



PROJECT PRO RADAR: PROVIDING RESILIENCE IN BASIC EDUCATION SECTOR TO AMPLIFY READINESS OF SCHOOL DRRM COORDINATORS IN BULA SOUTH DISTRICT

Valle, Eric D.

Completed 2022



E - Saliksik
Department of Education
Research Portal
e-saliksik.deped.gov.ph

E-Saliksik: the DepEd Research Portal is the official repository of education research in the Department of Education (DepEd). This research was funded by the Basic Education Research Fund.

ABSTRACT

A. Research Title :

PROJECT PRO RADAR: PROVIDING RESILIENCE IN BASIC EDUCATION SECTOR TO AMPLIFY READINESS OF SCHOOL DRRM COORDINATORS IN BULA SOUTH DISTRICT

B. Name of Researcher : Eric D. Valle

C. Date of TA Session : February 1, 2022

D. Summary :

This study aimed to improve the level of competency of school DRRM coordinators in Bula South District; further it drew out the level of competency of school DRRM coordinators in the three pillars of the Comprehensive Disaster Risk Reduction and Management in Basic Education using Training Needs Assessment (TNA); Analyzed the factors that affect the level of competency of school DRRM coordinators; tested the level of acceptance of the school DRRM coordinators on the interventions implemented, and determined the effects of intervention implemented on the level of competency of school DRRM coordinators.

A total enumeration of thirty-four (34) school DRRM coordinators of Bula South District were involved in this research. The researcher used the descriptive method in discussing the problems, and in gathering its data before and after the implementation of the interventions. The utilized interventions for this study used the format of Justified, Comprehensive, and Diversified Model were: under **Planning**: Oplan We as One, Oplan Consulta, and Collaborative Project; **Learning and Strategizing**: Project Konektado, Project Kaisa, Project Mapa, Project Aral,

and Project Hirilingan; **Monitoring and Evaluation:** Oplan Sita; **Recognizing:** Oplan Kilalanin; and **Sharing and Benchmarking:** Project Ibahagi.

The findings of the study revealed that Project PRO RADAR had a good impact on the level of competency of school DRRM coordinators. It ensured that School Disaster Risk Reduction and Management (SDRRM) Team has a culture of transparency, accountability, and participation in barangay and Municipal Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Council (MDRRMC). Therefore, the expected output of this study was attained to zero (0) fairly competent school DRRM coordinators in Bula South District for School Year 2021-2022.

Therefore, re-implementation of this study was highly encouraged to amplify readiness and resiliency in school and community. This will help schools create safe and supportive learning environments in attaining the system of education and in attaining the DepEd objective, quality education for all.

E. Conclusion:

The data gathered and analyzed revealed the following results: In line with the conducted Training Needs Assessment of school DRRM coordinators in Bula South District, it was unfortunately revealed that 12 or 35.29% belong to Fairly Competent, 16 or 47.05% belong to Competent, 6 or 17.64% belong to Much Competent and 0 belongs to Very Much Competent over 34 school DRRM coordinators who took the test which is below to the standard of 100%. The factors that affect the level of competency of school DRRM coordinators, ranked five (5) were: Lack of DRRM equipment, 3.25; Insufficient number of recruited or assigned people with similar interest and commitment towards a functional district/school

DRRM team, 3.29; Limited number of trainings conducted on DRRM, 3.24; Distance of school assignment to barangay residency, 3.24; and Have more than six (6) school special assignment, 3.18 or all rated “Often”. In the level of acceptance of the interventions implemented, the average weighted mean was 4.16 or "Accepted". In the effects of interventions implemented on the level of competency of school DRRM coordinators, the results revealed that there were “High” effects of the implemented interventions. The results also strengthened the expected output of this study to attain zero (0) fairly competent DRRM coordinators in the Bula South District.

F. Recommendation:

In the light of the findings, the following recommendations were surfaced: School DRRM team must observe the sustainability of disaster risk reduction and management operations in basic education by actively attending trainings, seminars, workshops, simulation exercises, and drills on capacity building, National and local legislators must create a law, provision, and directions of funds for school Disaster Risk Reduction and Management in both elementary and secondary, The District DRRM team must integrate throughout action the Mental Health and Psychosocial Support (MHPSS), COVID-19 Risk Communication and Community Engagement (RCCE), and child protection messaging through awareness-raising and community outreach to mitigate the risks of COVID-19, child protection issues, and mental distress, and the result generated in this study must be continuously implemented and monitored.

Keywords: *resiliency, readiness, safety, inclusive learning environment, community involvement, and competency*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>CONTENTS</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Title Page	1
Abstract	2
Table of Contents	5
List of Tables	6
List of Annexes	7
Context and Rationale	8
Innovation, Intervention, and Strategy	10
Action Research Questions	14
Action Research Methods	14
Participants and/or other Sources of Data and Information	14
Data Gathering Methods	15
Discussion of Results and Reflection	15
Advocacy, Utilization, and Dissemination	30
References	38
Financial Report	39

LIST OF TABLES

<u>TABLE</u>		<u>PAGE</u>
1	Level of Competency of School DRRM Coordinators using Pre-Training Needs Assessment (TNA)	16
2	Factors that affect the level of competency of school DRRM coordinators	19
3	Level of Acceptance of Interventions Implemented	24
4	Effects of interventions implemented on the level of competency of school DRRM coordinators of Bula South District	27
5	Plans for Advocacy, Utilization and Dissemination	31
6	Activity Report	32
7	Financial Report	39

LIST OF ANNEXES

<u>ANNEX</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
---------------------	--------------------

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1 | Research Questionnaire |
| 2 | Statistical Computations (Weighted Mean) on the Factors that affect the level of competency of school DRRM coordinators |

A. CONTEXT AND RATIONALE

Resilience in basic education sectors refers to the ability of schools to cope up with and protect their clients and properties from risk, destitution, and loss. Resilience starts with its personnel who work towards building local resilience so that a hazardous event no longer equal to disaster. If the personnel of the DRRM team is not competent enough, this will enlarge the vulnerabilities in disasters.

School safety is included in the standards and principles in implementing the enhanced **Philippine Basic Education System** or the **RA 10533** that makes the curriculum learner-centered, inclusive, and developmentally appropriate. This will be done by creating a child-friendly, environmentally friendly, and resilient school in disaster. By this thrust, the **Governance for Basic Education Act of 2001 otherwise known as Republic Act 9155** has specified the importance of education by means of giving quality and accessible education to all despite of creed, color, ethnicity, and location. With this, personnel of the school DRRM team shall be activated and competent enough as members of the Philippine Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Council (PDRPMC) according to the **Republic Act 10121** known as *the* Philippine Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Act of 2010.

Bayangos, Mariel et. al (2018), hazard only become disasters when it affects a population. The severity of the disaster depends on a population's competency to cope using its own resources. A hazard that occurs on an uninhabited island or hazards that occur in a community that is well prepared for

such events may not experience a disaster. Decreasing vulnerabilities and increasing capacities to a hazard could prevent disaster.

Wahlstrom, Margareta (2018), there are lack of awareness and capacity in DRR in the ministries of Education and teachers. Many schools have an overload of classes and there is resistance towards adding DRR to school curricula. Regardless of whether DRR and DRM issues are integrated into a school's curriculum, there is a need to build the capacity of teachers through the provision of training and materials. The lack of financing for training and providing materials is a challenge so innovations in schools are also important for DRR education.

Bowen, Alex (2019), It can be claimed that innovative programs in disaster management may contribute to the effectiveness of the organizations, as well as to the individuals, and the society. Firstly, the innovative-related program brings about changes and improved job performance, acquisition of new skills, and communication. What is more, innovative programs help people to have more self-efficacy and a sense of empowerment.

Last school year 2020-2021, the district DRRM coordinator conducted Training Needs Assessment (TNA) for the thirty-four (34) schools, DRRM coordinators of Bula South District, in preparation for Capacity Building of schools in the new DRRM manuals. In line with the conducted Training Needs Assessment (TNA) of school DRRM coordinators in Bula South District, it was unfortunately revealed that 12 or 35.29% belong to Fairly Competent, 16 or

47.05% belong to Competent, 6 or 17.64% belong to Much Competent and 0 belongs to Very Much Competent over 34 school DRRM coordinators who took the test which is below to the standard of 100%. With this situation, school DRRM coordinators who fall under the competent and fairly competent level are at risk to enlarge vulnerabilities in disasters.

With this result, the district DRRM team found its way to help school DRRM coordinators to strengthen their level of competency to amplify readiness in hazards and disasters through the Project PRO RADAR: Providing Resilience in Basic Education Sector to Amplify Readiness of school DRRM coordinators in Bula South District for SY 2021-2022.

This research was molded to foster, elevate and improve the level of competency of school DRRM coordinators for school resiliency and a safe learning environment for all.

B. INNOVATION, INTERVENTION, AND STRATEGY

The following innovations, interventions, and strategies were applied using Justified Comprehensive and Diversified Model:

PLANNING

a.] **Oplan We As One** – The district DRRM coordinator, school head-in-charge, and Public Schools District Supervisor called a consultation meeting where they discussed the baseline data on the conducted Pre-Training Needs Assessment. The participants were the members of the district DRRM team including personnel from MDRRMO and other identified stakeholders. This

informed the DRRM coordinators and the administration on the nature of the study and target output and solicited the group's commitment and support.

b.] **Oplan Consulta** – The researcher facilitated an agenda where school DRRM coordinators were asked what is their most necessary needs in performing their task as school coordinators, how the district DRRM team can assist them effectively, and what programs and project is their priority. Their suggestions were considered in designing and implementing research innovations.

c.] **Collaborative Project** – The district DRRM team together with the school head-in-charge coordinated with the Barangay and Municipal DRRM to look for a possible collaborative training/seminar/workshop for capacity building of schools in implementing DRRM programs.

LEARNING and STRATEGIZING

d.] **Project Konektado** – This innovation created the unified information and emergency hotline numbers from partner agencies including Barangay and Rural Health Unit, BFP, PNP, AFP, MDRRMO, and kabalikat Civicom. It ensured that there are available and updated Hotline numbers posted in each school. This was also a part of the Information and Education Campaign (IEC) of Bula South District where an early warning system, hazard map, and other important information were made available.

e] **Project Kaisa** – This was the community stakeholders' engagement and participation where identified stakeholders became a member of the district and school DRRM team. Every member of the team actively participated in assessing,

planning, implementing, monitoring, and evaluating education in an emergency program. This intervention also created the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with the local government unit, if the school is to be used as an evacuation center and other purposes as per RA 10821 and DepEd-DSWD-DILG JMC 1, s. 2013. In lined with immediate response, teachers who had a background in Basic Life Support, First Aid, Psychological First Aid, and Incident Management was identified, organized and included in District and Division Response Team.

f.] Project **Mapa** – This project was the creation of detailed comprehensive hazard and vulnerability maps for major natural hazards that need to be produced and constantly updated at the district and school levels. This was done in partnership with the Municipal Planning and Development Office (MPDO).

g.] Project **Aral** - This was an innovation in the part the of Education Continuity Plan (ECP) where the repository of learning materials in all learning areas in all grade levels was stored in one place. This was done because validated and quality assured contextualized and localized learning materials were not all available in the DepEd learning portal and were not available offline. With this, learning materials are already available in absence of internet connectivity in case hazards would incur significant damages to school facilities.

h.] Project **Hirilingan** – This innovation was done quarterly where all school DRRM coordinators gather for echoing, mentoring, and coaching to enhance DRRM programs and activities in school. But due to the pandemic this intervention

was mostly done online using group chats, google meet, and other online platforms.

MONITORING and EVALUATION

i.] **Oplan Sita** – It required all the schools in Bula South District to answer and submit the School Disaster Risk Reduction and Management (SDRRM) Monitoring form. The monitoring form consists of forty-one (41) indicators regarding the DRRM facilities, projects, programs, and activities in their local area including the status of their school DRRM team.

RECOGNIZING

j.] **Oplan Kilalanin** – In this stage, the District DRRM team identified and recognized the school DRRM team who effectively performs their duties and responsibilities and what is prescribed in DepEd Order No. 17, s. 2015 or the duties and function of school DRRM coordinators. This program also recognized schools, higher authorities, and partner agencies who take part in building resilience in schools.

SHARING and BENCHMARKING

k. **Project Ibahagi** – This project shared the result of this action research with the school, district, division, and community during conferences, meetings, and assemblies upon completion of this task.

C. ACTION RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This action research initiative determined the impact of Project PRO RADAR on the level of competency of school DRRM coordinators of Bula South District for School Year 2021-2022.

Specifically, it answered the following questions:

1. What is the level of competency of school DRRM coordinators in the three pillars of the Comprehensive Disaster Risk Reduction and Management in Basic Education using Training Needs Assessment?
2. What are the factors that affect the level of competency of school DRRM coordinators?
3. What are the level of acceptance of the school DRRM coordinators on the interventions implemented?
4. What are the effects of intervention implemented on the level of competency of school DRRM coordinators?

EXPECTED OUTPUT:

The expected output of this research was to attain zero (0) fairly competent school DRRM coordinators in Bula South District for School Year 2021-2022.

D. ACTION RESEARCH METHODS

This action research employed a descriptive method of research in discussing the answers to the four (4) research questions posted.

a. Participants and/or Other Sources of Data and Information

The participants of the research were the thirty-four (34) school DRRM

coordinators of Bula South District. No sampling technique was employed since the total enumeration of the respondents of the study.

b. Data Gathering Methods

For question number 1: A Training Needs Assessment was administered to get the level of competency of school DRRM coordinators.

For question number 2: Self-made questionnaires were utilized to know the factors that affect the level of competency of school DRRM coordinators and the Likert Scale was described as 4 - Always, 3 - Often, 2 - Sometimes, and 1 – Never was used.

For question number 3: For the level of acceptance of the interventions implemented a self-made questionnaire was also conducted and a Rating Scale was described as 5 – Highly Accepted, 4 – Accepted, 3 – Moderately Accepted, 2 – Less Accepted, and 1 – Not Accepted were utilized.

For question number 4: On the effects of intervention, Post-test was administered for the improvement of the level of competency of school DRRM coordinators.

E. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS AND REFLECTION

The Level of Competency of school DRRM coordinators in the Three Pillars of the Comprehensive Disaster Risk Reduction and Management in Basic Education using TNA-Training Needs Assessment

Reflected in Table 1 was the Level of competency of school DRRM coordinators in the three pillars of the Comprehensive Disaster Risk Reduction and

Management in Basic Education using Training Needs Assessment. In school year 2021-2022, the Bula South District has thirty-four (34) school DRRM coordinators. It showed that there were 12 or 35.29% belongs to Fairly Competent, 16 or 47.05% belongs to Competent, 6 or 17.64% belongs to Much Competent, and 0 belongs to Very Much Competent over 34 school DRRM coordinators in Bula South District.

Table 1 Level of Competency of School DRRM Coordinators using Pre-Training Needs Assessment (TNA)

School DRRM coordinators	Not Competent (1)	Fairly Competent (2)	Competent (3)	Much Competent (4)	Very Much Competent (5)
MALE					
Coordinator 1		/			
Coordinator 2			/		
Coordinator 3			/		
Coordinator 4		/			
Coordinator 5		/			
Coordinator 6		/			
Coordinator 7		/			
Coordinator 8		/			
Coordinator 9			/		
Coordinator 10			/		
Coordinator 11			/		
Coordinator 12			/		
Coordinator 13		/			
Coordinator 14			/		
Coordinator 15				/	
Coordinator 16			/		
Coordinator 17				/	
Coordinator 18				/	
Coordinator 19			/		
Coordinator 20				/	
FEMALE					
Coordinator 21		/			

Coordinator 22		/			
Coordinator 23			/		
Coordinator 24			/		
Coordinator 25				/	
Coordinator 26		/			
Coordinator 27			/		
Coordinator 28		/			
Coordinator 29		/			
Coordinator 30			/		
Coordinator 31			/		
Coordinator 32			/		
Coordinator 33				/	
Coordinator 34			/		
TOTAL	0	12	16	6	0

The result means there is a need for interventions concerned with decreasing vulnerabilities and increasing the capacities of school DRRM coordinators. Hazards that occur in a well-competent and prepared school DRRM team may not experience a disaster. Problem1 was addressed by utilizing the different interventions allotted for this research study, since the expected output of this study was to attain (0) Fairly Competent. This was the baseline for the conduct of the study.

Gayathri (2020), specified that identifying the risks and vulnerabilities of the local DRR practitioners and communities is the first important step in the management of disasters. It lays the foundation for further disaster preparedness and mitigation activities. DRR practitioners often do needs assessments, monitoring, and evaluation to answer the question, what are this community's felt needs, and which of those needs can we address to have the biggest impact.

Likewise, in this study identifying the risk and vulnerabilities of school DRRM coordinators was very important, since it was the basis for improvement. This very practical Needs Assessment does anchors and informed how DRR practitioners implement their programs and can improve the way they implement disaster risk reduction and management.

In addition, the three pillars of the Comprehensive DRRM in Basic Education Framework served as the guide of school in implementing DRRM. The Pillar 1: Safe learning Facilities includes the establishment of safe site selection, design, construction, and maintenance of school structures and ensure safe and continuous access to the facility. The Pillar 2: School Disaster Management refers to the establishment of organizational support such as DRRM team, community involvement and partnership with other agencies. The Pillar 3: Risk Reduction and Resilience Education covers the integration of DRRM in the formal and non-formal school curricula and in extra-curricular activities, capacity building, and providing necessary materials. These three pillars were prescribed in DepEd Order No. 37 series of 2015.

Reflection

The district DRRM team played an important role in the improvement of the level of competency of school DRRM coordinators. The district DRRM team religiously implemented the expected intervention for Project PRO RADAR and equated to zero (0) fairly competent school DRRM coordinators in Bula South District. Therefore, it is a must to dwell on the different interventions and let the school DRRM coordinators experience it for better output of their level of

competency.

The Factors that Affect the Level of Competency of school DRRM Coordinators

Reflected in Table 2 were the factors affecting the level of competency of school DRRM coordinators in the Bula South District. The four (4) indicators namely: facilities, community involvement, personal and professional factors, and organizational factors were rated “Often”.

Table 2 Factors that affect the level of competency of school DRRM coordinators

INDICATORS	Wx	I	Rank
Facilities	2.71	O	
1. There is not enough equipment in DRRM	3.35	O	1
2. There is no hazard and vulnerability map in the school	2.03	S	18
3. There are no Early Warning Devices in School	2.97	O	6
4. There are no Emergency Hotline Numbers	2.71	O	8
5. There is no access to documents and instructional materials to available free online and offline facilities for resumption of classes, learning materials, and provision of psychosocial support.	2.47	O	14
Community Involvement	2.57	O	
1. There is no active participation from the community and	2.47	O	13
2. Community members lack of interest in DRRM activities.	2.53	O	12
3. There is no memorandum of agreement between partner stakeholders	2.53	O	11
4. Don't know the proper access/protocols/coordination.	2.59	O	10
5. There is no designation assigned for community partnership.			7
Personal and Professional Factors	2.45	O	
1. Time Management	2.62	O	9
2. Health problem	1.79	S	19
3. Have more than six (6) school special assignment	3.18	O	5
4. Don't have enough training in the new Basic DRRM manuals	2.24	S	17
5. Newly designated as DRRM coordinator	2.44	O	15
Organizational Factors	2.74	O	

1. There are no regular conferences/meetings conducted	1.53	S	20
2. Distance of school assignment to barangay residency	3.24	O	4
3. There is no Education in Emergencies Program (EEP)	2.38	S	16
4. Limited number of trainings conducted on DRRM	3.24	O	3
5. Insufficient number of recruited or assigned people with similar interest and commitment towards a functional district/school DRRM team.	3.29	O	2
Others: please specify.			

Legend:

	Interval	Interpretation
4	3.40 – 4.00	Always (A)
3	2.40 – 3.39	Often (O)
2	1.40 – 2.39	Sometimes (S)
1	1.00 – 1.39	Never (N)

In descending order the indicators under facilities were: There is not enough equipment in DRRM, (3.35); There are no early warning devices in school, (2.97); There are no emergency hotline numbers, (2.71); There is no access to documents and instructional materials to available free online and offline facilities for resumption of classes, learning materials and provision of psychosocial support, (2.47); and there is no hazard and vulnerability map in school, (2.03).

In ascending order the indicators under community involvement were: There is no active participation from community and stakeholders, (2.47); Community members have a lack of interest in DRRM activities, (2.53); There is no memorandum of agreement between partner stakeholders, (2.53); Don't know the proper access/protocols/coordination with the local DRRM and possible stakeholders for resource mobilization and partnership, (2.59); and there is no designation assigned for community partnership, (2.74).

In descending order the indicators under personal and professional factors were: Have more than six (6) school special assignments, (3.18); Time management, (2.62); Newly designated as DRRM coordinator, (2.44); Don't have enough training in the new basic DRRM manuals, (2.24); and Health problem, (1.79).

In ascending order, the indicators under organizational factors were: There are no regular conferences/meetings conducted, (1.53); There is no Education in Emergencies Program (EEP), (2.38); Limited number of training conducted on DRRM, (3.24); Distance of school assignment to barangay residency, (3.24); and Insufficient number of recruit or assigned people with similar interest and commitment towards a functional district/school DRRM team, (3.29).

In all the factors that affect the level of competency of school DRRM coordinators, ranked five (5) were: Lack of DRRM equipment, 3.25; Insufficient number of recruited or assigned people with similar interest and commitment towards a functional district/school DRRM team, 3.29; Limited number of trainings conducted on DRRM, 3.24; Distance of school assignment to barangay residency, 3.24; and Have more than six (6) school special assignment, 3.18 or all rated "Often".

For these factors, the average weighted mean under the four factors were: Facilities, (2.71); Community Involvement, (2.57); Personal and Professional Factors, (2.45); and Organizational Factors, (2.74).

This showed that the factors affecting the level of competency of school DRRM coordinators were rated “Often”. It means that the school DRRM team in Bula South District frequently experienced dearth of necessary DRRM equipment including first aid kits, fire extinguishers, spine board, megaphone, hard hat, and emergency bell. Insufficient number of recruited or assigned member in DRRM team was also mentioned where Project KAISA was implemented that enabled active participation of partner agencies, community, and stakeholders in implementing DRRM activity. The result also shows that there were limited number of DRRM trainings that should be addressed by providing avenue to our school DRRM coordinators for capacity building. Establishing communication and coordination protocols was helpful in monitoring and evaluating the school DRRM team so that interventions will always be made at all levels.

Cubillas, Ariel U. (2018), on the Implementation of the School Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Program Components of the Disaster-Prone Elementary School in Butuan City, Philippines, revealed that there was an absence of building emergency evacuation, lack of training of the SDRRMG members, dearth of equipment, and a discontinuity of instruction. However, the schools make initiatives to mitigate the problems like improvised unused materials for them to make disaster equipment.

Likewise, facilities and organizational factors were revealed as the highest factor affecting the level of competency of school DRRM coordinators so resource mobilization and partnership are necessary. Resource Mobilization and Partnership are the assistance and/or contributions coming from internal and

external stakeholders like national and local government agencies, local government units, non-government organizations, civil society organizations, private sectors, parents, community elders, students, and teachers. In receiving assistance district DRRM team should take the lead in assessing whether additional support is still necessary so other affected schools could in the same way benefit.

Reflection

The four factors namely: facilities, community involvement, personal and professional factors, and organizational factors bear a big contribution to the improvements of the level of competency of school DRRM coordinators. Like in the system of education the attainment of goals will not be possible if the other parts were not functioning well for the common good of our clientele, learners. School DRRM coordinators also need support as an advocate for safe and inclusive learning environment. Meaning, that facilities, community involvement, personal and professional factors, and organization factors were a strong foundation for school DRRM coordinators as the frontliners in building a culture of safe learning environment, reducing risks, and ensuring learning continuity.

This is also a call for school administrators to support the SDRRM Program like the inclusion of DRRM in the School Improvement Plan (SIP), School-Based Management (SBM), School Improvement Plan (SIP), Community Extension, and Student-Led Hazard Mapping activity. All schools have an SBM grant that shall be used to support activities that will lead towards the formulation of a 3-year School Improvement Plan (SIP) that has

been agreed upon among school authorities, the community, and the DepEd Division Office; and/or implement the approved SIP translated into Annual Implementation Plan (AIP). Improved learning outcomes are measured in terms of student participation, completion, and achievement including school DRRM programs.

In this case, the DRRM team from the national level down to the school level must work together with the stakeholders and community to attain resilience in the most vulnerable sector including our children.

The Level of Acceptance of Interventions Implemented

Reflected in Table 3 were the interventions conducted during the School Year 2021-2022. The eleven (11) indicators were rated “Accepted”.

Table 3 Level of Acceptance of Interventions Implemented

INDICATORS	Wx	I	Rank
PLANNING			
Oplan We as One	4.16	A	8
Oplan Consulta	4.41	A	2
Collaborative Project	4.00	A	9
LEARNING & STRATEGIZING			
Project Konektado	4.38	A	3
Project Kaisa	4.34	A	4
Project Mapa	4.22	A	6
Project Aral	4.44	A	1
Project Hirilingan	3.94	A	11
MONITORING & EVALUATION			
Oplan Sita	4.25	A	5
RECOGNIZING			
Oplan Kilalanin	3.97	A	10
SHARING & BENCHMARKING			
Project Ibahagi	4.19	A	7
	4.21	A	

Legend:

Level of acceptance	Interval	Verbal Interpretation	
5	4.50-5.00	Highly Accepted	(HA)
4	3.50-4.49	Accepted	(A)
3	2.50-3.49	Moderately Accepted	(MA)
2	1.50-2.49	Less Accepted	(LA)
1	1.00-1.49	Not Accepted	(NA)

In descending order these were: Project Aral, (4.44); Oplan Consulta, (4.41); Project Konektado, (4.38); Project Kaisa, (4.34); Oplan Sita, (4.25); Project Mapa, (4.22); Project Ibahagi, (4.19); Oplan we as one, (4.16); Collaborative Project, (4.00); Oplan Kilalanin, (3.97); and Project Hirilingan, (3.94).

For these interventions, the average weighted mean was 4.21. This showed that the interventions conducted during the School Year 2021-2022 were “Accepted”. It can be noticed that Project Aral ranked in 1st place which means that the repository of learning materials in all learning areas and all grades were effectively used during this time of the pandemic. This innovation is a part of the Education Continuity Plan (ECP) of Bula South District that ensures the availability of quality-assured contextualized and localized learning materials. Meanwhile, Project Hirilingan was ranked the lowest because we are restricted to have face-to-face gatherings designed for echoing, mentoring, and coaching to enhance DRRM programs and activities in school. Instead, it was done on an online platform.

All the implemented interventions empowered the schools and school DRRM coordinators in ensuring learning continuity, institutionalizing Disaster Risk Reduction and Management (DRRM), and strengthening the resilience of basic education in the context of natural and human-induced hazards.

Forsman et al., (2021) stated that workplace interventions often encourage employees to identify, develop, and make use of workplace resources. The synthesized evidence suggests that bottom-up, resource-developing interventions are effective in the promotion of work engagement. The meta-analysis suggests that focusing on strengths and adopting a universal approach increase intervention effectiveness.

Reflection

School DRRM coordinators must help themselves to embrace the different interventions presented because everything started from within. These interventions linked core competencies required in performing duties and responsibilities as a DRRM practitioner. The District DRRM team must have to continue to ensure direct connection for these interventions to each school DRRM coordinator for continuity of the project and increase the impact of our efforts in building resilience in school.

The school DRRM coordinators accepted the interventions implemented for Project PRO RADAR because they experienced it congruent to the level of acceptance. The district DRRM team dwelt religiously on the different interventions to address the problem in the level of competency of school DRRM coordinators and it was a bright step to uplift the competency of school DRRM coordinators inside the five sectors of Bula South District and in the community as well.

The Effects of interventions Implemented on the Level of Competency of school DRRM coordinators

Reflected in Table 4 were the results of the pre-training needs assessment (TNA) inventory and post-training needs assessment (TNA) inventory. It is also shown in the table the difference of post-training needs assessment (TNA) inventory from the post-training needs assessment (TNA) inventory where the difference between the two TNA inventories revealed the effects of intervention implemented on the level of competency of school DRRM coordinators in Bula South District.

With regards to the effects of intervention implemented on the level of competency of the school DRRM coordinators in Bula South District there were: nine (9) or 26.47% under “Very High”; fifteen (15) or 44.11% under “High”; six (6) or 17.68% under “Moderately High”; and four (4) or 11.76% under “Low”.

Table 4 Effects of interventions implemented on the level of competency of school DRRM coordinators of Bula South District

Name of school DRRM coordinators	Post Test Training Needs Assessment (TNA)	Pre-Test Training Needs Assessment (TNA)	Difference	Remarks
MALE				
Coordinator 1	16	5	11	VH
Coordinator 2	18	9	9	VH
Coordinator 3	17	14	3	L
Coordinator 4	11	4	7	H
Coordinator 5	10	4	6	H
Coordinator 6	12	5	7	H
Coordinator 7	12	9	3	L

Coordinator 8	13	5	8	VH
Coordinator 9	15	9	6	H
Coordinator 10	14	9	5	MH
Coordinator 11	15	9	6	H
Coordinator 12	14	10	4	MH
Coordinator 13	10	5	5	MH
Coordinator 14	16	9	7	H
Coordinator 15	16	13	3	L
Coordinator 16	17	9	8	VH
Coordinator 17	16	13	3	L
Coordinator 18	19	14	5	MH
Coordinator 19	16	9	7	H
Coordinator 20	18	13	5	MH
FEMALE				
Coordinator 21	14	5	9	VH
Coordinator 22	12	5	7	H
Coordinator 23	16	9	7	H
Coordinator 24	14	9	5	MH
Coordinator 25	19	13	6	H
Coordinator 26	14	4	10	VH
Coordinator 27	18	8	10	VH
Coordinator 28	12	5	7	H
Coordinator 29	15	4	11	VH
Coordinator 30	14	7	7	H
Coordinator 31	13	7	6	H
Coordinator 32	16	8	8	VH
Coordinator 33	18	12	6	H
Coordinator 34	16	9	7	H
AVERAGE	15	8	7	H

Legend:

8 and Above	-	Very High	(VH)
6 to 7.99	-	High	(H)
4 to 5.99	-	Moderately High	(MH)
2 to 3.99	-	Low	(L)
Below 2	-	Very Low	(VL)

Based on the results it revealed that there were “High” effects of intervention implemented on the level of competency of school DRRM coordinators in Bula South District. The results also strengthened the expected output of this study to attain zero (0) fairly competent school DRRM coordinators with the help of the different interventions allotted for the study per se.

Karina Nielsen (2018), stated that organizations are becoming increasingly aware of the importance of employees in gaining and maintaining competitive advantage. Therefore, it is deemed important for an organization to create interventions and resources to improve employee well-being and performance.

Farjana Nur (2021), added that potential interventions can surely increase employee-supervisor interaction, promote good behavior and attitude, and improve employee performance to improve existing conditions.

Reflection

The effects of Project PRO RADAR on the level of competency of school DRRM coordinators were HIGH because of the different interventions implemented that were relevant to their needs as the frontline of the school DRRM team. School resiliency will be more strengthened if everyone is moving forward together because great things are never done by one person, they’re done by a team of people.

In this case, the school DRRM coordinators appreciated the Project PRO RADAR for this School Year 2021-2022. There’s a good output because the school DRRM coordinators religiously performed the different interventions

allotted for this research. The good output was the attainment of the expected output of this study which was zero fairly competent school DRRM coordinators for School Year 2021-2022.

As a district DRRM coordinator, it is a must to assist school DRRM coordinators in implementing DRRM activities in reducing risks and impacts of natural and human-induced hazards to school, community, learners, and personnel. These interventions implemented in Project PRO RADAR were a good avenue to address the risks and impacts of natural and human-induced hazards confronting the basic education sector. It was a big achievement that in our simple way we contributed to empowering the DepEd school DRRM coordinators in ensuring safety and learning continuity towards the main goal of the Department of Education, quality education for all.

F. ADVOCACY, UTILIZATION, AND DISSEMINATION

The findings and recommendations that were generated from this study may be used as inputs to suggestions for policy reformulation and system enhancement. The data from this initiative may be used in crafting project proposals such as District DRRM team projects, programs, and activities, Municipal Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Plan (MDRRMP), and Annual Implementation Plan (AIP), School Improvement Plan (SIP). The data can also be used to request (through a resolution) the institutionalization of funds exclusively for schools DRRM in the municipality. Table 5 shows the following procedures that will be followed to properly cascade the results of this research to its intended

users.

Table 5. Plans for Advocacy, Utilization, and Dissemination

Activities and Strategies	Time Frame	Persons Involved	Resource Requirements	Means of Verification(MOV)
1. Share the results of this action research to the Respondents, DepEd officials, partner agencies, and stakeholders.	May and June 2022	*Researcher Respondents, DepEd officials, Partner agencies, and stakeholders	PPT Presentation	*Certificate of presentation *documentation
2. Present the research in a Division, Regional, National and International Conferences	July to succeeding years	*Researcher	PPT Presentation	*Certificate of presentation *documentation
3. Provision of technical assistance on DRRM Implementation to schools	August 2022 to Succeeding years	*Researcher * Other interested people/school personnel	*Performance monitoring and coaching form/s *DepEd Order Number 16, s. 2017 *Research proposal and write-up	*Accomplished Performance monitoring and coaching form/s *Approved Proposal/s
4. Publish in Journal	September, 2022	*Researcher	Publication of Completed Research Report	Approved Research Report Documentation

- The Division of Camarines Sur, other Divisions, Regional and Central office will be given the published copy – as findings of this study might be related or the same as with the other divisions; thus, recommendations can be used for policy reformulation and system enhancement.
- The research findings will also be cascaded to Barangay and Municipal Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Council for partnership, inclusion in the council development plan, dissemination campaign, and possible institutionalization of funds thereof.
- The study will likewise be presented in a research forum or international, national, regional, division, and school conferences
- Provision of technical assistance on DRRM Implementation to schools

ACTIVITY REPORT

EVENT TITLE	<u>Utilization, Dissemination, and Advocacy</u>
EVENT DATE & TIME	May 26, 2022 1:00 am
VENUE	Live streaming via Google Meet
ATTENDEES/ GUESTS/ PARTICIPANTS	❖ The attendees to this activity are the following: 1. Public School District Supervisor 2. School Head-in-Charge in DRRM 3. District DRRM coordinator 4. School DRRM coordinators

EVENT BACKGROUND AND HIGHLIGHTS	The researcher presented and shared the results of his research titled “Project PRO RADAR: Providing Resilience in Basic Education Sector to Amplify Readiness of School DRRM coordinators in Bula South District” to its respondents. He started to discuss the research background, research problems, and especially the results of the research to the respondents. The results of the study were the following: In line with the level of competency of school DRRM coordinators, it was unfortunately revealed that 12 or 35.29% belong to Fairly Competent, 16 or 47.05% belong to Competent, 6 or 17.64% belong to Much Competent and 0 belongs to Very Much Competent over 34 school DRRM coordinators who took the test which is below to the standard of 100%. The factors that affect the level of competency of school DRRM coordinators ranked five (5) were: Lack of DRRM equipment, 3.25; Insufficient number of recruited or assigned people with similar interest and commitment towards a functional district/school DRRM team, 3.29; Limited number of trainings conducted on DRRM, 3.24; Distance of school assignment to barangay residency, 3.24; and Have more than six (6) school special assignment, 3.18 or all rated “Often”. In this case, the school DRRM coordinators, stakeholders, and community must work together as equally responsible for everyone’s safety and resiliency. The level of acceptance of the interventions implemented, the average weighted mean was 4.16 or "Accepted". In this case, the school DRRM coordinators and the DRRM team need to maintain those interventions to amplify readiness and resiliency in the school and community. In the effects of interventions implemented on the level of competency of school DRRM coordinators, the results revealed that there were “High” effects of the implemented interventions. The results also strengthened the expected output of this study to attain zero (0) fairly competent DRRM coordinators in the Bula South District.
---	--

	The findings of the study revealed that Project PRO RADAR had a good impact on the level of competency of school DRRM coordinators.
--	---

EVENT BACKGROUND AND HIGHLIGHTS	The adjustments made in the Implementation of Project PRO RADAR amidst COVID-19 Pandemic were the following: Online meeting, echoing, and mentoring; Early Planning and Constant Monitoring; and Use of Social Media Platforms. An Operational Plan was also proposed that is focused on capacity building and resource mobilization. The Operational Plan includes programs/ activities, objectives, resources needed, time frame, and success indicators. The programs/ activities are the following: District Capacity Building for school DRRM coordinators on emergency response and proper protocol before, during, and after disaster; Inclusion of school DRRM in the Municipal DRRM Plan and institutionalization of fund thereof, The creation of the unified information and emergency hotline numbers; Creation of Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with the local government unit, if the school is to be used as an evacuation center and other purposes as per RA 10821 and DepEd-DSWD-DILG JMC 1, s. 2013; Creation of detailed comprehensive hazard and vulnerability maps for major natural hazards, Creation of repository of learning materials in all learning areas, Constant Monitoring of DRRM Implementation; Advocacy Campaign; Evaluation and Rewards; Coordination to barangay and LGUs in the district and division DRRM; and Year-End Conversation with Coordinators for Program Sustainability.
INSIGHTS/ OBSERVATIONS/ RECOMMENDATIONS	The lessons/ insights observed in this study is that despite the pandemic, the active participation of school DRRM coordinators in Bula South District were observed in capacity building, volunteerism, and performing duties and responsibilities as frontliners of school DRRM team.

	To address the ranked 1 factor that affect the level of competency of school DRRM coordinators which is the lack of DRRM equipment, National and local legislators must create a law, provision, and directions of funds for school Disaster Risk Reduction and Management in both elementary and secondary. Newly appointed school DRRM coordinators must be trained and updated on the education comprehensive framework for disaster risk reduction and management in basic education. This will be done by attending trainings, seminars, workshops, and drills on capacity building. After the interventions conducted in this action research, the school DRRM teams must continue to undergo simulation exercises and practice DRRM information management and communication protocol that will enhance their level of competency at all times. Also, Standard Health Protocols were observed during the conduct of the research, and the information dissemination of the result of the study. Internet connection of the participants was also a concern, but the activity was done smoothly, and successfully.
--	--

Prepared by:

ERIC D. VALLE

Teacher III

Researcher

Meet - phf-vbpv-xwd

meet.google.com/phf-vbpv-xwd?pli=1

You're presenting to everyone

Stop presenting

1:28 PM | phf-vbpv-xwd

Project PRO RADAR:
Providing Resilience in Basic Education Sector
to Amplify Readiness of School DRRM
coordinators in Bula South District
 (A Completed Action Research SY 2021-2022)

ERIC D. VALLE
 Researcher/District DRRM Coordinator
 Bula South District

In-call messages

Let everyone send messages ☒

Messages can only be seen by people in the call and are deleted when the call ends

Raul Infeliz 11:59 PM
 Good afternoon. Still watching at Casugad ES.
 #PRORADAR

Teresa Baldoza 12:06 AM
 Good afternoon. Mabuhay. Still watching at Balaogan ES.

Antonette Ollado 12:07 AM
 Good afternoon. Bula South Central School

Send a message to everyone

Meet - phf-vbpv-xwd

meet.google.com/phf-vbpv-xwd?pli=1

You're presenting to everyone

Stop presenting

4:10 PM | phf-vbpv-xwd

4. What are the effects of interventions implemented on the level of competency of school DRRM coordinators?

With regards to the effects of intervention implemented on the level of competency of the 34 school DRRM coordinators in Bula South District there were: nine (9) or 26.47% under "Very High"; fifteen (15) or 44.11% under "High"; six (6) or 17.68% under "Moderately High"; and four (4) or 11.76% under "Low".

Based on the results it revealed that there were "High" effects of intervention implemented on the level of competency of school DRRM coordinators in Bula South District. The results also strengthened the expected output of this study to attain zero (0) fairly competent school DRRM coordinators with the help of the different interventions allotted for the study per se.

Meet - phf-vbpv-xwd

Settings

meet.google.com/phf-vbpv-xwd?pli=1

You're presenting to everyone

Stop presenting

Research Parameters PROJECT DSO SAGAE - PowerPoint

File Home Insert Draw Design Transitions Animations Slide Show Record Review View Help Tell me what you want to do

From Beginning Current Slide Start Slide Show

Custom Slide Show

Set Up Hide Slide Rehearsal Record Timing Set Up

Play Narrations Monitor (Automatic) Use Timings Show Media Controls Use Presenter View

Monitors

GET GENUINE OFFICE Your license isn't genuine, and you may be a victim of software counterfeiting. Avoid interruptions and keep your files safe with genuine Office today. Get genuine Office Learn more

19

20

21

22

23

24

Slide 21 of 35 English (Philippines) Accessibility: Investigate

4:26 PM | phf-vbpv-xwd

3. What are the level of acceptance of interventions Implemented?

In descending order these were: Project Aral, (4.44), Oplan Consulta, (4.41), Project Koreicada, (4.38), Project Kaga, (4.34), Oplan Sita, (4.25), Project Mapa, (4.22), Project Ipagagi, (4.19), Oplan we as one, (4.18), Collaborative Project, (4.06), Oplan Kalatagan, (3.97), and Project Malingan, (3.94).

INTERVENTIONS	Wts	I	Rank
PLANNING			
Oplan We as One	4.15	A	8
Oplan Consulta	4.41	A	2
Collaborative Project	4.00	A	9
LEARNING & STRATEGIZING			
Project Koreicada	4.38	A	3
Project Kaga	4.34	A	4
Project Mapa	4.22	A	6
Project Aral	4.44	A	1
Project Malingan	3.94	A	11
MONITORING & EVALUATION			
Oplan Sita	4.25	A	5
RECORDING			
Oplan Kalatagan	3.97	A	10
SHARING & BENCHMARKING			
Project Ipagagi	4.19	A	7
	4.21	A	

For these interventions, the average weighted mean was 4.21. This showed that the interventions conducted during the School Year 2021-2022 were "Accepted".

Notes Comments

54

Meet - phf-vbpv-xwd

Settings

meet.google.com/phf-vbpv-xwd?pli=1

You're presenting to everyone

Stop presenting

Book South District Meeting - PowerPoint

File Home Insert Draw Design Transitions Animations Slide Show Record Review View Help Tell me what you want to do

Font Paragraph Drawing Editing

14

15

16

17

Slide 6 of 17 English (Philippines) Accessibility: Good to go

6:03 PM | phf-vbpv-xwd

Closing Remarks

CHITO PICIO P. AMPARADO

School Head-in-Charge

DRRM

You

Antonette Ollado

32 others

G. REFERENCES

- Bayangos, Mariel et. al (2018). School Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Manual: Booklet 1(DRRMS), DepEd, 2018.
- Bowen, Alex (2019). Innovative Programs in Disaster Management. Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment, 2019.
- Cubillas, Ariel U. (2018). The Implementation of the School Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Program Components of the Disaster-Prone Elementary Schools, International Journal of Current Research, 10, (11), 75309-75314, November 29, 2018.
- Department of Education DRRMS (2020). Manual on Strengthening Resilience in Basic Education Sector, 2020.
- DepEd Order No. 39, s. 2016. Adoption of the Basic Education Research Agenda.
- DepEd Order No. 16, s. 2017. Research Management Guidelines.
- Division Memorandum No. 132, s. 2022. Division Research Management Guidelines, March 22, 2022.
- Division Memorandum No. 22, s. 2022. Reconstitution of the Schools Division Research Committee, January 3, 2022.
- Farjana, Nur L. (2021). Interventions to increase employee-supervisor interaction and performance to improve existing conditions, 2021.
- Forsman et al., (2021). Workplace Interventions to Identify, Develop, and Make Use of Workplace Resources of Employees.
- Gayatri Dhan (2020). The Role of Research in Disaster Risk Reduction.
- Nielsen, Karina O. (2018). Workplace resources to improve both employee well-being and performance: A systematic review and meta-analysis.

H. FINANCIAL REPORT

ACTIVITY	CAH-OUT	BALANCE
BASIC EDUCATION RESEARCH FUND (BERF)		Php 15,000.00
1. Crafting and preparation of the research paper proposal	Php 1,000.00	Php 14,000.00
2. Travel to RO V for the submission of revised research paper for evaluation	Php 1,000.00	Php 13,000.00
3. Printing of Tarpaulin of Emergency Hotline Numbers for 17 schools of Bula South District	Php 2890.00	10,110.00
4. Printing of school hazard and vulnerability maps for 17 schools of Bula South District	Php 2550.00	7,560.00
5. Purchase of district DRRM Logbook with 50 leaves for DRRM attendance, minutes, and recordings.	Php 200.00	7360.00
6. Purchase of Bond paper (Long)	Php 960.00	6,400.00
7. Purchase of Bond paper and specialty paper for certificates (Short and A4)	Php 1040.00	5,360.00
8. Purchase of printer ink (Epson L3110) – 2 ink bottles for each color blue, black, yellow, magenta for the printing of documents.	Php 2,560.00	2800.00
9. Purchase of Blank re-writable DVDs for project Aral.	Php 800.00	2000.00
Paper fastener – plastic coated	Php 100.00	1900.00
Folders	Php 600.00	1300.00
Folder Plastic Jackets	Php 450.00	850.00
Storage Box	Php 350.00	500.00
Hardbound of completed action research	Php 500.00	0

Annex 1: Research Questionnaire

RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE

Name: _____ Designation: _____

School: _____ Sector: _____

Thank you for accepting the invitation to participate in the action research entitled Project **PRO RADAR: PRO**viding **Resilience** in **bA**sic **eD**ucation sector to **Amplify Readiness** of school DRRM coordinators in Bula South District. This study aimed to determine the impact of Project PRO RADAR and improve the level of competency of school DRRM coordinators in Bula South District. Rest assured that information will be kept confidential. Thank you very much and keep safe.

1. **Level of competency** of school DRRM coordinators in the three pillars of the Comprehensive Disaster Risk Reduction and Management in Basic Education. Assess your level of competency in the different areas provided and described below using a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 means not competent, 2 means fairly competent, 3 means competent, 4 means much competent, and 5 means very much competent. Check the number corresponding your self-assessment.

SAFE LEARNING FACILITIES	5	4	3	2	1
1. I can discuss the different types of common hazards in the Philippines as well as their corresponding early warning systems.					
2. I have understanding of the different common hazards in the Philippines and how they impact on the lives of the people.					
3. I know how to conduct the Student-led School Watching and Hazard Mapping and Multi-hazard Drills in schools.					
4. I can discuss about the procedures and the different documentary requirements needed for Student-led School Watching and Multi-hazard Drills in schools.					
5. I can facilitate a process of coming up with an evidence-based DRRM Plan for my area of responsibility or AOR (either region or division)					
6. I know the definition and importance of having a DRRM plan as well as its different elements.					
7. I can facilitate a process of coming up with a Contingency Plan for my area of responsibility (either region or division).					
8. I know the definition and importance of having a Contingency Plan as well as its different elements.					
9. I understand the principles and minimum standards of Education in Emergencies .					
10. I can apply or implement an Education in Emergencies Program in my AOR in case a disaster happens.					
SCHOOL DISASTER MANAGEMENT	5	4	3	2	1
1. I am knowledgeable about the tools (RADaR and PDNA), procedures and information flow protocols of DepEd before, during and after any hazard.					
2. I can efficiently coordinate assessment, response and recovery information and activities with internal and external education stakeholders .					
3. I can differentiate among the different Alternative Delivery Modes (ADMS) that maybe used during emergencies.					
4. I know the importance of using Alternative Delivery Modes during emergency periods.					
5. I know about the different temporary learning spaces design principles and standards.					

6. I can easily coordinate and facilitate the process of providing temporary learning spaces to schools that need them.					
7. I can enumerate the different education in emergencies supplies needed by the schools during emergencies.					
8. I can advocate for emergency supplies logistics strategies to our office.					
9. I can facilitate Psycho-social First-aid Sessions with teachers and learners affected by disasters.					
10. I understand the basic principles and approaches in providing psychosocial first-aid for children and adults.					
DISASTER RISK REDUCTION IN EDUCATION	5	4	3	2	1
1. I can discuss the provisions of JMC #1 S 2013 (Camp Coordination and Management Guidelines)which are relevant to DepEd.					
2. I can provide technical and coordination support to schools in my area of responsibility which are be-ing used as evacuation centers during emergencies.					
3. I can provide First Aid Interventions and Basic Life Support to those who need it.					
4. I can make basic security assessment and coordination before doing field work.					
5. I can design, deliver and manage DRRM training activities for teachers and other stakeholders.					
6. I am knowledgeable about the different principles of adult learning.					
7. I can design a DRRM resource mobilization strategy and carry it out for my AOR.					

2. Factors that affect the level of competency of school DRRM coordinators.

Factors Affecting the Level of Competency	4	3	2	1
Facilities				
1. There is no enough equipment in DRRM				
2. There is no hazard and vulnerability map in school				
3. There is no Early Warning Devices in School				
4. There is no Emergency Hotline Numbers				
5. There is no access to documents and instructional materials to available free online and offline facilities for resumption of classes, learning materials and provision of psychosocial support.				
Community Involvement				
1. There is no active participation from community and stakeholders.				
2. Community members has lack of interest in DRRM activities.				
3. There is no memorandum of agreement between partner stakeholders				
4. Don't know the proper access/protocols/coordination with the local DRRM and possible stakeholders for resource mobilization and partnership.				
5. There is no designation assigned for community partnership.				
Personal and Professional Factors				
1. Time Management				
2. Health problem				
3. Have more than six (6) school special assignment				
4. Don't have enough training in the new Basic DRRM manuals				
5. Newly designated as DRRM coordinator				

Organizational Factors					
1. There is no regular conferences/meetings conducted					
2. Distance of school assignment to barangay residency					
3. There is no Education in Emergencies Program (EEP)					
4. Limited number of trainings conducted on DRRM					
5. Insufficient number of recruit or assigned people with similar interest and commitment towards a functionable district/school DRRM team.					
Others: please specify.					

Legend:

	Interval	Interpretation
4	3.40 – 4.00	Always (A)
3	2.40 – 3.39	Often (O)
2	1.40 – 2.39	Sometimes (S)
1	1.00 – 1.39	Never (N)

3. Level of acceptance of interventions implemented

Interventions Conducted	5	4	3	2	1
PLANNING					
Oplan We as One					
Oplan Consulta					
Collaborative Project					
LEARNING AND STRATEGIZING					
Project Konektado					
Project Kaisa					
Project Mapa					
Project Aral					
Project Hirilingan					
MONITORING and EVALUATION					
Oplan Sita					
RECOGNIZING					
Oplan Kilalanin					
SHARING and BENCHMARKING					
Project Ibahagi					

Legend:

Level of acceptance	Interval	Verbal Interpretation
5	4.50-5.00	Highly Accepted (HA)
4	3.50-4.49	Accepted (A)
3	2.50-3.49	Moderately Accepted (MA)
2	1.50-2.49	Less Accepted (LA)
1	1.00-1.49	Not Accepted (NA)

4. Effects of interventions implemented on the level of competency of school DRRM coordinators of Bula South District.

Name of school DRRM coordinators	Post Test Training Needs Assessment (TNA)	Pre-Test Training Needs Assessment (TNA)	Difference	Remarks

Legend:

8 and Above	-	Very High	(VH)
6 to 7.99	-	High	(H)
4 to 5.99	-	Moderately High	(MH)
2 to 3.99	-	Low	(L)
Below 2	-	Very Low	(VL)

Annex 1.1: Statistical Computations (Weighted Mean)

Weighted Mean scores of the Factors that Affect the Level of Competency of School DRRM coordinators in Bula South District

Indicators	Facilities										Average		Community Involvement										Average		
	Never		Sometimes		Often		Always		I	Wx	R	Never		Sometimes		Often		Always			Wx	I	R		
1	0	0	0	0	14	42	18	72	O	3.35	1	2	2	12	24	14	42	4	16		2.47	O	5		
2	7	7	18	36	2	6	5	20	S	2.03	5	0	0	13	26	16	48	3	12		2.53	O	4		
3	4	4	5	10	5	15	18	72	O	2.97	2	4	4	9	18	12	36	7	28		2.53	O	3		
4	0	0	0	0	28	84	2	8	O	2.71	3	4	4	8	16	12	36	8	32		2.59	O	2		
5	5	5	16	32	9	27	5	20	O	2.47	4	5	5	7	14	6	18	14	56		2.74	O	1		
										2.71											2.57				

Personal & Professional factors									Average			Organizational Factor								Average			Overall Average			
Never		Sometimes		Often		Always			Wx	I	R	Never		Sometimes		Often		Always		Wx	I	R	Wx	I		
3	3	6	12	18	54	5	20		2.62	O	2	16	16	12	24	4	12	0	0	1.53	S	5	2.49	Often		
12	12	14	28	3	9	3	12		1.79	S	5	0	0	2	4	14	42	16	6	3.24	O	2	2.40	Often		
0	0	4	8	12	36	16	64		3.18	O	1	3	3	12	24	14	42	3	12	2.38	S	4	2.76	Often		
5	5	15	30	7	21	5	20		2.24	S	4	6	6	14	28	12	36	10	40	3.24	O	3	2.69	Often		
14	14	0	0	3	9	15	60		2.44	O	3	0	0	2	4	12	36	18	72	3.29	O	1	2.74	Often		
									2.45												2.74			2.62		

Annex 1.2: Statistical Computations (Weighted Mean)

Weighted Mean scores of the level of Acceptance of Interventions Implemented to School DRRM coordinators in Bula South District

Implemented Interventions	Level of Acceptance										Average		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Wx	I	R
PLANNING													
Oplan We as One	0	0	4	8	3	9	9	36	16	80	4.16	A	8
Oplan Consulta	0	0	0	0	7	21	5	20	20	100	4.41	A	2
Collaborative Project	0	0	2	4	8	24	10	40	12	60	4.00	A	9
LEARNING & STRATEGIZING													
Project Konektado	0	0	0	0	8	24	4	16	20	100	4.38	A	3
Project Kaisa	0	0	0	0	8	24	5	20	19	95	4.34	A	4
Project Mapa	0	0	2	4	6	18	7	28	17	85	4.22	A	6
Project Aral	0	0	0	0	6	18	6	24	20	100	4.44	A	1
Project Hirilingan	0	0	0	0	12	36	10	40	10	50	3.94	A	11
MONITORING & EVALUATION													
Oplan Sita	0	0	0	0	8	24	8	32	16	80	4.25	A	5
RECOGNIZING													
Oplan Kilalanin	1	1	1	2	9	27	8	32	13	65	3.97	A	10
SHARING & BENCHMARKING													
Project Ibahagi	0	0	0	0	6	18	14	56	12	60	4.19	A	7
											4.21		