *(M=4.38, SD=0.66)* yet was also remarked Strongly Agree.

Table 13. *Level of Teachers' Proficiency in terms of Instructional Delivery*

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
1. Prioritize student's learning and empower students' active participation in class discussion.	4.46	0.62	Always
2. Provide activities for student's developmental skills.	4.42	0.63	Always
3. Engage students in diverse activities through differentiated instructions.	4.40	0.65	Always
4. Promote positive learning environment for students.	4.51	0.62	Always
5. Provide materials other than visuals to enhance the multiple intelligence of students.	4.38	0.66	Always

Weighted Mean	*4.43*
SD	*0.56*
Verbal Interpretation	*Very Great Extent*

The level of teachers' proficiency in terms of instructional delivery attained a weighted mean score of 4.43 and a standard deviation of 0.56 and was Very Great Extent among the respondents.

Based on the results, the respondents indicate that teachers' proficiency in terms of instructional delivery is consistently implemented at a high level. The respondents strongly agree with all the statements, indicating that prioritizing student learning, empowering active participation, providing developmental activities, engaging in diverse activities, promoting a positive learning environment, and using materials to enhance multiple intelligences are always practiced. The overall weighted mean of 4.43 suggests that the respondents perceive the level of teachers' proficiency in terms of instructional delivery to be at a very great extent.

Table 14. *Level of Teachers' Proficiency in terms of Assessment and Evaluation*

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
1. Give presentations that are clear and concise.	4.48	0.62	Always
2. Use a variety of data collection methods.	4.35	0.66	Always
3. Develop clear and concise monitoring plans.	4.36	0.67	Always
4. Identify own strengths and weaknesses that can be helpful in the field of teaching professionalism.	4.35	0.65	Always
5. Identify tasks that need to be performed to meet certain goals or to achieve a specific performance standard.	4.35	0.64	Always
Weighted Mean	*4.38*		
SD	*0.56*		
Verbal Interpretation	*Very Great Extent*		

Table 14 exemplifies the level of teachers' proficiency in terms of assessment and evaluation. From the statements, "*Give presentations that are clear and concise*" bore the highest mean score *(M=4.48, SD=0.62)* and was remarked as Always. On the other hand, "*Use a variety of data collection methods*", "*Identify own strengths and weaknesses that can be helpful in the field of teaching professionalism*" and "*Identify tasks that need to be performed to meet certain goals or to achieve a specific performance standard*" received the lowest mean score of responses with *(M=4.35, SD=0.66, 0.65, 0.64)* yet was also remarked as Always.

The level of teachers' proficiency in terms of assessment and evaluation reached a weighted mean score of 4.38 and a standard deviation of 0.56 and was Very Great Extent among the respondents.

Based on the results, the respondents indicate that teachers' proficiency in terms of assessment and evaluation is consistently implemented at a high level. The respondents strongly agree with all the statements, indicating that giving clear and concise presentations, using a variety of data collection methods, developing clear monitoring plans, identifying strengths and weaknesses, and identifying tasks to meet goals or performance standards are always practiced. The overall weighted mean of 4.38 suggests that the respondents perceive the level of teachers' proficiency in terms of assessment and evaluation to be at a very great extent. According to Baker, (2014), the different forms of teacher evaluation focus on individual teaching performance in classrooms (teacher appraisal, teacher peer evaluation and student ratings); the school context (external school inspection and internal school self-evaluation) and student outcomes (national or regional student assessments and value-added assessments to measure gains in learning overtime.

Table 15. *Level of Teachers' Proficiency in terms of Research and Innovation*

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
1. Continue conducting relevant research to address new problems.	3.86	0.86	Often
2. Take initiative in creating new activities and programs that can be helpful in school.	3.91	0.88	Often
3. See research as the secondary source of knowledge to develop new actions.	3.89	0.88	Often
4. Take advantage of the research resources and use them to make powerful programs for the schools.	3.88	0.87	Often
5. Use various and reliable resources to utilize better work progress regarding research and innovation.	3.96	0.85	Often
Weighted Mean	*3.90*		
SD	*0.80*		
Verbal Interpretation	*Very Great Extent*		

Table 15 demonstrates the level of teachers' proficiency in terms of research and innovation. From the statements, "*Use various and reliable resources to utilize better work progress regarding research and innovation*" borne the highest mean score *(M=3.96, SD=0.85)* and was remarked as Often. On the other hand, "*Continue conducting relevant research to address new problems*" received the lowest mean score of responses with *(M=3.86, SD=0.86)* yet was also remarked as Often.

The level of teachers' proficiency in terms of research and innovation achieved a weighted mean score of 3.90 and a standard deviation of 0.80 and was Great Extent among the respondents.

Based on the results, the respondents indicate that teachers' proficiency in terms of research and innovation is often implemented. The respondents agree that conducting relevant research, taking initiative in creating new activities and programs, seeing research as a secondary source of knowledge, taking advantage of research resources, and using various reliable resources for research and innovation are often practiced. The overall weighted mean of 3.90 suggests that the respondents perceive the level of teachers' proficiency in terms of research and innovation to be at a very great extent.

Table 16. *Level of Teachers' Proficiency in terms of Ethics and Professionalism*

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
1. Participate in various trainings and seminars that could lead to professional improvement.	4.50	0.60	Always
2. Improve own productivity towards job assignment.	4.47	0.62	Always
3. Practice professionalism and integrity at all times.	4.57	0.59	Always
4. Demonstrate work ethics and rectitude in work.	4.52	0.62	Always
5. Promote ethical behavior inside and outside the school.	4.54	0.61	Always
Weighted Mean	*4.52*		
SD	*0.55*		
Verbal Interpretation	*Very Great Extent*		

Table 16 shows the level of teachers' proficiency in terms of ethics and professionalism. From the statements, "*Practice professionalism and integrity at all times*" generated the highest mean score *(M=4.57, SD=0.59)* and was remarked as Strongly Agree. On the other hand, "*Improve own productivity towards job assignment*" received the lowest mean score of responses with *(M=4.47, SD=0.62)* yet was also remarked Strongly Agree.

The level of teachers' proficiency in terms of ethics and professionalism accomplished a weighted

mean score of 4.52 and a standard deviation of 0.55 and was Very Great Extent among the respondents.

Based on the results, the respondents indicate that teachers' proficiency in terms of ethics and professionalism is consistently implemented at a high level. The respondents strongly agree with all the statements, indicating that participating in professional development activities, improving productivity, practicing professionalism and integrity, demonstrating work ethics, and promoting ethical behavior are always practiced. The overall weighted mean of 4.52 suggests that the respondents perceive the level of teachers' proficiency in terms of ethics and professionalism to be at a very great extent.

Level of School Performance

Table 17. *Level of School Performance in terms of Enrollment Rate*

School Year	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
2020-2021	539	1334.00	6243.00	3758	1772.377
2021-2022	539	1289.00	7165.00	4112	2090.215
2022-2023	539	1337.00	6542.00	3696	1847.295
Average	539	1320.00	6650.00	3856	1899.348

Table 17 illustrate the level of school performance in terms of enrollment rate. The school year, "*2021-2022*" yielded the highest mean score of *(M=4112, SD=2090.215)*. Followed by the school year, "*2020-2021*" with a mean score of *(M=3758, SD=1772.377)*. While, the school year, "*2022-2023*" received the lowest mean score of *(M=3696, SD=1847.295)*.

The level of school performance in terms of enrollment rate attained a weighted mean score of 3855.45 and a standard deviation of 1899.348.

Based on the data, the enrollment rates for each school year and the average enrollment rate are provided. The minimum and maximum enrollment rates indicate the range of enrollment numbers observed for each school year. The mean enrollment rate represents the average enrollment rate across the given school year. The standard deviation measures the dispersion or variability of the enrollment rates around the mean.

Table 18. *Level of School Performance in terms of Drop-out Rate*

School Year	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
2020-2021	539	.00000	.05200	.019	.015
2021-2022	539	.00000	.03400	.010	.009
2022-2023	539	.00000	.02900	.014	.010
Average	539	.00000	.03700	.015	.01

Table 18 exemplify the level of school performance in terms of drop-out rate. The school year, "*2020-2021*" produced the highest mean score of *(M=0.19%, SD=0.015)*. Followed by the school year, "*2022-2023*" with a mean score of *(M=0.14%, SD=0.10)*. While, the school year, "*2021-2022*" received the lowest mean score of *(M=0.010%, SD=0.009)*.

The level of school performance in terms of drop-out rate reached a weighted mean score of 0.015% and a standard deviation of 0.01.

Based on the data, the drop-out rates for each school year and the average drop-out rate are provided. The minimum and maximum drop-out rates indicate the range of drop-out rates observed for each school year. The mean drop-out rate represents the average drop-out rate across the given school year. The standard deviation measures the dispersion or variability of the drop-out rates around the mean.

Level of School Performance in terms of Graduation Rate

Table 19 demonstrate the level of school performance in terms of graduation rate. The school year, "*2020-2021*" bore the highest mean score of *(M=97.35%, SD=1.02)*. Followed by the school year, "*2022-2023*" with a mean score of *(M=97.14%, SD=1.42)*. While, the school year, "*2021-2022*" received the lowest mean score of *(M=97.13%, SD=1.90)*.

The level of school performance in terms of graduation rate achieved a weighted mean score of 77.56% and a standard deviation of 38.85.

Table 19. *Level of School Performance in terms of Graduation Rate*

School Year	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
2020-2021	539	95.83	98.23	97.35	1.02
2021-2022	539	92.23	98.33	97.13	1.90
2022-2023	539	93.50	98.16	97.14	1.42
Average	539	.92	98.17	97.20	38.85

Based on the data, the graduation rates for each school year and the average graduation rate are provided. The minimum and maximum graduation rates indicate the range of graduation rates observed for each school year. The mean graduation rate represents the average graduation rate across the given school year. The standard deviation measures the dispersion or variability of the graduation rates around the mean. It is important to note that the standard deviation for the average graduation rate is significantly higher compared to the individual school years. This suggests a higher degree of variability in the graduation rates across the different school years.

Table 20. *Level of School Performance in terms of MPS Result*

School Year	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
2020-2021	539	52.18	66.89	58.87	4.47
2021-2022	539	55.26	59.95	58.64	1.39
2022-2023	539	53.79	60.19	58.62	1.60
Average	539	53.81	62.12	58.71	2.17

Table 20 show the level of school performance in terms of MPS result. The school year, "*2020-2021*" borne the highest mean score of *(M=58.87, SD=4.47)*. Followed by the school year, "*2021-2022*" with a mean score of *(M=58.64, SD=1.39)*. While, the school year, "*2022-2023*" received the lowest mean score of *(M=58.62, SD=1.60)*.

Based on the data, the MPS results for each school year and the average MPS result are provided. The minimum and maximum MPS results indicate the range of scores observed for each school year. The mean

MPS result represents the average score across the given school year. The standard deviation measures the dispersion or variability of the MPS results around the mean. It is interesting to note that the mean MPS result for each school year and the average MPS result are relatively close, indicating a consistent performance level across the years. The standard deviations for the MPS results are relatively small, suggesting a relatively low variability in the scores.

Significant relationship between School Learning Action Cell and Teachers' Proficiency

Table 21. *Significant relationship between School Learning Action Cell and Teachers' Proficiency*

School Learning Action Cell		Content Knowledge and Pedagogy	Instructional Delivery	Assessment and Evaluation	Research and Innovation	Ethics and Professionalism
objectives	Pearson Correlation	.569**	.586**	.604**	.518**	.476**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	539	539	539	539	539
preparation	Pearson Correlation	.558**	.614**	.669**	.508**	.500**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	539	539	539	539	539
resources	Pearson Correlation	.481**	.542**	.620**	.526**	.451**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	539	539	539	539	539
implementation	Pearson Correlation	.548**	.623**	.619**	.492**	.515**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	539	539	539	539	539
monitoring and feedback	Pearson Correlation	.596**	.664**	.668**	.527**	.584**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	539	539	539	539	539
teaching-learning process	Pearson Correlation	.646**	.710**	.723**	.511**	.597**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	539	539	539	539	539
classroom discipline	Pearson Correlation	.685**	.728**	.687**	.395**	.676**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	539	539	539	539	539
feedback mechanism	Pearson Correlation	.669**	.687**	.705**	.550**	.563**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	539	539	539	539	539
content mastery	Pearson Correlation	.739**	.755**	.755**	.489**	.653**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	539	539	539	539	539
teaching skills	Pearson Correlation	.765**	.789**	.747**	.421**	.729**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	539	539	539	539	539
assessment skills	Pearson Correlation	.767**	.785**	.781**	.532**	.720**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	539	539	539	539	539

Scale	Strength
0.80 – 1.00	Very Strong
0.60 – 0.79	Strong
0.40 – 0.59	Moderate
0.20 – 0.39	Weak
0.00 – 0.19	Very Weak

Table 21 demonstrates the significant relationship between School Learning Action Cell and teachers' proficiency. The Planning and Management, Classroom management and Classroom instruction of the School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) were observed to have a significant relationship to Teachers' proficiency's content knowledge and pedagogy, instructional delivery, assessment and evaluation, research and innovation, and ethics and professionalism. This is based on the computed r values obtained from the tests with moderate strong to strong relationship. Furthermore, the p-values obtained were less than the significance alpha 0.05, hence there is a significance.

From the findings above, we can infer that at 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis "There is no significant relationship between School Learning Action Cell and teachers' proficiency" is rejected. Thus, the alternative should be accepted which incites that there is a significant relationship between them.

Significant Relationship between School Learning Action Cell and School Performance

Table 22. *Significant Relationship between School Learning Action Cell and School Performance*

School Learning Action Cell		Enrollment Rate	Drop-out Rate	Graduation Rate	MPS Result
objectives	Pearson Correlation	.130**	-.110*	.031	.036
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.010	.471	.402
	N	539	539	539	539
preparation	Pearson Correlation	.143**	-.136**	.045	.004
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.002	.297	.925
	N	539	539	539	539
resources	Pearson Correlation	.161**	-.077	.050	-.011
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.074	.243	.793
	N	539	539	539	539
implementation	Pearson Correlation	.130**	-.080	.050	.011
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.003	.062	.249	.794
	N	539	539	539	539
monitoring and feedback	Pearson Correlation	.159**	-.101*	.061	.023
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.019	.159	.596
	N	539	539	539	539
teaching-learning process	Pearson Correlation	.171**	-.115**	.033	.020
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.007	.443	.651
	N	539	539	539	539
classroom discipline	Pearson Correlation	.157**	-.158**	.054	.048
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.208	.262
	N	539	539	539	539
feedback mechanism	Pearson Correlation	.142**	-.127**	.033	.052
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.003	.440	.224
	N	539	539	539	539
content mastery	Pearson Correlation	.142**	-.145**	.039	.033
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.001	.363	.443

	N	539	539	539	539
teaching skills	Pearson Correlation	.129**	-.115**	.062	.057
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.003	.007	.152	.185
	N	539	539	539	539
assessment skills	Pearson Correlation	.129**	-.122**	.059	.041
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.003	.004	.173	.341
	N	539	539	539	539

Scale	Strength
0.80 – 1.00	Very Strong
0.60 – 0.79	Strong
0.40 – 0.59	Moderate
0.20 – 0.39	Weak
0.00 – 0.19	Very Weak

Table 22 demonstrates the significant relationship between School Learning Action Cell and teachers' proficiency.

The Planning and Management, Classroom management and Classroom instruction of the School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) was observed to have a significant relationship to School performance's enrollment rate and drop-out rate only. This is based on the computed r values obtained from the tests with very weak relationship. Furthermore, the p-values obtained were less than the significance alpha 0.05, hence there is a significance.

From the findings above, we can infer that at 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis "There is no significant relationship between School Learning Action Cell and school performance" is partially rejected. Thus, the alternative should be partially accepted which incites that there is a significant relationship between them.

4. Conclusion and Recommendation

On the basis of the foregoing findings, the following conclusion were drawn.

Based on the findings, its is concluded that there is a significant relationship between School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) and teachers' proficiency. Therefore, the null hypothesis stated that, "There is no significant relationship between School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) and teachers' proficiency were accepted and the alternative hypothesis were rejected. On the other hand, its is also concluded that school performance in terms of drop-out rate, graduation rate, and MPS result were not directly affected by the School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) in terms of planning and management, classroom management, and classroom instruction. Therefore, the null hypothesis stated that, "There is no significant relationship between School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) and school performance is partially rejected. This only indicates that School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) only affects the enrollment rate and partially affects the drop-out rate but not the graduation rate and the MPS result.

Based on the drawn conclusions resulted to the following recommendations:

School Heads and Leaders may continue to prepare programs and activities that may help teachers to improve their proficiency level and professional development. Also, The study's results suggest confirming beneficial best practices for SLAC implementation. It offers guidance in planning, implementing, and evaluating teachers' professional development and overall school performance. Lastly, The study suggests that teachers may encourages collaboration with school administration to sustain the implementation of School Learning Action Cel (SLAC) and create a conducive environment for professional development.

References

Binauhan, R. C. (2019). Learning action cell implementation in the public elementary schools in the division of Cavite. International of Advanced Research and Publications, 3(11), 34-41. https://rb.gy/bkicd

Mendoza, J., & HIFE, L. (2020, December). EDUCATIONAL LEADERS PRACTICES AND SCHOOL CULTURE IN CALABARZON STATE UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES. International Journal of Scientific & Engineering Research, 11(12), 603–617. https://www.ijser.org/researchpaper/EDUCATIONAL-LEADERS-PRACTICES-AND-SCHOOL-CULTURE-IN-CALABARZON-STATE-UNIVERSITIES-AND-COLLEGES.pdf

DepEd Order No. 035, s. 2016. The Learning Action Cell as a K to 12 Basic Education Program School-Based Continuing Professional Development Strategy for the Improvement of Teaching and Learning

Bhat, A., (2022). Descriptive Correlational: Descriptive vs Correlational Research