# IMPLEMENTATION OF LEARNING CONTINUITY PLAN (LCP) RELATED VARIABLES AMIDST PANDEMIC AND PERFORMANCE OF THE SECONDARY SCHOOLS, DIVISION OF SAN PABLO CITY: INPUT TO QUALITY ASSURANCE

**ERWIN G. ABRIL[1], EDEN C. CALLO, EdD[2]**
[1]0000-0002-9893-8894, [2]0000-0002-9457-9361
[1]erwin.abril@deped.gov.ph, [2]eden.callo@lspu.edu.ph
[1]Col. Lauro D. Dizon Memorial Integrated High School, Department of Education
[2]Laguna State Polytechnic University, San Pablo City Campus, Philippines

**ABSTRACT**

*The Basic Education Learning Continuity Plan (BE-LCP) has been designed with a legal framework responsive to the COVID-19 pandemic, keeping in mind the constitutional mandate to uphold the right of all citizens to quality education at all times. Thus, this descriptive-correlational research design determined the implementation of the LCP and the performance of the 14 principals and 452 teachers in the secondary schools, Division of San Pablo City. The results were analyzed using mean, standard deviation, Pearson-r Correlation, t-test, and multiple linear regression analysis. The study revealed that the principals had implemented the LCP implementation-related variables to a great extent, while teachers implemented it to an extent. Both groups of respondents considered the learning delivery modalities, assessment of learning, and learning resources as an integral part of the school's performance. The implementation of LCP related variables has a significant relationship with school performance. There were significant differences in the responses of the two groups of respondents regarding the perceived implementation of LCP. On the other hand, the implementation of LCP variables singly or in combination influenced the school's performance. This study calls for collaboration between schools and stakeholders in implementing LCP as the primary framework in responding to the challenges posed by the COVID-19 pandemic.*

*Keywords: COVID-19, Learning Continuity Plan (LCP), access, quality, governance, school performance*

## INTRODUCTION

Amidst the COVID-19 pandemic and its concomitant challenges, the Department if Education (DepEd), through the National Educators Academy of the Philippines (NEAP), affirms its commitment to providing and supporting the professional growth of teachers and school leaders (DepEd, 2020).

The Department echoes UNESCO's belief that educational quality, access, and system strengthening cannot be compromised in times of crisis (UNESCO, 2017). Doing the opposite negatively affects human capital. Thus, DepEd affirms its commitment to sustaining quality, accessible, relevant, and liberating Philippine essential education services anchored on the Sulong EduKalidad framework. Furthermore, it will continue to strive to produce holistic Filipino learners with

21st-century skills. Consequently, the Bureau of Curriculum Development ensures that learning standards are relevant and flexible to address the complex, disruptive, volatile, and ambiguous impact of COVID-19 in the Philippines, particularly in the basic education sector.

In the light of the crisis, DepEd introduced the Basic Education Learning Continuity Plan (BE-LCP) during the COVID-19. This is the Department's response to the challenges posed by the COVID-19 pandemic in the field of basic education. Nonetheless, DepEd also believes that education must continue, regardless of the changes and even dangers confront now and in the future. (Briones, 2020).

With a learner-oriented framework, the reforms articulated in the BE-LCP are aligned with the four pillars of Sulong Edukalidad: K to 12 curriculum review and update; improving the learning environment; teachers' upskilling and reskilling; and engagement of stakeholders for support and collaboration. These pillars should be implemented with an emphasis on innovation, agility, and synergy. The goals unite Sulong Edukalidad, BE-LCP, and the futures of the Philippine education for and with every learner: agency and self-actualization, work readiness, and responsible citizenship. Thus, the BE-LCP must be guided by life-long, life-wide, life-deep, and life-wise learning principles (DepEd, 2020).

DepEd Order No. 12, s. 2020, the Adoption of the Basic Education Learning Continuity Plan (BE-LCP) for School Year 2020 – 2021, in the light of the COVID-19 Public Health Emergency, states that the Department ensures education shall continue amidst the threat of the pandemic. It will be made possible through the K12 Curriculum adjustments, alignment of learning materials, deployment of multiple learning delivery modalities, provisions of corresponding training for teachers and school leaders, and proper orientation of parents or guardians of learners.

The quality of education is one of the keys to overcoming challenges. It is usually understood as the balanced compliance of education (its outcomes, processes, and environment) with identified needs, goals, requirements, norms, and standards. Quality is the level of compliance of the program's characteristics and outcomes with the conditions set for the Department (Gerasimov & Shaposhnikov, 2014). Accordingly, educators need to identify and advance a specific vision for preparing young people for global citizenship. The curriculum and instruction goals should be clear, as should the aims of the topics have presented in school textbooks (Aydin & Damgaci, 2017; Leek, 2016). These goals should also be malleable to accommodate rapidly changing trends in contemporary global education.

An opportunity to choose from different learning modalities of learning is essential for student success. It includes blended, modular and online, and partially face-to-face. However, when student persistence was studied, the development of blended learning was shown to have a more significant impact. Students also perceived that the blended format was superior when learning the course material (Cruz-Johnson, 2012).

E-learning tools have played a crucial role during this pandemic, helping schools and universities facilitate student learning during the closure of universities and schools (Subedi et al., 2020). Learners with a fixed mindset have a hard time adapting and adjusting, but learners with a growth mindset adapt quickly to new situations. Teachers and student readiness must be assessed and supported while adapting to the latest adjustments. For online learning, there is no one-size-fits-all methodology.

Technology ushers in fundamental structural changes that can be integral to support both teaching and learning (Callo and Yazon, 2020). Digital learning tools, such as

computers and handheld devices, and an internet connection, support learning 24 hours a day, seven days a week, building 21st-century skills, increasing student engagement and motivation, and accelerating learning. Learning is a complex activity involving students' motivation, physical conditions, teaching resources, teaching skills, and curriculum. All of these play a vital role in a student's development. It is further concluded that there is a direct relationship between a school's physical facilities and educational outcomes. Good maintenance, modern systems, and flexible designs are necessary because the physical structure can limit the learning experience. In addition, school facilities should be flexible enough to accommodate changing learning patterns and methods (Lyons, 2012).

With a learner-oriented framework, the reforms articulated in the BE-LCP are aligned with the four pillars of Sulong Edukalidad: K to 12 curriculum review and update; improving the learning environment; teachers' upskilling and reskilling; and engagement of stakeholders for support and collaboration. These pillars should be implemented with an emphasis on innovation, agility, and synergy.

## OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

This study determined the implementation of Learning Continuity Plan (LCP) related variables amidst pandemic and performance of the secondary schools, Division of San Pablo City as input to quality assurance.

Specifically, it sought to fulfill the following objectives.

1. To determine the perceived implementation of the Learning Continuity Plan (LCP) related variables to access, quality and governance, and school's level of performance in learning delivery modalities, assessment of learning, and learning resources.
2. To evaluate the significant relationship between the extent of implementation of LCP related variables in access, quality, governance, and school performance.
3. To analyze the significant differences in respondents' responses to the perceived implementation of LCP related variables and school performance.
4. To investigate the LCP implementation-related variables that singly or in combination influence school performance in learning delivery modalities, assessment of learning, and learning resources.

## METHODOLOGY

The study was a descriptive-correlational predictive research design that described the relationship between variables when there was no ability to manipulate or control the independent variables (Lappe, 2000). It includes an analysis of the relationship between the predictor and criterion variables (Salkind, 2006). In addition, it provides an indication of multiple items related to each other and how well one or more variables might predict an outcome without an indication of the causes of the relationship (Salkind, 2006). Correlations measure the relationship between variables and how one variable changes as another variable change in both direction and strength (Cook & Cook, 2008; Salkind, 2008). The respondents of the study were the 14 principals and 452 teachers of the secondary schools, in the Division of San Pablo City, the Academic year 2020–2021, through a random stratified sampling technique.

A five-part online survey questionnaire

served as the primary research instrument. The first part was the respondents' personal information about their age, gender, civil status, years of service, educational attainment, plantilla position, and ancillary services. The second part focused on the perceived implementation of the learning continuity plan regarding task and timeline, budget and resources, stakeholder analysis, and implementation risk. The third part was the respondent's perception of implementing a learning continuity plan regarding quality regarding leadership and governance, curriculum and planning, accountability and continuous improvement, and management of resources. The fourth was the respondents' perceived implementation of continuous improvement in governance, transparency, ethics, and accountability. Furthermore, to determine school performance in terms of learning delivery modalities, assessment of learning, and learning resources, the respondents' perceptions were utilized. Likewise, to test its reliability, the researchers conducted pilot testing of the questionnaire to 20 teachers not included in the study. It reported a reliability index of α = 994, which is an excellent coefficient.

With the help of the Secondary Schools Public Schools District Supervisors, the researchers sent a google form link to the respondents. A letter to the school's division superintendent, public school district supervisors, and the respondents was submitted. Then, the researchers proceeded to the actual phase of the study, the data gathering process. The school principals from different secondary schools provided kind assistance to facilitate the successful administration of the online survey questionnaire.

After it was checked and scrutinized by the research adviser and statistician, it was forwarded to the LSPU Statistics Center for actual data treatment. The gathered data were subsequently collected, grouped, coded, and tabulated for computations, analysis, and interpretations according to corresponding statistical measures. The compiled data were analyzed using descriptive statistics such as mean and standard deviation. In addition, Pearson's Correlation, t-test, and multiple linear regression analysis using the stepwise method were employed for the inferential analysis of the data.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

### 1. Perceived Implementation of Learning Continuity Plan (LCP) Related Variables

### 1.1 Implementation of LCP in terms of access

The data reveals that the principals implemented access in terms of task and timeline ($\bar{x}$=4.82), evaluation of implementation risks ($\bar{x}$=4.81), budget and resources ($\bar{x}$ = 4.59), and stakeholder analysis ($\bar{x}$ = 4.52) to a great extent.

**Table 1**
*Implementation of LCP in terms of access*

| Indicators | Principals | | Teachers | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | Interpretation | Mean | Interpretation |
| Task and Timeline | 4.82 | To a Great Extent | 4.49 | Extent |
| Budget and Resources | 4.59 | To a Great Extent | 4.32 | Extent |
| Stakeholder Analysis | 4.52 | To a Great Extent | 4.37 | Extent |
| Evaluation of Implementation Risk | 4.81 | To a Great Extent | 4.55 | To a Great Extent |
| **OVERALL** | **4.69** | **To a Great Extent** | **4.43** | **Extent** |

On the other hand, evaluation of implementation risks was found to be implemented by the teachers to a great extent ($\bar{x}$ = 4.55) while task and timeline ($\bar{x}$ = 4.49), stakeholder analysis ($\bar{x}$ = 4.37) and budget and resources ($\bar{x}$ = 4.32) implemented to an extent level. To a great extent, (overall mean values=4.69, 4.43) for the principals and teachers, respectively, implies that both respondents had implemented access to ensure that learning will continue despite the health condition the education sector faces.

### 1.2 Implementation of LCP in terms of quality

**Table 2**
*Implementation of LCP in terms of quality*

| Indicators | Principals | | Teachers | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Mean** | **Interpretation** | **Mean** | **Interpretation** |
| Leadership and Governance | 4.79 | To a Great Extent | 4.40 | Extent |
| Curriculum and Instruction | 4.75 | To a Great Extent | 4.52 | To a Great Extent |
| Accountability and Continuous Improvement | 4.57 | To a Great Extent | 4.39 | Extent |
| Management of Resources | 4.69 | To a Great Extent | 4.54 | To a Great Extent |
| **OVERALL** | **4.70** | **To a Great Extent** | **4.41** | **Extent** |

The results found that principals had implemented leadership and governance ($\bar{x}$ = 4.79), curriculum and instruction ($\bar{x}$ = 4.75) management of resources ($\bar{x}$ = 4.69) and accountability and continuous improvement ($\bar{x}$ = 4.57) to a great extent. As the head of the institution, the principal ensured that the quality implementation of BE-LCP was strictly fulfilled for learning to continue despite the COVID-19 pandemic.

On the other hand, management of resources ($\bar{x}$ = 4.54) and curriculum and instruction ($\bar{x}$ = 4.52) was perceived by the teachers to a great extent. In contrast, leadership and governance ($\bar{x}$ = 4.40) and accountability and continuous improvement ($\bar{x}$ = 4.39) were perceived to an extent.

With an overall mean value of 4.70 for the principals and 4.41 for the teachers, to a great extent, achieving success in the implementation of LCP and assurance that learning and other school processes were adequately employed, quality must be considered, and should be taken into high regards.

### 1.3 Implementation of LCP in terms of governance

**Table 3**
*Perceived Implementation of LCP in terms of governance*

| Indicators | Principals | | Teachers | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Mean** | **Interpretation** | **Mean** | **Interpretation** |
| Transparency | 4.84 | To a Great Extent | 4.28 | Extent |
| Ethical | 4.83 | To a Great Extent | 4.51 | To a Great Extent |
| Accountability | 4.70 | To a Great Extent | 4.42 | Extent |
| **OVERALL** | **4.79** | **To a Great Extent** | **4.40** | **Extent** |

The perceived implementation of the Learning Continuity Plan (LCP) in terms of governance is presented in Table 3. The data show that principal's transparency ($\bar{x}$ = 4.84), ethical ($\bar{x}$ = 4.83) and accountability ($\bar{x}$ = 4.70) were implemented to a great extent. On the other hand, the teachers attested that ethical ($\bar{x}$ = 4.51), to a great extent, was important as one of the indicators of governance. Moreover, accountability ($\bar{x}$ = 4.42) and transparency ($\bar{x}$ = 4.28) were implemented to an extent level. As facilitators of the teaching and learning process, teachers ensured that they followed and adhered to the different ethical behaviors as stated in the Professional Code of Ethics expected from them.

The overall mean values of 4.79 for the principals and 4.40 for the teachers imply that governance plays an essential role in implementing the Learning Continuity Plan (LCP). This is also one way of ensuring that the school and the personnel, and other stakeholders uphold the morale of their roles and responsibilities.

## 2. Perceived School Performance

**Table 4**
*School Performance*

| Indicators | Principals | | Teachers | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | Interpretation | Mean | Interpretation |
| Learning Delivery Modalities | 4.63 | Highly Implemented | 4.72 | Highly Implemented |
| Assessment of Learning | 4.69 | Highly Implemented | 4.56 | Highly Implemented |
| Learning Resources | 4.81 | Highly Implemented | 4.54 | Highly Implemented |
| **OVERALL** | **4.71** | **Highly Implemented** | **4.61** | **Highly Implemented** |

The results found that principals and teachers had highly implemented the learning delivery modalities ($\bar{x}$ = 4.63, 4.72), assessment of learning ($\bar{x}$ = 4.69, 4.56), and learning resources ($\bar{x}$ = 4.81, 4.54). Thus, it indicates that the school is performing well in assuring quality education amidst the COVID-19 pandemic. The overall mean values of 4.71 for the principals and 4.61 for the teachers imply that both groups of respondents guaranteed every learner's right to quality education by giving them access to the different learning modalities and the assessment procedure. Moreover, it ensured learning materials necessary in the learning continuity for the school to serve the learners better.

## 3. Significant Relationship Between the LCP Related Variables and School Performance

As shown in Table 5, the obtained r values signify a positive estimate for the implementation of LCP in terms of access in terms of task and timeline, budget and resources, stakeholder analysis, and evaluation of implementation risks. They are significantly correlated with learning delivery modalities at $p < .05$. Therefore, it can be noted that having access to the different learning modalities, assessment procedures, and learning resources will result in a more significant opportunity for the students to

continue learning even at times of pandemic. The future of this nation may depend on the extent to which students acquire the skills, knowledge, and dispositions necessary to become responsible global citizens" (Herrera, 2012).

**Table 5**
*Relationship on Perceived Implementation of LCP Related Variables and the School Performance*

| Implementation of LCP Related Variables | | School Performance | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Learning Delivery Modalities | Assessment of Learning | Learning Resources |
| Access | Task and Timeline | .688** | .694** | .735** |
| | Budget and Resources | .656** | .678** | .750** |
| | Stakeholder Analysis | .646** | .668** | .708** |
| | Evaluation of Implementation of Risks | .806** | .783** | .834** |
| Quality | Leadership and Governance | .703** | .732** | .786** |
| | Curriculum and Instruction | .799** | .839** | .830** |
| | Accountability and Continuous Improvement | .691** | .720** | .786** |
| | Management of Resources | .838** | .846** | 1.000** |
| Governance | Transparency | .610** | .673** | .739** |
| | Ethical | .756** | .768** | .798** |
| | Accountability | .732** | .766** | .791** |

*** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)*

The existing positive relationship between access implementation of LCP and performance of the school denotes that the schools have established a system that is open and accessible to all types of stakeholders, especially to the learners. Strengthening its accessibility will mean that learners and other stakeholders will reach their needs to support the continuous learning that the Department is aspiring for (Briones, 2020). Moreover, the obtained r values signify a positive relationship between the quality implementation of the Learning Continuity Plan (LCP) in terms of leadership and governance, curriculum and instruction, accountability and continuous improvement and management of resources were found to have a significant relationship to the school performance in terms of learning delivery modalities, assessment of learning and teaching resources at p<.05 level of significance. The existing positive relationship indicates that schools with the high-quality implementation of LCP would mean better performance.

Thus, for the school to achieve high performance, the quality offering of services and other educational programs must be considered because it plays an essential role in creation, growth, mental and social evolution, and contributes to society's advancement. (Oswald, 2014). Assessment plays a role in learner's efficacy, fosters learners' abilities to construct meaning, and promotes metacognition. By asking learners to check their skill mastery levels or reflect on the assessment of their work, they learned to examine their reasoning and decision-making process (Cukusic, Garaca, & Jadric, 2014).

Lastly, governance in terms of

transparency, ethical, and accountability are significantly related to the performance of the school at p<.05 significant level. The relationship between variables indicates that an established mechanism of transparency, ethical, and accountability would mean more meaningful opportunities to achieve quality and excellence in the performance by selecting suitable and efficient plans and objectives to enable the learners to reach their maximum potential. It means that proper implementation of governance guaranteed the rights of every learner and the community to quality education. Transparent administration must provide transparency of details, decision-making, and accountability for outcomes (Ramzi, 2013).

## 4. Test of Difference on the Perceived LCP Related Variables and Performance of the School

### 4.1 Difference in the Perceived Implementation of LCP on Access

**Table 6**
*Significant difference in the Perceived Implementation of LCP in terms of access*

| Access | Groups | Mean | SD | t | Mean Diff. | Sig. | 95% CI for Cohen's d | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | Lower | Upper |
| Task and Timeline | Principals | 4.82 | 0.17 | 2.355 | 0.332 | 0.000 | 0.11 | 1.17 |
| | Teachers | 4.49 | 0.53 | | | | | |
| Budget and Resources | Principals | 4.59 | 0.35 | 1.633 | 0.264 | 0.013 | -0.09 | 0.98 |
| | Teachers | 4.32 | 0.60 | | | | | |
| Stakeholder Analysis | Principals | 4.52 | 0.40 | 0.933 | 0.149 | 0.063 | -0.28 | 0.79 |
| | Teachers | 4.37 | 0.59 | | | | | |
| Evaluation Implementation of Risks | Principals | 4.81 | 0.22 | 1.915 | 0.261 | 0.003 | -0.01 | 1.05 |
| | Teachers | 4.55 | 0.51 | | | | | |

*Legend: p < .05 significant*

Table 6 shows that there was a significant difference between the assessments given by the principal and teachers on task and timeline (t = 2.355), budget and resources (t = 1.633), and evaluation of implementation risks (t = 1.915) at p < .05 level of significance.

The results revealed that both groups of respondents had interpreted the implementation of LCP in terms of access differently. As head of the school, the principal focused on the school's welfare while teachers focused more on delivering instruction. The principal ensures improving, monitoring, evaluating, and decision-making because their leadership is a critical

mechanism for improving schools.

Meanwhile, there was no significant difference in the respondents' perceptions of access in stakeholder analysis (t = 0.933). It connotes that both groups of respondents assessed the variable at the same extent level of implementation.

Thus, the school must view access not as something simply given in educational systems or something students "have." With the interactional and intersectional considerations, the more comprehensive concepts of "accessibility" are suggested, point to the process of making education accessible (Stauber, 2015).

### 4.2 Difference in the Perceived Implementation of LCP on Quality

**Table 7.**
*Significant Difference on the Perceived Implementation of LCP on Quality*

| Quality | Groups | Mean | SD | t | Mean Diff. | Sig. | 95% CI for Cohen's d | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | Lower | Upper |
| Leadership and Governance | Principals | 4.79 | 0.30 | 2.551 | 0.390 | 0.001 | 0.16 | 1.23 |
| | Teachers | 4.40 | 0.57 | | | | | |
| Curriculum and Instruction | Principals | 4.75 | 0.32 | 1.623 | 0.234 | 0.013 | -0.09 | 0.97 |
| | Teachers | 4.52 | 0.54 | | | | | |
| Accountability and Continuous Improvement | Principals | 4.57 | 0.41 | 1.142 | 0.186 | 0.041 | -0.22 | 0.84 |
| | Teachers | 4.39 | 0.61 | | | | | |
| Management of Resources | Principals | 4.69 | 0.34 | 1.040 | 0.149 | 0.036 | -0.25 | 0.81 |
| | Teachers | 4.54 | 0.53 | | | | | |

*Legend: p < .05 significant*

Table 7 depicts the significant difference on the perceived implementation of LCP on quality in terms of leadership and governance (t = 2.551), curriculum and instruction (t = 1.623), accountability and continuous improvement (t = 1.142) and management of resources (t = 1.040) at p < .05 level of significance.

The quality in the implementation of LCP was perceived by both respondents differently. It can be said that the role of the principal is to administration, and the teacher's is instructional. The functions of the principal are to set goals, delegate tasks, and ensure a practical managerial skill that would optimize the capability of the school to perform better. The teachers are expected to ensure effective delivery of instructions to assure quality.

Effectiveness in incorporating various teaching principles into classroom teaching is a primary factor to enhance teacher's competence and professional development (Drape et al., 2016).

### 4.3 Difference in the Perceived Implementation of LCP on Governance

**Table 8**
*Test of Significant Difference on the Perceived Implementation of Learning Continuity Plan (LCP) on Governance*

| Governance | Groups | Mean | SD | t | Mean Diff. | Sig. | 95% CI for Cohen's d | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | Lower | Upper |
| Transparency | Principals | 4.84 | 0.24 | 2.941 | 0.555 | 0.001 | 0.26 | 1.33 |
| | Teachers | 4.28 | 0.70 | | | | | |
| Ethical | Principals | 4.83 | 0.27 | 2.020 | 0.318 | 0.001 | 0.01 | 1.08 |
| | Teachers | 4.51 | 0.59 | | | | | |
| Accountability | Principals | 4.70 | 0.33 | 1.767 | 0.277 | 0.009 | -0.05 | 1.01 |
| | Teachers | 4.42 | 0.58 | | | | | |

*Legend: p < .05 significant*

Table 8 reveals that there were significant differences on the perceived implementation of LCP on governance in terms of transparency (t = 2.941), ethical (t = 2.020) and accountability (t = 1.767) at p < .05 level of significance. It connotes that both respondents attested that their role and responsibilities in the practice of school governance differed from another. The existence of a positive effect of the principles of the effective governance framework, protecting the rights of stakeholders, determining the role of stakeholders, and institutional transparency performance contributed to maintaining the ethical standards of the teaching profession (Abdelhadi, 2016).

### 4.4. Difference in the Perceived School Performance

**Table 9**
*Test of Significant Difference on the Perceived School Performance*

| Performance of the School | Groups | Mean | SD | t | Mean Diff. | Sig. | 95% CI for Cohen's d | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | Lower | Upper |
| Learning Delivery Modalities | Principals | 4.72 | 0.32 | 0.685 | 0.090 | 0.061 | -0.35 | 0.72 |
| | Teachers | 4.63 | 0.49 | | | | | |
| Assessment of Learning | Principals | 4.69 | 0.37 | 0.970 | 0.138 | 0.018 | -0.27 | 0.80 |
| | Teachers | 4.56 | 0.53 | | | | | |
| Learning Resources | Principals | 4.81 | 0.28 | 1.889 | 0.271 | 0.001 | -0.02 | 1.05 |
| | Teachers | 4.54 | 0.53 | | | | | |

*Legend: p < .05 significant*

The test of significant difference on the respondents' perceived performances of the school is depicted in Table 9.

The table shows no significant difference in the principals' and teachers' perceived school performance regarding learning delivery modalities (t = 0.685). It means that both groups of respondents assessed that particular variable to the same extent of implementation.

However, the perceptions of the principals and teachers on the performance of the school in terms of assessment of learning (t = 0.970) and management of learning (t = 1.889) signify that there were significant differences at p < .05 level of significance.

The functions of both groups of respondents in the assessment of learning and management of resources differ from one another. As the facilitators of learning, teachers assumed that assessment of

learning and management of resources are an integral part of the success of the learning process. The principals see its purpose as an essential factor in determining the school's performance regarding student development and achievement.

The principal's primary responsibility is to oversee curriculum, teaching, and evaluation problems to increase learner success and achievement. As a result, principals must have the necessary instructional skills, capacities, and determination to lead successful schools and foster learner achievement (Rigby, 2014).

## 5. Regression Analysis of School Performance on the Perceived Implementation of LCP Related Variables

### 5.1 Regression on the Extent of Implementation of LCP and School Performance as to Learning Delivery Modalities

**Table 10**

*Regression on the Extent of Implementation of LCP Influencing the School Performance as to Learning Delivery Modalities*

| Implementation of LCP Related Variables | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standard Coefficients | t | Sig |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| | Constant | 0.854 | 0.114 | | 7.508 | 0.000 |
| *(Access)* | Evaluation of Implementation Risks | 0.436 | 0.050 | 0.454 | 8.805 | 0.000 |
| *(Quality)* | Curriculum and Instruction | 0.444 | 0.061 | 0.487 | 7.227 | 0.000 |
| | Overall Quality | -0.234 | 0.083 | -0.265 | -2.813 | 0.005 |
| *(Governance)* | Transparency | -0.210 | 0.050 | -0.303 | -4.213 | 0.000 |
| | Overall Governance | 0.388 | 0.084 | 0.465 | 4.625 | 0.000 |

*Adjusted $R^2$ = 71.10%  df = 5, 460  F-value = 229.584  p-value = <.01  N = 466*

Table 10 presents a stepwise multiple linear regression conducted with learning delivery modalities as measures of performance of the school as the dependent variable and the four constructs of access, four constructs of quality, and three constructs of governance as the independent variables.

The multiple regression analysis revealed that the evaluation of implementation risks, curriculum and instruction, overall quality, transparency, and overall governance contributed significantly to the regression model F (5,460) = 229.584, p=0.001, and accounted for 71.10% of the variation in accounting to the learning delivery modalities scores.

Participants predicted learning delivery modalities (LDM) is equal to:

$$LDM = 0.854 + 0.444CI + 0.436EIR + 0.388OG - 0.234OQ - 0.210T$$

***LDM*** *= Learning Delivery Modalities score,* ***CI*** *= Curriculum and Instruction score,* ***EIR*** *= Evaluation of Implementation Risks score,* ***OG*** *= Overall Governance score,* ***OQ*** *= Overall Quality score and* ***T*** *= Transparency score.*

The equation tells that for every one (1) point increase in the respondent's perceived quality implementation of LCP in curriculum and instruction. As a result, 0.444 points increase in the school's performance regarding learning delivery modalities holding other variables

constant. Moreover, the model also predicts that for every (1) point increase in the respondent's perceived access to evaluation of implementation risks, the model predicts a 0.436 increase in the learning delivery modalities holding other variables fixed. Finally, the model also predicts that for every one (1) point increase in the overall governance implementation of LCP, an increase of 0.388 points in the implementation of learning delivery modalities.

The model predicts a one (1) point decrease to the school's performance regarding learning delivery modalities holding other variables fixed. Furthermore, a decrease of 0.234 points on the respondent's perceived overall quality implementation of LCP. Finally, the model explains that for every one (1) point decrease in the implementation of governance in terms of transparency, the school's performance will decrease by 0.210 points holding the other factors constant

### 5.2 Regression on the Extent of Implementation of LCP and School Performance as to Assessment of Learning

**Table 11**
*Regression on the Extent of Implementation of LCP Influencing the School Performance as to Assessment of Learning*

| Implementation of LCP Related Variables | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standard Coefficients | t | Sig |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| | Constant | 0.493 | 0.124 | | 3.990 | 0.000 |
| *(Access)* | Evaluation of Implementation Risks | 0.156 | 0.055 | 0.151 | 2.816 | 0.005 |
| *(Quality)* | Curriculum and Instruction | 0.528 | 0.050 | 0.538 | 10.542 | 0.000 |
| | Overall Quality | -0.234 | 0.083 | -0.265 | -2.813 | 0.005 |
| *(Governance)* | Accountability | 0.130 | 0.043 | 0.145 | 3.041 | 0.002 |

***Adjusted $R^2$ = 72.50%  df = 4, 461  F-value = 331.559  p-value = <.01  N= 466***

Table 11 presented a stepwise multiple linear regression conducted with an assessment of learning as a measure of performance of the school as the Dependent Variable and the four constructs of access, four constructs of quality, and three constructs of governance as the independent variables.

The multiple regression analysis revealed that the evaluation of implementation risks, curriculum and instruction, overall quality, and accountability contributed significantly to the regression model F (4,461) = 331.559, p <.001 and accounted for 72.50% of the variation in accounting to the assessment of learning scores.

Participants predicted assessment of learning (AL) is equal to:

$$AL = 0.493 + 0.528CI - 0.234OQ + 0.156EIR + 0.130A$$

***AL*** *= Assessment of Learning score,* ***CI*** *= Curriculum and Instruction score,* ***OQ*** *= Overall Quality score,* ***EIR*** *= Evaluation of Implementation Risks score and* ***A*** *= Accountability*

The equation may further imply that for every one-point increase in the implementation of curriculum and instruction, there is 0.528 points increase in the school's performance in terms of assessment of learning, keeping other variables constant. It also indicates that for every one-point increase in the overall quality in the implementation of LCP, the model predicts 0.234 decrease in the assessment of learning, keeping other variables constant. Moreover, for every one-point increase in the evaluation of implementation risks, the school's performance

in terms of assessment of learning will increase by 0.156, holding other variables constant. Furthermore, an increase to governance in terms of accountability will predict a one point increase of 0.130 to the assessment of learning, keeping other variables constant.

### 5.3 Regression on the Extent of Implementation of LCP and School Performance as to Learning Resources

**Table 12**
*Regression on the Extent of Implementation of LCP Influencing the School Performance as to Learning Resources*

| Implementation of LCP Related Variables | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standard Coefficients | t | Sig |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| | Constant | 0.413 | 0.110 | | 3.755 | 0.000 |
| *(Access)* | Evaluation of Implementation Risks | 0.364 | 0.048 | 0.347 | 7.645 | 0.000 |
| *(Quality)* | Curriculum and Instruction | 0.300 | 0.047 | 0.302 | 6.354 | 0.000 |
| *(Governance)* | Overall Governance | 0.253 | 0.044 | 0.278 | 5.779 | 0.000 |

***Adjusted $R^2$ = 76.90%  df = 3, 462  F-value = 516.364  p-value = <.01  N = 466***

Table 12 depicts the results of stepwise multiple linear regression for learning resources as a measure of performance of the school (IV) and the four constructs of access, four constructs of quality, and three constructs of governance (DV). The regression revealed that evaluation of implementation risks, curriculum, instruction, and overall governance contributed significantly to the regression model F (3.462) = 516.364, p < .001 and accounted for 76.90% of the variation in accounting to the learning resources scores. As a result, participants predicted learning resources (LR) is equal to:

$$LR = 0.0.413 + 0.364EIR + 0.300CI + 0.253OG$$

***LR** = Learning Resources score, **EIR** = Evaluation of Implementation Risks score, **CI** = Curriculum and Instruction score, and **OQ** = Overall Governance*

The equation further justifies that for every one-point increase in access in terms of evaluation of implementation risks, there is 0.364 points increase in the school's performance in terms of learning resources keeping curriculum and instruction, and overall governance fixed. Moreover, for every one-point increase in the respondent's perceived quality in the implementation of LCP in curriculum and instruction, the model predicts a 0.300 increase in the learning resources, keeping evaluation of implementation risks and overall governance fixed. Further, the model also predicts that for every (1) point increase in perceived overall governance, the school's performance in terms of learning resources will increase by 0.253, holding evaluation of implementation risks and curriculum and instruction fixed.

## CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. The hypothesis stating that the extent of implementation of Learning Continuity Plan (LCP) related variables in terms of access, quality, and governance are not significantly related to the school's

performance and is not supported.

2. The hypothesis stating that the respondents' responses on the perceived implementation of Learning Continuity Plan (LCP) related variables and performance of the school have no significant difference and is not supported.
3. The hypothesis stating that the extent of implementation of Learning Continuity Plan (LCP) related variables singly or in combination do not significantly influence the school performance and is not supported

## RECOMMENDATIONS

In the light of the findings and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations are hereby suggested:

1. Principals and teachers may work collaboratively to review the school's BE-LCP to assess its content and implementation process, and accessibility.
2. School leaders may devise a scheme for monitoring quality assurance to satisfy standard needs and requirements and ensure continued success and quality on implementing the Learning Continuity Plan (LCP).
3. In partnership with the parents and other stakeholders, the school's administration and teachers may reach out to one another to give feedback and suggestions to further improve the school's performance in times of the COVID-19 pandemic. This may help both sides to improve and provide an immediate intervention if a problem arises.
4. As an immediate superior and head of the school, the school principal may plan and organize an organizing body that may help monitor and evaluate school processes.
5. Professional development for teachers and school leaders may be conducted to gain new knowledge and competencies to perform their function in the distance learning process effectively.
6. A follow-up or similar study may be considered using other variables since Learning Continuity Plan (LCP) deals with numerous concerns.

## REFERENCES

Abdelhadi, M. (2016). Governance: a true path for the relationship of the state and local communities after revolutions. The Arab Democratic Center. http://democraticac.de/?p=26699 (Arabic version).

Aydin, H. & Koc-Damgaci, F. (2017). From Empire to Republic: Citizenship, Pluralism, and Diversity in Turkey. In JA Banks (Eds), *Global Migration, Structural Inclusion, and Education across Nations.* Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association (AERA) Press.

Briones, L. (2020). Learning opportunities shall be available: The Basic education learning continuity plan in the time of COVID-19. https://planipolis.iiep.unesco.org/sites/planipolis/files/ressources/philippinesc_basic_education_learning_continuity_plan_be-lcp.pdf

Callo, E. C., & Yazon, A. D. (2020). Exploring the factors influencing the readiness of faculty and students on online teaching and learning as an alternative delivery mode for the new normal. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, *8*(8), 3509-3518.

Cook, B., Cook, L., ( 2008). Nonexperimental quantitative research and its role in guiding instruction. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1053451208321565

Cruz-Johnson, C. (2012). Success and persistence of learners in a blended developmental reading course at an urban

community college. Doctoral Dissertation. Capella University, Minneapolis, Minnesota. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED538811

Cukusic, M., Garaca, Z., & Jadric, M. (2014). Online self-assessment and students' success in higher education institutions. Computers & Education, 72, 100-109. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/259127183_Online_self-assessment_and_students'_success_in_higher_education_institutions

DepEd. (2020). Official statement Department of Education.https://www.deped.gov.ph/2020/05/06/official-statement-2

Drape, T., Lopez, M., & Radford, D. (2016). Teacher efficacy and professional development needs of mid-career agriculture educators integrating next generation science standards and other content areas. *Career and Technical Education Research, 41*(1)*,* 33-48. DOI:10.5328/cter41.1.33

Gerasimov, S.I., Shaposhnikov, S.O. (2014). Mezhdunarodnaya professionalino-obshchestvennaya akkreditacia ingenernih obrazovatel'nih program. [International public-professional accreditation of engineering degree programs] SPb: Isdatel'stvo SPbGETU «LETI.»

Herrera, S. (2012). Globalization: Current constraints and promising perspectives. *Journal of Curriculum and Instruction, 6*(1), 1-10.

Leek, J. (2016). Global citizenship education in school curricula. A Polish perspective. *Journal of Social Studies Education Research, 7*(2), 51-74.

Lyons (2012) *Workers of Tomorrow, education in progress*, Ministry of Education and Scientific Research. Port Fortis. Fiji.

Oswald, L. J. (2014). *School-based management: rational and implementation guidelines.* Palmer, AK: Wordsworth LLC Publishing.

Ramzi, Fahad Abed Al-Rahman Misfer, (2013), The administration transparent to the managers of Education offices in Mecca from the perspective of managers and supervisors, Master, Um Al Qura University.

Rigby, J.G. (2014). Three logics of instructional leadership, *Education Administration Quarterly,* 50(4), 610-644.

Salkind, N.J. (2006) Exploring Research. 6th Edition, Prince-Hall, Upper Saddle River.

Stauber, B. (2015), 'Access to and accessibility of education: an analytic and conceptual approach to a multidimensional issue', European Education 47(1): 11–25.

Subedi, S., Nayaju, S., Subedi, S., Shah, S. K., & Shah, J. M. (2020). Impact of e-learning during COVID-19 pandemic among nursing students and teachers of Nepal. *International Journal of Science and Healthcare Research*, 5(3), 9.

UNESCO. (2017). Education for Sustainable Development Goals: Learning Objectives. France: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. ISBN 978-92-3-100209-0

## AUTHORS' PROFILE

**Erwin G. Abril** is a candidate for the degree of Doctor of Education major in Educational Management and graduate of Master of Arts in Education major in Social Science at the Laguna State Polytechnic University on 2016. He also finished a Bachelor of Secondary Education in Social Science at the same university in 2008. Presently, he is a Teacher III teaching Social Studies subject at Col. Lauro D. Dizon Memorial Integrated High School. He is currently the Dizon High Faculty Club and SAGAP (Samahan ng mga Guro sa Araling Panlipunan) Vice-President. He has served as Grade 8 Chief Adviser for six (6) consecutive years, where he practiced and honed his leadership skills. He also served as speaker, writer, demonstrator, observer, academic coach, and facilitator in various seminars and training conducted in the regional, division, and school levels.

**Dr. Eden C. Callo** is an associate professor at the College of Teacher Education – Graduate Studies and Applied Research of the Laguna State Polytechnic University-San Pablo City Campus. She has a doctorate in industrial education management. She teaches professional education subjects and shows expertise in mentoring and advising research papers in the masters' and doctoral programs.

In addition, Dr. Callo elevated the teacher education program of the LSPU San Pablo City campus into a Center of Development.

## COPYRIGHTS