Fostering Resiliency and Positive School-Community Engagement through Capacity Building Practices and Sustainable Stakeholders' Partnerships

Samantha Cristina A. Tejada

Laguna State Polytechnic University Sta. Cruz Laguna 4009 PHILIPPINES

Email address: julierosemendoza002@gmail.com

Abstract—The study focuses on determining the relationship of school capacity building practices and sustainable stakeholders' partnerships and school resiliency and school-community engagement. Specifically, it sought to find out the level of school capacity building practices, sustainable stakeholders' partnerships, school resiliency and school-community engagement of the school respondents and the relationship between them. The researcher used descriptive design. The respondents that were used in the study are one hundred fifty-six (156) teachers from two (2) selected elementary schools within the fourth district of Laguna. In selecting the respondents, the researcher used random sampling technique. The following were the significant findings of the investigation. The findings showed that the level of school capacity building practices was to a very high extent. Also, the level of sustainable stakeholders' partnerships was to a very high extent. In addition, the level of school resiliency was to a very high extent. Moreover, the level of community engagement was to a very high extent. Furthermore, significant relationship was found between school capacity building practices and sustainable stakeholders' partnerships on the school resiliency last. Lastly, significant relationship was found between school capacity building practices and sustainable stakeholders' partnerships on the community engagement. According to the findings, the subsequent conclusions were established. The researcher therefore concludes that the null hypotheses stating no significant relationship between school capacity-building practices and sustainable stakeholders' partnership on the school resiliency and school-community engagement are rejected. The outcomes reveal a notable connection between independent and dependent variables. From the established conclusions, the ensuing recommendations follow. Educators should actively engage in continuous professional development to enhance their skills in implementing capacity-building strategies that foster school resiliency and strengthen community engagement. Attending training programs and collaborating with stakeholders can improve teaching effectiveness and student support systems. In addition, students should be encouraged to actively participate in school-community initiatives by joining mentorship programs, volunteer work, and extracurricular activities that promote leadership, collaboration, and social responsibility. This engagement helps build resilience and fosters stronger community ties.

Keywords— Resiliency; Positive School-Community Engagement; Capacity Building Practices.

I. INTRODUCTION

Fostering resiliency and a positive school culture has become a key priority for educators and community leaders. To achieve sustainable growth and long-term success, schools must engage in capacity-building practices like professional development opportunities for teachers and resource management. One of the most effective approaches to capacity building involves forging the curriculum and instruction, which provide access to teaching and learning in the classroom, Narcisse (2017).

In addition, it has been stated that in order to achieve this goal, stakeholder's partnerships may help and serve as a bridge between schools and the community, offering resources, mentorship opportunities, and collaborative solutions that contribute to student success, (Coccia, 2020). By building meaningful connections with stakeholders can develop school resiliency and community engagement to address challenges, improve outcomes, and create sustainable support systems.

Through these, schools contribute to the overall well-being and stability of their communities. Perspectives from school heads and policymakers have long emphasized the importance of capacity building and stakeholders' collaboration. It became evident that for schools to maximize their potential for resilience and societal progress. they needed to position themselves at the center of both.

As schools play an important role in shaping resiliency and community partnership, their influence extends beyond the classroom. Schools have the potential to lead efforts in strengthening communities through education, information sharing, and extensive stakeholder networks, Zhang & Byrd, 2015). Historical perspectives from educational philosophers and policymakers underscore the importance of school-community collaboration.

This study sought to explore the intricate relationship between school capacity-building practices and sustainable stakeholders partnership on the school resiliency and school community partnership in creating positive educational environments. Looking at these dynamics, this research aims to contribute valuable insights into how schools can cultivate resilience and strengthen community ties.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

This study specifically seeks to answer the following questions:

    1. What is the level of school capacity building practices in terms of;

        1.1 Professional development opportunities,

        1.2 Funding and resources,

1.3 Policy and governance,
1.4 Curriculum and instruction,
1.5 Assessment and evaluation,
1.6 External support?
2. What is the level of sustainable stakeholders' partnerships in terms of;
2.1 Shared responsibilities,
2.2 Flexibility and adaptability,
2.3 Inclusive participation,
2.4 Shared benefits and outcome,
2.5 Monitoring and evaluation,
2.6 Long-term commitment?
3. What is the level of school resiliency in terms of;
3.1 Crisis response and adaptability,
3.2 Peer support and mentoring programs,
3.3 Restorative Practices,
3.4 Creativity and Innovation?
4. What is the level of community engagement in terms of;
4.1 Community resource utilization,
4.2 Access to enrichment programs,
4.3 Social capital and networking,
4.4 Community-led project initiatives,
4.5 Cultural competence and inclusivity,
4.6 Parental and community feedback?

II. METHODOLOGY

This study used the descriptive quantitative research design in gathering information. This method enables the researcher to interpret the theoretical meaning of the findings and hypothesis development for further studies. Specifically, the researcher used self-made questionnaire which enabled researcher to gather information from the respondents regarding the research questions among the elementary schools in the fourth district of Laguna.

Quantitative research is the process of collecting and analyzing numerical data. It may be utilized to identify patterns and averages, generate predictions, examine causal relationships, and extend results to broader populations, Bhandari, (2021). With this reason, the researcher chose to use this as appropriate research design for this study.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter outlines the various results and analyzes the outcomes produced from the treatment of the data collected in this research.

Level of School Capacity Building Practices

Table 1 shows the level of school capacity-building practices in terms of professional development opportunities.

Schools provide professional development programs aimed at enhancing teachers' skills and instructional practices. The highest mean score (M = 6.75, SD = 0.47) indicates that teachers strongly agree that they are embedded into the teaching process in ways that foster positive social skills in students. This suggests that schools prioritize not only academic excellence but also the holistic development of learners through teacher engagement. On the other hand, the

lowest mean score (M = 6.63, SD = 0.58) is associated with engaging teachers in various seminars that contribute to their professional growth. While still rated as Very high, this may indicate that some teachers perceive limitations in the frequency, accessibility, or relevance of these seminars.

The level of school capacity-building practices in professional development attained a weighted mean score of (M = 6.68, SD = 0.40) and was verbally interpreted as Very High.

In summary, the school effectively fosters professional growth by providing continuous learning opportunities for teachers, ensuring that professional development programs align with instructional needs, and encouraging the application of innovative strategies in classrooms. The role of teachers in delivering education and implementing educational policies is crucial.

Table 1. Level of School Capacity Building Practices in terms of Professional Development Opportunities

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
Engage teachers in various seminars that can help them grow professionally.	6.62	.58	Strongly Agree
Embed teachers into teaching process that foster positive social skills to students.	6.75	.47	Strongly Agree
Provide a program that help the teachers to learn more about inclusive education.	6.67	.53	Strongly Agree
Provide opportunities for the teachers to be more knowledgeable about the diverse personalities of learners.	6.64	.57	Strongly Agree
Personalize teacher learning with a professional development plan.	6.71	.50	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.68		
SD	0.40		
Verbal Interpretation	Very High		

Level of School Capacity-Building Practices in Terms of Funding and Resources

Table 2 shows the level of school capacity-building practices in terms of funding and resources. Schools allocate financial resources to support infrastructure, learning materials, and inclusive education, ensuring that students and teachers have access to necessary facilities and materials.

Table 2. Level of School Capacity Building Practices in terms of Funding and Resources

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
Allocate enough budget on building structures that are needed on the school.	6.60	.58	Strongly Agree
Prioritize the budget for necessary materials needed by the learners.	6.64	.58	Strongly Agree
Focus on the finances that will help establish better inclusive education.	6.59	.59	Strongly Agree
Give support in releasing the budget for the projects promoting inclusive education.	6.75	.47	Strongly Agree
Assigned specific financial funds and planning for sustainable inclusive education.	6.58	.62	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.64		
SD	0.44		
Verbal Interpretation	Very High		

The highest mean score (M = 6.75, SD = 0.47 indicates that teachers strongly agree that there is substantial support in releasing the budget for projects promoting inclusive

education. This suggests that the school prioritizes financial support for initiatives aimed at fostering an inclusive learning environment. On the other hand, the lowest mean score (M = 6.58, SD = 0.62882) is associated with assigning specific financial funds and planning for sustainable inclusive education. While respondents strongly agree, this may suggest that long-term financial planning for sustainability requires further reinforcement.

The level of school capacity-building practices in terms of funding and resources attained a weighted mean score of (M = 6.64, SD = 0.44) and was verbally interpreted as Very High.

In summary, the school demonstrates a strong commitment to financial planning and resource allocation, ensuring that educational infrastructure, materials, and inclusive education initiatives are well-supported. The role of financial investment in education is crucial in sustaining high-quality learning environments.

Table 3 shows the level of school capacity-building practices in terms of policy and governance.

Table 3. Level of School Capacity Building Practices in terms of Policy and Governance

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
Align everyone with a common vision and make clear your expectations for people's roles and their responsibilities.	6.6786	.53916	Strongly Agree
Facilitates communication between and among school and community leaders for informed decision-making and solving of school community wide-learning problems.	6.8016	.44668	Strongly Agree
Control over the education process and take the responsibilities to manage budget, personnel and curriculum.	6.7698	.45800	Strongly Agree
Provides better programs for the students based on the available resources that directly match student needs.	6.7183	.51664	Strongly Agree
Provide guidance and direction for all the staff and members to achieve common goals.	6.7817	.46809	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.75		
SD	0.38		
Verbal Interpretation	*Very High*		

Effective policy and governance structures are essential in ensuring that schools operate efficiently, foster collaboration, and implement well-defined educational strategies.

The highest mean score (M = 6.80, SD = 0.44) indicates that teachers strongly agree that the school effectively facilitates communication between and among school and community leaders for informed decision-making and the resolution of school-wide learning challenges. This suggests that the school prioritizes transparency and collaboration in governance. On the other hand, the lowest mean score (M = 6.68, SD = 0.53 is associated with aligning everyone with a common vision and clarifying roles and responsibilities. While still rated as Strongly agree, this may indicate that further emphasis is needed to ensure all stakeholders fully understand their roles in achieving educational goals.

The level of school capacity-building practices in terms of policy and governance attained a weighted mean score of (M = 6.75, SD = 0.38) and was verbally interpreted as Very High.

In summary, the school exhibits strong leadership and governance by fostering a collaborative environment, ensuring clear policies, and aligning programs with available resources to meet student needs.

Level of School Capacity-Building Practices in Terms of Curriculum and Instruction

Table 4 shows the level of school capacity-building practices in terms of curriculum and instruction. A well-structured curriculum and effective instructional strategies are essential in providing quality education that meets the diverse needs of students.

The highest mean score (M = 6.80, SD = 0.44) indicates that teachers strongly agree that the school allows adapting the curriculum to the learning styles of children with special education needs.

Table 4. Level of School Capacity Building Practices in terms of Curriculum and Instruction

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
Provide opportunities for students to share their own experiences and perspectives.	6.67	.53	Strongly Agree
Allows adapting the curriculum to the learning styles of children with special education needs.	6.80	.44	Strongly Agree
Determines the content of what students learn.	6.76	.45	Strongly Agree
Identify methods that the educators use to teach.	6.71	.51	Strongly Agree
Ranging from general educational requirements to specific programs for special education.	6.78	.46	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.70		
SD	0.39		
Verbal Interpretation	*Very High*		

This suggests that the school prioritizes inclusivity and ensures that the curriculum is responsive to diverse learners. On the other hand, the lowest mean score (M = 6.68, SD = 0.53) is associated with providing opportunities for students to share their own experiences and perspectives. While still rated as Strongly agree, this may indicate that further reinforcement is needed to enhance student engagement and expression in the learning process.

The level of school capacity-building practices in terms of curriculum and instruction attained a weighted mean score of (M = 6.70, SD = 0.39) and was verbally interpreted as Very High.

In summary, the school demonstrates a strong commitment to curriculum development and instructional quality by ensuring that educational programs align with student needs, instructional methods are well-defined, and learning experiences are inclusive.

Table 5 presents the level of school capacity-building practices in terms of assessment and evaluation. Effective assessment and evaluation practices are essential in ensuring that teaching strategies remain effective, learning outcomes are monitored, and instructional methods are continuously

improved.

Table 5. Level of School Capacity Building Practices In terms of Assessment and Evaluation

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
Monitor the teaching method used by the teachers.	6.6587	.53800	Strongly Agree
Constantly observe the performance and management within the classroom.	6.7897	.43663	Strongly Agree
Evaluate and give feedback whenever there is need of changes in the teaching approach.	6.7222	.51494	Strongly Agree
Monitors learners progress especially the students with special needs.	6.6548	.54650	Strongly Agree
Ensures that teaching methodologies and strategies are fully enhance which become more appropriate in handling all kinds of learners.	6.7421	.48167	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean **SD** **Verbal Interpretation**	*6.71* *0.37* *Very High*		

The highest mean score (M = 6.79, SD = 0.43663) indicates that teachers strongly agree that the school constantly observes classroom performance and management. This suggests that regular monitoring and feedback mechanisms are in place to maintain high teaching standards. On the other hand, the lowest mean score (M = 6.65, SD = 0.54) is associated with monitoring learners' progress, especially for students with special needs. While still rated as strongly agree, this may indicate the need for additional resources or strategies to further enhance the tracking and support of diverse learners.

The level of school capacity-building practices in terms of assessment and evaluation attained a weighted mean score of (M = 6.71, SD = 0.37) and was verbally interpreted as Very High.

In summary, the school effectively implements assessment and evaluation practices by monitoring teaching methods, observing classroom performance, and ensuring appropriate feedback mechanisms are in place.

Level of School Capacity Building Practices in terms of External Support

Table 6 presents the level of school capacity-building practices in terms of external support. Establishing strong external support systems is essential for enhancing school programs, fostering partnerships, and ensuring the sustainability of quality education.

The highest mean score (M = 6.67, SD = 0.52551) indicates that teachers strongly agree that the school effectively builds relationships with individuals and organizations to extend linkages and partnerships. This suggests that the school actively engages external stakeholders to strengthen collaboration and resource-sharing.

On the other hand, the lowest mean score (M = 6.63, SD = 0.52309) is associated with establishing effective communication with other organizations. While still rated as Strongly agree, this may indicate the need for further refinement in communication strategies to maximize external collaboration opportunities.

Table 6. Level of School Capacity Building Practices in terms of External Support

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
Build an effective communication with the other organization that can help in establishing sustainable quality education.	6.63	.52	Strongly Agree
Build a good relationship with other people that can help extending school's linkages and partnership.	6.67	.52	Strongly Agree
Encourage stakeholders to support the school programs and activities.	6.64	.54	Strongly Agree
Maintain the connection with the stakeholders and other organization outside the school.	6.64	.54	Strongly Agree
Extent and gain mutual understanding of the objectives and expectations of all parties.	6.66	.52	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean **SD** **Verbal Interpretation**	*6.65* *0.40* *Very High*		

The level of school capacity-building practices in terms of external support attained a weighted mean score of (M = 6.65, SD = 0.40) and was verbally interpreted as Very High.

In summary, the school demonstrates a strong commitment to external engagement by fostering communication, building partnerships, and maintaining stakeholder involvement.

Level of Sustainable Stakeholders' Partnerships

Table 7 shows the level of sustainable stakeholders' partnerships in terms of shared responsibilities. Effective shared responsibilities among stakeholders ensure collective decision-making, leadership empowerment, and mutual support in achieving educational goals.

Table 7. Level of Sustainable Stakeholders' Partnerships in terms of Shared Responsibilities

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
Restructure decision making and empower leadership behaviors.	6.76	.48	Strongly Agree
Allow another member to lead on the field of they are excelling.	6.78	.43	Strongly Agree
Understand and appreciate collective goals.	6.80	.43	Strongly Agree
Provide emotional support for each other.	6.80	.43	Strongly Agree
Appreciate and acknowledge member's contribution.	6.84	.40	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean **SD** **Verbal Interpretation**	*6.80* *0.33* *Very High*		

The highest mean score (M = 6.84, SD = 0.40) indicates that teachers strongly agree that the school appreciates and acknowledges members' contributions. This suggests that recognizing stakeholder efforts fosters a positive and collaborative environment. On the other hand, the lowest mean score (M = 6.77, SD = 0.48) is associated with restructuring decision-making and empowering leadership behaviors. While still rated as strongly agree, this may indicate that further improvements in leadership delegation and governance structures could enhance stakeholder engagement.

The level of sustainable stakeholders' partnerships in terms of shared responsibilities attained a weighted mean score of (M = 6.80, SD = 0.33) and was verbally interpreted as Very

High.

In summary, the school successfully promotes shared leadership, mutual support, and collective goal-setting among stakeholders.

Level of Sustainable Stakeholders' Partnerships in terms of Flexibility and Adaptability

Table 8 shows the level of sustainable stakeholders' partnerships in terms of flexibility and adaptability. Flexibility and adaptability are crucial in responding to challenges, embracing innovations, and ensuring continuous improvement in educational initiatives.

The highest mean score (M = 6.83, SD = 0.41) indicates that teachers strongly agree that stakeholders carefully consider their initial response before facing new challenges. This suggests that decision-making processes involve strategic thinking and preparedness. On the other hand, the lowest mean score (M = 6.76, SD = 0.50) is associated with modifying leadership styles in response to uncertain or unpredictable circumstances. While still rated as strongly agree, this may indicate that further refinement in leadership adaptability could enhance overall responsiveness to change.

Table 8. Level of Sustainable Stakeholders' Partnerships in terms of Flexibility and Adaptability

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
Modifies style or approach to leadership in response to uncertain or unpredictable circumstances.	6.76	.50	Strongly Agree
Willingness to adapt to changes and be ready for possible mishaps that may be encountered throughout.	6.78	.44	Strongly Agree
Revises plans to incorporate new innovations and overcome challenges, while still achieving goals.	6.81	.42	Strongly Agree
Open to experiences and seek the learning opportunities for each situation.	6.79	.44	Strongly Agree
Considers initial response before facing the new challenges.	6.82	.41	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	*6.80*		
SD	*0.34*		
Verbal Interpretation	*Very High*		

The level of sustainable stakeholders' partnerships in terms of flexibility and adaptability attained a weighted mean score of (M = 6.80, SD = 0.34) and was verbally interpreted as Very High.

In summary, the school effectively fosters a culture of adaptability and resilience among stakeholders by encouraging openness to change, continuous learning, and strategic decision-making.

Table 9 shows the level of sustainable stakeholders' partnerships in terms of inclusive participation.

Inclusive participation ensures that all stakeholders are actively involved in decision-making, collaboration, and shared responsibilities within the educational system.

The highest mean score (M = 6.83, SD = 0.42) indicates that teachers strongly agree that asking for help and encouraging involvement fosters a sense of inclusion and belonging among stakeholders. This highlights the importance of collective engagement in achieving organizational goals.

On the other hand, the lowest mean score (M = 6.78, SD = 0.45321) is associated with allowing everyone to take part in organizational activities. While still rated as strongly agree, this suggests that there may be opportunities to further enhance participation and representation. The level of sustainable stakeholders' partnerships in terms of inclusive participation attained a weighted mean score of (M = 6.81, SD = 0.32) and was verbally interpreted as Very High.

Table 9. Level of Sustainable Stakeholders' Partnerships in terms of Inclusive Participation

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
Allow everyone to take part in the work and activities of organizations.	6.7778	.45321	Strongly Agree
Everyone's voice is listened to and that decisions are made with people rather than for them.	6.8175	.40712	Strongly Agree
Ask for help and encourage involvement of everyone so people feel involved.	6.8254	.42957	Strongly Agree
Share thoughts, feelings, and rationale to build trust.	6.8175	.42625	Strongly Agree
Provide support without removing responsibility.	6.8056	.43489	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	*6.81*		
SD	*0.32*		
Verbal Interpretation	*Very High*		

Table 10 shows the level of sustainable stakeholders' partnerships in terms of shared benefits and outcomes.

Table 10. Level of Sustainable Stakeholders' Partnerships in terms of Shared Benefits and Outcome

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
Align leadership around school goals and vision.	6.81	.42	Strongly Agree
Engage teachers and staffs in the purpose journey.	6.79	.44	Strongly Agree
Help every member to recognize what is meaningful to them, then encourage them to connect that to school's goals.	6.80	.43	Strongly Agree
Improve the efficiency and productivity of the organization.	6.79	.46	Strongly Agree
Increase employee morale, promote innovation, and encourage collaboration.	6.83	.41	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	*6.81*		
SD	*0.30*		
Verbal Interpretation	*Very High*		

Shared benefits and outcomes ensure that all stakeholders experience meaningful engagement, alignment with institutional goals, and collective growth.

The highest mean score (M = 6.84, SD = 0.410) indicates that teachers strongly agree that increasing employee morale, promoting innovation, and encouraging collaboration contribute to a productive and motivated school environment. This suggests that a positive and supportive culture significantly impacts stakeholder engagement. On the other hand, the lowest mean score (M = 6.80, SD = 0.43) is associated with helping members recognize what is meaningful to them and connecting that to school goals. While still rated as strongly agree, this suggests that further emphasis on individual goal alignment could enhance stakeholder motivation and involvement.

The level of sustainable stakeholders' partnerships in terms of shared benefits and outcomes attained a weighted mean score of (M = 6.81, SD = 0.30) and was verbally interpreted as Very High.

In summary, the school effectively fosters a collaborative and goal-oriented environment by aligning leadership with institutional vision, engaging staff in meaningful work, and enhancing overall productivity.

Level of Sustainable Stakeholders' Partnerships in terms of Monitoring and Evaluation

Table 11 shows the level of sustainable stakeholders' partnerships in terms of monitoring and evaluation.

Monitoring and evaluation are essential in assessing the effectiveness of educational programs, addressing gaps, and ensuring continuous improvement through stakeholder collaboration.

Table 11. Level of Sustainable Stakeholders' Partnerships in terms of Monitoring and Evaluation

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
Monitors expected and actual performance, continually addresses the gaps in education, and ensures a venue for feedback and redress.	6.68	.50	Strongly Agree
Programs and activities are collaboratively made by the school head, faculty members and stakeholders to sustain continuous improvement and initiatives.	6.68	.52	Strongly Agree
Provide clear, transparent and inclusive programs for both teachers and learners.	6.64	.58	Strongly Agree
Improving physical environments, classroom settings and/or virtual classroom to support various kinds of learning.	6.63	.54	Strongly Agree
Evaluate and measures the outcomes of every activity, programs, services and take responsibilities addressing the feedback.	6.72	.50	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	*6.68*		
SD	*0.39*		
Verbal Interpretation	*Very High*		

The highest mean score (M = 6.73, SD = 0.50) indicates that teachers strongly agree that evaluating and measuring the outcomes of activities, programs, and services—while taking responsibility for addressing feedback—is a critical practice. This emphasizes the importance of accountability and responsiveness in school initiatives. On the other hand, the lowest mean score (M = 6.63, SD = 0.54) is associated with improving physical environments and classroom settings to support various kinds of learning. While still rated as strongly agree, this suggests that there may be areas for further enhancement in physical or virtual learning spaces.

The level of sustainable stakeholders' partnerships in terms of monitoring and evaluation attained a weighted mean score of (M = 6.68, SD = 0.39) and was verbally interpreted as Very High.

In summary, the school effectively implements monitoring and evaluation strategies to sustain continuous improvement by fostering collaboration among school leaders, faculty members, and stakeholders.

According to Kendall E, et al (2017), stakeholders' capacity building consists of developing knowledge, skills and operational capacity, monitoring and evaluation so that individuals and community or stakeholder's groups may achieve their project purposes.

Table 12 shows the level of sustainable stakeholders' partnerships in terms of long-term commitment. Long-term commitment ensures that stakeholders remain engaged in supporting the school's goals.

Table 12. Level of Sustainable Stakeholders' Partnerships in terms of Long-term Commitment

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
Focus on positive ideas and commonalities between the member of the organization.	6.63	.59	Strongly Agree
Be sure to address issues as soon as these arise.	6.69	.52	Strongly Agree
Clearly describe their responsibilities	6.62	.52	Strongly Agree
Build a culture of trust for every people involve in the school organization.	6.67	.52	Strongly Agree
Identify Meaningful Long-Term Goals and stay on course to achieve these with the help of different linkages and partnerships.	6.76	.47	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	*6.70*		
SD	*0.35*		
Verbal Interpretation	*Very High Extent*		

The highest mean score (M = 6.76, SD = 0.47) indicates that stakeholders strongly agree that identifying meaningful long-term goals and staying on course to achieve them through linkages and partnerships is crucial for sustainability. This highlights the significance of strategic planning and external collaboration in ensuring continuous school improvement. On the other hand, the lowest mean score (M = 6.63, SD = 0.59) is associated with focusing on positive ideas and commonalities within the organization. While still rated as strongly agree this suggests that reinforcing a shared vision and strengthening internal alignment could further enhance long-term stakeholder commitment.

The level of sustainable stakeholders' partnerships in terms of long-term commitment attained a weighted mean score of (M = 6.70, SD = 0.35) and was verbally interpreted as Very High.

In summary, the school effectively promotes long-term stakeholder engagement by fostering trust, setting clear responsibilities, and addressing challenges promptly.

Level of School Resiliency

Table 13 shows the level of school resiliency in terms of crisis response and adaptability. It presents the statements, mean, standard deviation, and remarks. Crisis response and adaptability are critical for ensuring that schools can effectively manage risks, respond to emergencies, and maintain stability in challenging situations.

The highest mean score (M = 6.83, SD = 0.41) indicates that stakeholders strongly agree that understanding common risks for schools and establishing strong management is essential for resiliency. This highlights the importance of proactive risk assessment and structured management strategies in ensuring school preparedness. On the other hand, the lowest mean score (M = 6.79, SD = 0.43) is associated with identifying risks and defining an action plan for the

school. While still rated as strongly agree, this suggests that schools could further refine risk assessment frameworks and preparedness planning.

Table 13. Level of School Resiliency in terms of Crisis Response and Adaptability

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
Identify risk and define action plan needed for the school.	6.78	.43	Strongly Agree
Building school's crisis management to negate possible risks and how to respond to crises should they occur.	6.78	.44	Strongly Agree
Identify the potential risk for the school and take an action before it may happen.	6.79	.44	Strongly Agree
Create a hierarchy for sharing information on the crisis.	6.78	.44	Strongly Agree
Understand the common risk for school and establish strong management.	6.83	.41	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	*6.80*		
SD	*0.33*		
Verbal Interpretation	*Very High Extent*		

The level of school resiliency in terms of crisis response and adaptability attained a weighted mean score of (M = 6.80, SD = 0.33) and was verbally interpreted as Very High.

In summary, the school demonstrates strong resiliency by implementing structured crisis management, proactively identifying risks, and establishing clear communication strategies.

Table 14 presents the level of school resiliency in terms of peer support and mentoring programs

Table 14. Level of School Resiliency in terms of Peer Support and Mentoring Programs

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
Set up collaborative interaction with workers.	6.71	.56	Strongly Agree
Create a safe environment to learn from each other.	6.81	.41	Strongly Agree
Identify common reasons to learn from each other.	6.82	.44	Strongly Agree
Fill knowledge gaps by providing activities and performances that support peer support	6.80	.44	Strongly Agree
Provide activities that promotes tolerance and resilience among all the members of the organization.	6.80	.45	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	*6.80*		
SD	*0.33*		
Verbal Interpretation	*Very High*		

Peer support and mentoring programs play a vital role in fostering resilience by creating a collaborative and supportive environment for both educators and students.

The highest mean score (M = 6.83, SD = 0.44) indicates that stakeholders strongly agree on the importance of identifying common reasons to learn from each other, emphasizing shared experiences as a foundation for growth. Meanwhile, the lowest mean score (M = 6.72, SD = 0.56 is associated with setting up collaborative interaction with workers. While still rated as strongly agree this suggests an opportunity to further enhance teamwork and structured collaboration among school members.

The level of school resiliency in terms of peer support and mentoring programs attained a weighted mean score of (M =

6.80, SD = 0.66) and was verbally interpreted as Very High.

In summary, the school effectively fosters resilience by promoting peer learning, creating a safe environment for collaboration, and implementing mentoring programs that bridge knowledge gaps.

Table 15 presents the level of school resiliency in terms of restorative practices.

Table 15. Level of School Resiliency in terms of Restorative Practices

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
Foster empathetic listening among all the member of the school organization.	6.81	.41	Strongly Agree
Address problems that arise between students or between students and staff.	6.77	.46	Strongly Agree
Build relationships within the various groups within the school community.	6.79	.50	Strongly Agree
Use conflict as a learning opportunity and allow participants to come to a shared understanding.	6.80	.44	Strongly Agree
Develop Emotional Intelligence (EI) through listening and acknowledgement.	6.8	.40	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	*6.81*		
SD	*0.29*		
Verbal Interpretation	*Very High*		

The highest mean score (M = 6.85, SD = 0.40 indicates that stakeholders strongly agree on the importance of developing Emotional Intelligence (EI) through listening and acknowledgment, highlighting the role of emotional awareness in conflict resolution and relationship-building

Meanwhile, the lowest mean score (M = 6.77, SD = 0.46 is associated with addressing problems that arise between students or between students and staff. While still rated as Strongly agree, this suggests an opportunity to enhance conflict resolution strategies and communication within the school community.

The level of school resiliency in terms of restorative practices attained a weighted mean score of (M = 6.81, SD = 0.29) and was verbally interpreted as Very High.

Level of School Resiliency in terms of Creativity and Innovation

Table 16 presents the level of school resiliency in terms of creativity and innovation.

Creativity and innovation are crucial in fostering adaptability, problem-solving, and continuous improvement within the school environment.

The highest mean score (M = 6.76, SD = 0.46) indicates that stakeholders strongly agree on the importance of being capable of taking risks and being flexible in all situations, emphasizing the need for adaptability in fostering innovation. Meanwhile, the lowest mean score (M = 6.61, SD = 0.66) is associated with allowing members of the organization to have space and time to innovate new things for better school performance.

While still rated as strongly agree, this suggests an opportunity to further encourage structured time and resources for innovation among school members.

The level of school resiliency in terms of creativity and innovation attained a weighted mean score of (M = 6.65, SD = 0.44) and was verbally interpreted as Very High.

Table 16. Level of school resiliency in terms of creativity and innovation.

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
Engage more in creative processes.	6.62	.58	Strongly Agree
Approach challenges and constraints innovatively.	6.64	.57	Strongly Agree
Establish creative environment for students, faculty members and all other person in school organization.	6.61	.58	Strongly Agree
Capable of taking risk and be flexible for all the situation.	6.75	.46	Strongly Agree
Allow the member of the organization to have space and time to innovate new things for the better school performance.	6.61	.66	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.65		
SD	0.44		
Verbal Interpretation	Very High		

In summary, the school effectively fosters resilience by promoting creative thinking, innovation, and problem-solving strategies. Schools should continue implementing programs that encourage risk-taking in learning, provide an environment conducive to creativity, and integrate innovation in teaching methodologies to sustain resilience and adaptability in the school community.

Level of School- Community Engagement

Table 17 presents the level of community engagement in terms of community resource utilization. It includes statements, mean scores, standard deviations, and remarks. Community resource utilization plays a crucial role in ensuring the efficient allocation, transparency, and strategic use of school resources to enhance educational outcomes

Table 17. Level of School- Community Engagement in terms of Community Resource Utilization

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
Assign people or projects based on their skills, previous experience, availability, or project budget.	6.73	.51	Strongly Agree
Support school heads in ongoing resource management efforts.	6.74	.47	Strongly Agree
Provide and manage transparency, effectiveness and efficiency within the school.	6.75	.45	Strongly Agree
Make strategic plan for organizing and using school resources.	6.76	.47	Strongly Agree
Evaluation and maximizing resources for school activities and projects.	6.76	.46	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.75		
SD	0.36		
Verbal Interpretation	Very High		

The highest mean score (M = 6.77, SD = 0.468) indicates that stakeholders strongly agree on the importance of evaluating and maximizing resources for school activities and projects, emphasizing the need for continuous assessment and optimization of available resources. Meanwhile, the lowest mean score (M = 6.73, SD = 0.51) is associated with assigning people or projects based on their skills, previous experience, availability, or project budget

While still rated as strongly agree, this suggests an opportunity to refine resource allocation strategies by ensuring more structured role assignments within the school community.

The level of community engagement in terms of community resource utilization attained a weighted mean score of (M = 6.75, SD = 0.36) and was verbally interpreted as Very High.

In summary, the school effectively engages with the community by strategically utilizing resources, maintaining transparency, and optimizing school assets for various programs. Schools should continue fostering collaboration between school heads and stakeholders to strengthen resource management efforts, ensuring sustainability and long-term educational development.

Level of Community Engagement in terms of Access to Enrichment Programs

Table 18 presents the level of community engagement in terms of access to enrichment programs. Access to enrichment programs is essential in providing diverse learning opportunities, fostering collaboration, and ensuring that all members of the school community can enhance their skills and knowledge.

The highest mean score (M = 6.81, SD = 0.41) indicates that stakeholders strongly agree on the importance of offering flexibility in program design, highlighting the need for adaptable and inclusive educational programs. Meanwhile, the lowest mean score (M = 6.71, SD = 0.51) is associated with assessing members' interests and needs. While still rated as strongly agree, this suggests an opportunity to strengthen the assessment process to ensure that enrichment programs align more effectively with the specific interests and professional growth areas of school members.

Table 18. Level of Community Engagement in terms of Access to Enrichment Programs

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
Assess member's Interests and Needs	6.71	.51	Strongly Agree
Integrate diverse learning experiences for all the staffs.	6.76	.46	Strongly Agree
Collaborate with local organizations.	6.71	.53	Strongly Agree
Offer flexibility in program design.	6.81	.41	Strongly Agree
Provide everyone with opportunities to explore their learning through various experiences.	6.75	.47	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.75		
SD	0.36		
Verbal Interpretation	Very High Extent		

The level of community engagement in terms of access to enrichment programs attained a weighted mean score of (M = 6.75, SD = 0.36) and was verbally interpreted as Very High.

In summary, the school successfully provides access to enrichment programs by integrating diverse learning experiences, fostering collaboration with local organizations, and ensuring program flexibility. Moving forward, enhancing the assessment of members' interests and needs could further improve the impact of these enrichment opportunities.

369

Table 19 presents the level of community engagement in terms of social capital and networking. It includes statements, mean scores, standard deviations, and remarks. Social capital and networking play a crucial role in strengthening school-community relationships, enhancing collaboration, and fostering a supportive environment for both students and staff.

Table 19. Level of Community Engagement In terms of Social Capital and Networking

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
Foster productive conversations and repeated discussions within these structured in-school organizations	6.75	.45	Strongly Agree
Engage students in extracurricular opportunities.	6.83	.42	Strongly Agree
stablish formal and informal communication channels that are incorporated as a way of work.	6.80	.40	Strongly Agree
Train employees on effective communication and active listening.	6.76	.46	Strongly Agree
Create consistency in collaboration tools used for work.	6.80	.45	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	*6.79*		
SD	*0.31*		
Verbal Interpretation	*Very High*		

The highest mean score (M = 6.83, SD = 0.42) indicates that stakeholders strongly agree on the importance of engaging students in extracurricular opportunities, emphasizing the value of holistic student development beyond academic learning. Meanwhile, the lowest mean score (M = 6.76, SD = 0.45) is associated with fostering productive conversations and repeated discussions within structured in-school organizations. While still rated as strongly agree, this suggests an opportunity to enhance structured dialogue and communication strategies within the school.

The level of community engagement in terms of social capital and networking attained a weighted mean score of (M = 6.79, SD = 0.31) and was verbally interpreted as Very High.

In summary, the school effectively promotes social capital and networking by encouraging student participation in extracurricular activities, maintaining open communication channels, and fostering collaboration among stakeholders. Further strengthening structured discussions within in-school organizations could enhance the effectiveness of networking initiatives.

Level of Community Engagement in terms of Community-Led Project initiatives

Table 20 presents the level of community engagement in terms of community-led project initiatives. It includes statements, mean scores, standard deviations, and remarks.

Community-led initiatives play a vital role in fostering collaboration between the school and local stakeholders, ensuring that projects address shared goals and benefit both the institution and the broader community.

The highest mean score (M = 6.81, SD = 0.40) indicates that stakeholders strongly agree on the importance of sharing the school's vision and engaging with social groups to instill mutual understanding.

This underscores the significance of aligning school initiatives with community values and fostering inclusivity.

Table 20. Level of Community Engagement in terms of Community-Led Project initiatives

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
Interact with the school neighborhood and local businesses.	6.70	.48	Strongly Agree
Share school's vision and engage with social groups helps instill mutual understanding.	6.80	.40	Strongly Agree
Provide workshops with community organizations.	6.76	.48	Strongly Agree
Diversify channel of communications and leverage relationships among the community.	6.71	.53	Strongly Agree
Plan diverse activities such as workshops, mentorships, and community projects, tailored to the community's needs.	6.78	.47	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	*6.75*		
SD	*0.37*		
Verbal Interpretation	*Very High*		

Meanwhile, the lowest mean score (M = 6.71, SD = 0.48) is associated with interacting with the school neighborhood and local businesses. While still rated as strongly agree, this suggests an opportunity to strengthen partnerships with nearby establishments and enhance community participation.

The level of community engagement in terms of community-led project initiatives attained a weighted mean score of (M = 6.75, SD = 0.37) and was verbally interpreted as Very High. In summary, the school effectively promotes community-led initiatives by engaging with social groups, organizing workshops, and diversifying communication channels. Enhancing connections with local businesses and broadening outreach programs could further amplify the effectiveness of these initiatives.

Table 21 presents the level of community engagement in terms of cultural competence and inclusivity.

Table 21. Level of Community Engagement in terms of Cultural Competence and inclusivity

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
Create a supportive peer culture both inside and outside the classroom.	6.70	.49	Strongly Agree
Incorporates a variety of cultural backgrounds and perspectives	6.78	.43	Strongly Agree
Provide students with a sense of belonging despite of having different cultures.	6.79	.49	Strongly Agree
Integrate knowledge about various kind of culture and promotes equality.	6.73	.50	Strongly Agree
Utilize activities that encourage students to participate and learn from each other.	6.74	.50	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	*6.75*		
SD	*0.36*		
Verbal Interpretation	*Very High Extent*		

Cultural competence and inclusivity are essential in fostering a diverse and supportive learning environment where students, faculty, and community members feel valued and respected regardless of their backgrounds.

The highest mean score (M = 6.79, SD = 0.49) indicates that stakeholders strongly agree on the importance of providing students with a sense of belonging despite having

different cultures. This highlights the school's commitment to inclusivity and creating an environment where diversity is embraced. Meanwhile, the lowest mean score (M = 6.70, SD = 0.49) is associated with creating a supportive peer culture both inside and outside the classroom. While still rated as strongly agree, this suggests an opportunity to further enhance peer relationships and promote deeper cultural understanding among students.

The level of community engagement in terms of cultural competence and inclusivity attained a weighted mean score of (M = 6.75, SD = 0.36) and was verbally interpreted as Very High.

In summary, the school effectively fosters cultural competence and inclusivity by incorporating diverse perspectives, promoting equality, and encouraging participation in culturally enriching activities. Further strengthening peer support systems and implementing more interactive cultural exchange initiatives could further enhance the school's inclusive environment.

Level of Community Engagement in terms of Parental and Community Feedback

Table 21 presents the level of community engagement in terms of parental and community feedback.

Effective parental and community feedback mechanisms are crucial in fostering a strong partnership between schools and families, ensuring that student needs are met through collaborative efforts.

The highest mean score (M = 6.78, SD = 0.435) indicates that stakeholders strongly agree on the importance of ensuring that parents can witness the improvement of children's performance. This highlights the significance of transparency and parental involvement in monitoring student progress.

Table 21. Level of Community Engagement in terms of Parental and Community Feedback

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
Provides a forum for the discussion of problems and their solutions.	6.73	.46	Strongly Agree
Ensures the full cooperation of parents in the efficient implementation of school plans and activities.	6.76	.46	Strongly Agree
Takes part on planning, implementing, monitoring and evaluation in addressing student's needs.	6.70	.50	Strongly Agree
Develops collaborative activities for building good relationship between teachers, parents and students.	6.69	.51	Strongly Agree
Ensures that the parents can witness the improvement of children's performance.	6.77	.43	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	*6.73*		
SD	*0.37*		
Verbal Interpretation	*Very High Extent*		

Meanwhile, the lowest mean score (M = 6.69, SD = 0.51) is associated with developing collaborative activities for building good relationships between teachers, parents, and students. While still rated as strongly agre, this suggests an opportunity to further enhance parent-teacher-student interactions through well-structured engagement programs. The level of community engagement in terms of parental and community

feedback attained a weighted mean score of (M = 6.73, SD = 0.37) and was verbally interpreted as Very High. In summary, the school has successfully established mechanisms for gathering and utilizing parental and community feedback to enhance student development.

IV. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings, the following conclusions were drawn.

The research found a significant relationship between school capacity-building practices and sustainable stakeholders' partnership on the school resiliency and school-community engagement, leading to the rejection of the first hypothesis. The results concludes the importance of professional development, funding and resources, policy and governance, curriculum and instruction, assessment and evaluation, and external support in strengthening school resiliency. Likewise, the presence of shared responsibilities, flexibility and adaptability, inclusive participation, shared benefits and outcomes, monitoring and evaluation, and long-term commitment among stakeholders contributes to a school's ability to respond to crises, foster peer support and mentoring, implement restorative practices, and encourage creativity and innovation.

Furthermore, a significant relationship between school capacity-building practices and sustainable stakeholders' partnership on the school resiliency and school-community engagement, leading to the rejection of the second hypothesis. The results confirm that capacity-building efforts and sustainable partnerships significantly influence community engagement in terms of community resource utilization, access to enrichment programs, social capital and networking, community-led project initiatives, cultural competence and inclusivity, and parental and community feedback. This implies that well-structured school initiatives and strong stakeholder collaboration contribute to enhanced participation, inclusivity, and engagement within the community.

Based on the drawn conclusions resulted to the following recommendations:

1. Educators may actively engage in continuous professional development to enhance their skills in implementing capacity-building strategies that foster school resiliency and strengthen community engagement. Attending training programs and collaborating with stakeholders can improve teaching effectiveness and student support systems.

2. Students may be encouraged to actively participate in school-community initiatives by joining mentorship programs, volunteer work, and extracurricular activities that promote leadership, collaboration, and social responsibility. This engagement helps build resilience and fosters stronger community ties.

3. School leaders may implement strong governance policies and strategic planning that ensure the sustainability of stakeholder partnerships. This includes regular monitoring and evaluation of school-community engagement programs to assess their effectiveness and make necessary improvements.

REFERENCE

[1]. Coccia, M. (2020), Critical decisions in crisis management: rational strategies of decision making. Journal of Economics Library, 7(2), 81-96. https://doi.org/10.1453/jel.v7i2.2049.

[2]. Zhang, J.J. & Byrd, C.E. (2015), Enhancing the Quality of After-School Programs through Effective Program Management. Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, 76(8):5-10.

[3]. Bachman, J. G., O'Malley, P. M., & Johnston, L. D. (2020), Correlates of drug use, Part I: Selected measures of background, recent experiences, and life-style orientations. Monitoring the Future, Occasional Paper 8. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.

[4]. Baldwin, A. L., Baldwin, C. P., Kasser, T., Zax, M., Sameroff, A., & Seifer, R. (2018), Contextual risk and resiliency during late adolescence. Development and Psychopathology, 5, 741-761.

[5]. Banks, J. A., & Banks, C. A. M. G. (2018), Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives. Wiley.

[6]. Banks, J.A. (2015). Cultural diversity and education: Foundations, curriculum, and teaching. Routledge.

[7]. Baran, B. E., & Alderman, M. (2020), Preparing for the unthinkable: Leadership development for organizational crisis. Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 3(1), 45-47. https://doi.org/10.1108/10878570610637849.

[8]. Aglazor, G. (2019), Capacity-Building Needs in Vocational And Technical Education Training Program Through Curriculum Modification For Special Needs Learners, Educational Extracts ISSN 2320-7612 Vol. VII Issue 1 January 2019 pp. 3-10.