International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Publications
ISSN (Online): 2581-6187

Adopt-A-School Program Management in Fostering Safe Learning Environment and School Performance

Alegria A. De Lumban
Laguna State Polytechnic University Sta. Cruz Laguna 4009 PHILIPPINES
Email address: alegriadelumban@gmail.com

Abstract*—This study determined the Adopt-A-School Program management in fostering a safe learning environment and school performance in Cluster IV schools in the Division of Laguna. It also examined the relationships among program implementation, monitoring practices, school safety, and school performance as basis for proposing an enhancement framework. A quantitative descriptive-correlational research design was employed. The respondents consisted of nine school heads and 141 teachers from Cluster IV schools selected through purposive sampling. Data were gathered using validated researcher-made questionnaires and were analyzed using descriptive statistics such as mean and standard deviation, as well as inferential statistics including correlation to determine relationships among variables. Findings revealed that the Adopt-A-School Program was generally well implemented, while monitoring practices were moderately implemented. The level of safe learning environment was high, and school performance across all categories was very satisfactory. Significant relationships were found between program implementation and safe learning environment, as well as between program monitoring and safe learning environment. However, no significant relationship was found between program implementation and school performance, and monitoring practices showed limited influence on school performance. The study concluded that Adopt-A-School Program implementation and monitoring significantly contribute to enhancing the safety learning environment, thus rejecting the null hypotheses related to safety. However, program implementation and monitoring do not consistently influence school performance, thus failing to reject the null hypotheses related to performance. These findings suggest that school performance is influenced by broader contextual factors beyond program management. Based on the findings, the study recommends strengthening monitoring consistency, improving reporting systems, enhancing data utilization for decision-making, and reinforcing safety-related initiatives.*

***Keywords*—** *Adopt-A-School Program, program implementation, program monitoring, school safety, school performance.*

I. INTRODUCTION

Providing a safe and supportive learning environment while ensuring high academic performance remains a fundamental goal of educational systems worldwide. A safe learning environment refers to conditions that ensure the physical, psychological, and social well-being of learners, enabling them to engage actively in the learning process. In this context, Adopt-A-School Program (ASP) management plays a vital role, as it involves the systematic planning, implementation, and monitoring of partnerships between public schools and external stakeholders to support school needs and improve learning conditions. However, public schools, particularly in developing countries like the Philippines, continue to face challenges such as inadequate facilities, limited instructional materials, and insufficient resources, which may affect both school safety and performance.

To address these concerns, the Philippine government institutionalized the Adopt-A-School Program (ASP) through Republic Act No. 8525, further strengthened by DepEd Order No. 2, s. 2013. This policy encourages partnerships between public schools and private individuals, corporations, and organizations that provide financial, material, and technical assistance. Effective program management ensures that these partnerships are aligned with school needs, efficiently implemented, and continuously evaluated to achieve sustainable improvements in school conditions and outcomes.

Studies in the Philippine context highlight that the success of educational programs largely depends on strong monitoring and evaluation mechanisms. For instance, Palingcod (2022) emphasized the need for enhanced monitoring systems to ensure accountability, efficiency, and alignment of program outcomes with educational goals, particularly in improving school performance and maintaining safe learning environments. Similarly, Sanchez et al. (2024) found that effective monitoring, evaluation, and adjustment practices among school heads contributed to improved school operations through better data management, stakeholder involvement, and process efficiency.

In another study, Caayaman (2023) identified gaps in monitoring and mentoring practices among school leaders, underscoring the need for strengthened supervision and leadership to ensure program alignment and sustainability. These findings suggest that while programs like ASP provide essential support, their effectiveness largely depends on how well they are implemented and monitored within the school system.

Despite these insights, limited studies have examined the combined influence of Adopt-A-School Program implementation and monitoring on both school safety and performance outcomes. Existing research often focuses on program management or leadership practices independently, without exploring how these elements interact to influence learning conditions and institutional performance.

This study addresses this gap by investigating how the management and monitoring of the Adopt-A-School Program contribute to fostering safe learning environments and improving school performance in Cluster IV schools in the Division of Laguna. By examining both implementation and monitoring dimensions, the study aims to provide practical

Alegria A. De Lumban, "Adopt-A-School Program Management in Fostering Safe Learning Environment and School Performance," *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Publications (IJMRAP)*, Volume 8, Issue 12, pp. 180-193, 2026.

insights for school leaders, policymakers, and stakeholders in strengthening program effectiveness. Ultimately, it seeks to support the development of safer, more supportive, and higher-performing schools.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

Problem/s which were addressed by the research

The study determined the adopt-a-school program management in fostering safe learning environment and school performance in Cluster IV schools in the Division of Laguna.

Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the extent of Adopt-A-School Program implementation in terms of:
   1.1. Adequacy of resources;
   1.2 Relevance;
   1.3 Stakeholder participation and collaboration;
   1.4 Efficiency; and
   1.5 Monitoring, evaluation, and feedback mechanisms?
2. What is the Extent of Adopt-A-School Program Monitoring in terms of:
   2.1 Frequency of monitoring visits;
   2.2 Data collection methods;
   2.3 Stakeholder involvement;
   2.4 Reporting procedures; and
   2.5 Use of data for improvement?
3. What is the Level of Safety Learning Environment in terms of
   3.1 Physical security;
   3.2 Psychological safety;
   3.3 Disaster preparedness;
   3.4 Health and hygiene; and
   3.5 Conflict resolution mechanisms?
4. What is the Level of School Performance based on their Office Performance Commitment and Review Rating when grouped according to school categories?
5. Is there a significant relationship between the policy of adopt-a-school program implementation and the safety learning environment?
6. Is there a significant effect between the policy of adopt-a-school program implementation and the school performance when grouped according to school categories (big school, medium school, and small school)?
7. Is there a significant relationship between the adopt-a-school program monitoring and safety learning environment?
8. Is there a significant effect between the adopt-a-school program monitoring and school performance when grouped according to school categories?

II. Methodology

A quantitative descriptive-correlational research design was employed. The respondents consisted of nine school heads and 141 teachers from Cluster IV schools selected through purposive sampling. Data were gathered using validated researcher-made questionnaires and were analyzed using descriptive statistics such as mean and standard deviation, as well as inferential statistics including correlation to determine relationships among variables..

III. Results and Discussion

This chapter deals with the presentation, analysis and interpretation of the results based on the gathered data from the study.

Table 1 presents the extent of the Adopt-A-School Program implementation in terms of adequacy of resources. The overall mean of 5.15 (SD = 0.65) indicates that the program is well implemented in this domain. The relatively low standard deviation suggests a high level of agreement among respondents, reflecting consistent perceptions regarding the adequacy and availability of resources provided through the program.

Among the indicators, the highest mean was obtained by the statement, “Technical assistance from partners improves school operations,” with a mean of 5.29 (SD = 1.41), interpreted as well implemented. This suggests that respondents particularly recognize the value of technical assistance as a crucial form of support that strengthens administrative processes and enhances school functionality. The finding highlights that capacity-building efforts and operational guidance from partners are perceived as highly beneficial components of the program.

On the other hand, the lowest mean was recorded for the statement, “The financial support provided by partners is sufficient to address school needs,” with a mean of 4.95 (SD = 1.45), although still within the well implemented range. The slightly higher variability in responses indicates differing perceptions regarding the sufficiency of financial assistance. These findings imply that while financial support is appreciated, it may not fully address all priority needs of the school, suggesting room for strengthening funding mechanisms or improving alignment between financial assistance and actual school requirements.

Table 1. Extent of Adopt-A-School Program Implementation in terms of Adequacy of Resources

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The financial support provided by partners is sufficient to address school needs.	4.95	1.45	Well Implemented
Learning materials and equipment provided are adequate for classroom use.	5.25	1.38	Well Implemented
The school facilities supported by the program meet safety and functionality standards.	5.28	1.44	Well Implemented
The resources provided are accessible to both teachers and students.	5.23	1.42	Well Implemented
Technical assistance from partners improves school operations.	5.29	1.41	Well Implemented
Provided resources are sustainable and long-lasting.	5.09	1.41	Well Implemented
The school’s priority needs are addressed through the support received.	4.99	1.52	Well Implemented
Weighted Mean	5.15		
SD.	0.65		
Verbal Interpretation	Well Implemented		

Overall, the results indicate that the Adopt-A-School Program effectively provides adequate and accessible resources, particularly in terms of technical and operational support. This pattern was supported by the assertion of Brinkerhoff & Wetterberg (2016) that public–private

Alegria A. De Lumban, “Adopt-A-School Program Management in Fostering Safe Learning Environment and School Performance,” *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Publications (IJMRAP)*, Volume 8, Issue 12, pp. 180-193, 2026.

partnerships in education become more impactful when assistance extends beyond financial contributions to include technical expertise and institutional capacity-building initiatives that directly improve school performance.

Table 2. Extent of Adopt-A-School Program Implementation in terms of Relevance

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Adopt-A-School projects align with the priorities in the School Improvement Plan (SIP).	5.19	1.47	Well Implemented
Projects supported by partners address the immediate needs of students.	5.16	1.46	Well Implemented
Teacher training provided is responsive to actual classroom challenges.	5.03	1.50	Well Implemented
Health and nutrition-related projects are relevant to student well-being.	5.17	1.44	Well Implemented
Adopt-A-School interventions complement existing DepEd programs.	5.27	1.35	Well Implemented
The projects contribute directly to improving teaching and learning outcomes.	5.08	1.39	Well Implemented
The programs implemented are inclusive of diverse learners.	5.14	1.42	Well Implemented
Weighted Mean	5.15		
SD.	0.75		
Verbal Interpretation	Well Implemented		

Table 2 presents the extent of the Adopt-A-School Program implementation in terms of relevance. The overall mean of 5.15 (SD = 0.75) indicates that the program is well implemented in this dimension. The moderate standard deviation reflects a generally consistent perception among respondents that the initiatives under the program are aligned with school priorities and learner needs.

The highest mean was obtained by the statement, "Adopt-A-School interventions complement existing DepEd programs," with a mean of 5.27 (SD = 1.35), interpreted as well implemented. This indicates that respondents strongly perceive coherence between partner-supported initiatives and ongoing institutional programs. The relatively lower variability further suggests agreement that the program strengthens and reinforces existing frameworks rather than operating independently. These findings suggest that the program's effectiveness is enhanced when external interventions are integrated into the school's established systems and priorities.

The lowest mean was recorded for the statement, "Teacher training provided is responsive to actual classroom challenges," with a mean of 5.03 (SD = 1.50), although still within the well implemented range. The slightly higher variability in responses indicates differences in how teachers perceive the applicability of training initiatives. This suggests that while professional development efforts are relevant, greater contextual alignment with classroom-specific challenges may further strengthen their impact.

These findings are supported by the study of Rodríguez-Segura et al. (2022), which emphasized that education partnerships yield stronger outcomes when interventions are aligned with school improvement plans and existing institutional programs, ensuring coherence, responsiveness, and sustained educational impact.

Extent of Adopt-A-School Program Implementation in terms of Stakeholder Participation and Collaboration

Table 3 presents the extent of the Adopt-A-School Program implementation in terms of stakeholder participation and collaboration. The overall mean of 5.16 (SD = 0.65) indicates that the program is well implemented in this dimension. The relatively low standard deviation suggests a strong level of agreement among respondents that stakeholder engagement and collaborative practices are evident in program implementation.

Table 3. Extent of Adopt-A-School Program Implementation in terms of Stakeholder Participation and Collaboration

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Parents actively participate in Adopt-A-School projects.	5.12	1.32	Well Implemented
Local Government Units (LGUs) provide consistent support to the program.	5.22	1.37	Well Implemented
Private partners are actively engaged in school activities.	5.02	1.44	Well Implemented
Teachers collaborate effectively with partners in implementing projects.	5.13	1.38	Well Implemented
Students are encouraged to take part in project-related activities.	5.11	1.41	Well Implemented
The school maintains strong partnerships with the community.	5.19	1.32	Well Implemented
Collaboration among stakeholders fosters ownership of the program.	5.29	1.44	Well Implemented
Weighted Mean	5.16		
SD.	0.65		
Verbal Interpretation	Well Implemented		

The highest mean was obtained by the statement, "Collaboration among stakeholders fosters ownership of the program," with a mean of 5.29 (SD = 1.44), interpreted as well implemented. This indicates that respondents strongly recognize the role of collaboration in building shared responsibility and commitment toward program goals.
When stakeholders feel involved and valued in decision-making and implementation processes, a greater sense of ownership emerges, which can contribute to sustainability and long-term program progress and success through collaboration.

Conversely, the lowest mean was recorded for the statement, "Private partners are actively engaged in school activities," with a mean of 5.02 (SD = 1.44), although still within the well implemented range. The comparable standard deviation suggests variability in perceptions of private sector involvement. These findings suggest that while private partners are generally engaged, the depth or visibility of their participation may vary across contexts, indicating opportunities to further strengthen consistent engagement mechanisms.

Overall, the results demonstrate that stakeholder participation and collaborative practices are strong components of the Adopt-A-School Program. Active involvement of parents, LGUs, teachers, students, and community members appears to cultivate shared accountability and collective support for school initiatives.

These findings are supported by the study of FitzGerald & Quiñones (2019) which found that meaningful stakeholder

collaboration in school–community partnerships enhances program ownership, strengthens trust among partners, and improves the sustainability of educational initiatives.

Extent of Adopt-A-School Program Implementation in terms of Efficiency

Table 4 presents the extent of Adopt-A-School Program implementation in terms of efficiency. The overall mean of 5.14 (SD = 0.66) indicates that the program is well implemented in this dimension. The relatively low standard deviation suggests a consistent perception among respondents that operational processes, coordination systems, and implementation procedures are functioning effectively within the program.

Table 4. Extent of Adopt-A-School Program Implementation in terms of Efficiency

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Adopt-A-School projects are implemented on schedule.	5.20	1.38	Well Implemented
Communication between the school and partners is clear and consistent.	5.13	1.41	Well Implemented
Roles and responsibilities are clearly defined in project implementation.	5.05	1.34	Well Implemented
The school administration coordinates effectively with stakeholders.	5.15	1.39	Well Implemented
Implementation processes are well-documented and transparent.	5.15	1.37	Well Implemented
Delays in implementation are minimized through proper planning.	5.21	1.45	Well Implemented
Coordination among partners contributes to smooth program delivery.	5.10	1.42	Well Implemented
Weighted Mean	5.14		
SD.	0.66		
Verbal Interpretation	Well Implemented		

Table 4 presents the extent of Adopt-A-School Program implementation in terms of efficiency. The overall mean of 5.14 (SD = 0.66) indicates that the program is well implemented in this dimension. The relatively low standard deviation suggests a consistent perception among respondents that operational processes, coordination systems, and implementation procedures are functioning effectively within the program.

Among the indicators, the highest mean was obtained by the statement, “Delays in implementation are minimized through proper planning,” with a mean of 5.21 (SD = 1.45), closely followed by “Adopt-A-School projects are implemented on schedule,” with a mean of 5.20 (SD = 1.38). Both are interpreted as well implemented. These findings suggest that planning mechanisms and time management practices are strong components of program execution. Effective scheduling and anticipatory planning appear to support timely completion of projects and reduce operational disruptions.

In contrast, the lowest mean was recorded for the statement, “Roles and responsibilities are clearly defined in project implementation,” with a mean of 5.05 (SD = 1.34), although still interpreted as well implemented. This comparatively lower rating suggests that while responsibilities are generally established, there may be minor ambiguities in role delineation that could affect coordination efficiency. Clearer definition and communication of roles may further enhance smooth implementation.

Overall, the findings indicate that the Adopt-A-School Program demonstrates strong operational efficiency, particularly in planning and scheduling practices. Strengthening clarity in role assignments and reinforcing structured coordination mechanisms may further improve delivery systems and ensure sustained implementation effectiveness.

These findings are supported by Seo et al. (2023), who emphasized that collaborative initiatives achieve higher efficiency when planning systems are structured and roles among partners are clearly defined to prevent delays and improve coordination.

Table 5 presents the extent of the Adopt-A-School Program implementation in terms of efficiency. The overall mean of 5.14 (SD = 0.66) indicates that the program is well implemented in this area. The relatively low standard deviation reflects a consistent perception among respondents that operational processes, coordination mechanisms, and implementation procedures are functioning effectively.

Table 5. Extent of Adopt-A-School Program Implementation in terms of Monitoring, Evaluation, and Feedback Mechanisms

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Project monitoring is conducted regularly.	5.15	1.37	Well Implemented
Monitoring tools are used effectively to track project progress.	5.15	1.42	Well Implemented
Feedback from stakeholders is gathered systematically.	5.25	1.37	Well Implemented
Monitoring results are shared with the school community.	5.10	1.43	Well Implemented
Evaluation reports are used to make improvements in program implementation.	4.89	1.43	Well Implemented
Feedback mechanisms encourage active stakeholder input.	4.97	1.39	Well Implemented
Monitoring and evaluation activities are aligned with DepEd standards.	5.35	1.37	Very Well Implemented
Weighted Mean	5.12		
SD.	0.69		
Verbal Interpretation	Well Implemented		

The highest mean was obtained by the statement, “Delays in implementation are minimized through proper planning,” with a mean of 5.21 (SD = 1.45), interpreted as well implemented. This indicates that strategic planning mechanisms are perceived to be effective in ensuring timely execution of projects. Efficient scheduling and anticipatory planning appear to play a crucial role in preventing operational bottlenecks and sustaining program momentum.

In contrast, the lowest mean was recorded for the statement, “Roles and responsibilities are clearly defined in project implementation,” with a mean of 5.05 (SD = 1.34), although still within the well implemented range. While respondents generally agree that responsibilities are defined, the comparatively lower mean suggests that clarity in role delineation may require further strengthening. Ambiguities in responsibilities, even if minimal, can affect coordination and decision-making processes during implementation.

Taken together, these findings suggest that the Adopt-A-School Program demonstrates strong operational efficiency, particularly in planning and minimizing delays. However, enhancing clarity in role assignment and accountability structures may further improve implementation smoothness and coordination among stakeholders. These findings are supported by the study of Smith (2022), which emphasized that effective cross-sector collaborations achieve higher efficiency when planning mechanisms are structured and roles are clearly defined to reduce duplication, confusion, and delays in program delivery.

Table 6. Composite Table of Extent of Adopt-A-School Program Implementation

Aspects	Mean	SD	Remarks
Adequacy	5.15	0.654	Well Implemented
Relevance	5.15	0.748	Well Implemented
Stakeholder Participation	5.16	0.649	Well Implemented
Efficiency	5.14	0.663	Well Implemented
Monitoring, Evaluation, and Feedback Mechanisms	5.12	0.687	Well Implemented
Weighted Mean	5.14		
SD.	0.477		
Verbal Interpretation	Well Implemented		

Table 6 presents the composite results of the extent of the Adopt-A-School Program implementation across all major dimensions. The overall implementation mean of 5.14 (SD = 0.477) indicates that the program is well implemented in general. The relatively low standard deviation suggests strong consistency in respondents' perceptions across the different implementation areas, reflecting a stable and uniform assessment of program performance.

Among the dimensions, Stakeholder Participation obtained the highest mean of 5.16 (SD = 0.649), interpreted as well implemented. This indicates that collaborative engagement among parents, LGUs, private partners, teachers, and the community is the strongest aspect of program implementation. The finding suggests that active involvement and shared responsibility among stakeholders significantly contribute to the program's effective execution and sustainability.

On the other hand, Monitoring, Evaluation, and Feedback Mechanisms registered the lowest mean of 5.12 (SD = 0.687), although still within the well implemented range. While the rating remains positive, its comparatively lower value suggests that systematic assessment and feedback processes may require further strengthening to enhance continuous improvement and accountability. The slightly higher variability also indicates differing perceptions regarding the effectiveness of monitoring systems.

Overall, the composite findings demonstrate that the Adopt-A-School Program is consistently implemented across all major dimensions, with stakeholder collaboration emerging as its strongest component. The comparatively lower emphasis on monitoring and feedback suggests an opportunity to reinforce evaluation systems to ensure sustained program refinement and evidence-based decision-making. These findings are supported by the study of Bultema (202), which highlighted that collaborative governance initiatives are most effective when strong stakeholder engagement is complemented by robust monitoring and evaluation mechanisms to ensure accountability and continuous program improvement.

Table 7. Extent of Adopt-A-School Program Monitoring in terms of Frequency of Monitoring Visits

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Program monitoring visits are conducted as scheduled.	4.99	1.42	Slightly Agree
The frequency of visits is sufficient to track program progress.	5.04	1.45	Slightly Agree
Monitoring visits are conducted by both internal and external stakeholders.	5.17	1.31	Slightly Agree
School heads receive regular visits from program coordinators.	5.13	1.48	Slightly Agree
Partners actively participate during monitoring visits.	5.04	1.37	Slightly Agree
The frequency of visits ensures accountability in implementation.	5.21	1.37	Slightly Agree
Monitoring visits provide opportunities for immediate feedback.	5.27	1.40	Slightly Agree
Weighted Mean	5.12		
SD.	0.67		
Verbal Interpretation	Slightly Agree		

Table 7 presents the extent of Adopt-A-School Program monitoring in terms of the frequency of monitoring visits. The overall mean of 5.12 (SD = 0.67) indicates that respondents slightly agree regarding the adequacy and regularity of monitoring visits. Although the perception is generally positive, the interpretation suggests that monitoring frequency is not as strongly established compared to other dimensions of program implementation.

The highest mean was obtained by the statement, "Monitoring visits provide opportunities for immediate feedback," with a mean of 5.27 (SD = 1.40), interpreted as slightly agree. This indicates that respondents recognize monitoring visits as important avenues for providing timely feedback and addressing concerns during implementation. The finding suggests that when visits occur, they contribute to communication, clarification of issues, and strengthening accountability within the program.

In contrast, the lowest mean was recorded for the statement, "Program monitoring visits are conducted as scheduled," with a mean of 4.99 (SD = 1.42), also interpreted as slightly agree. This relatively lower rating suggests that adherence to scheduled timelines for monitoring may not always be consistent. The variation in responses indicates differing experiences among schools in terms of how regularly visits are conducted.

Overall, the results suggest that monitoring visits are perceived as beneficial, particularly in providing immediate feedback and reinforcing accountability. However, greater consistency in scheduling and conducting visits may further strengthen oversight and ensure systematic program tracking. These findings are supported by the Read & Atinc (2018)., which emphasized that structured and regular monitoring systems are essential in education partnership programs to

Alegria A. De Lumban, "Adopt-A-School Program Management in Fostering Safe Learning Environment and School Performance," *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Publications (IJMRAP)*, Volume 8, Issue 12, pp. 180-193, 2026.

enhance accountability, improve transparency, and promote continuous improvement.

Extent of Adopt-A-School Program Monitoring in terms of Data Collection Methods

Table 8 presents the extent of Adopt-A-School Program monitoring in terms of data collection methods. The overall mean of 5.20 (SD = 0.69) indicates that respondents slightly agree regarding the effectiveness and appropriateness of the data collection processes used in monitoring. The standard deviation reflects a moderate level of consistency in perceptions, suggesting that while practices are generally viewed positively, experiences may vary across contexts.

Table 8. Extent of Adopt-A-School Program Monitoring in terms of Data Collection Methods

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Monitoring activities use systematic data collection tools.	5.44	1.33	Agree
Surveys and interviews are used to gather stakeholder feedback.	5.05	1.44	Slightly Agree
Observation is a common method used during monitoring.	5.23	1.35	Slightly Agree
Data collection ensures accuracy of program evaluation.	5.04	1.40	Slightly Agree
Teachers are regularly consulted for monitoring data.	5.11	1.38	Slightly Agree
Data collected reflects the true progress of projects.	5.31	1.42	Agree
Data collection methods follow DepEd protocols.	5.21	1.42	Slightly Agree
Weighted Mean	5.20		
SD.	0.69		
Verbal Interpretation	Slightly Agree		

The highest mean was obtained by the statement, "Monitoring activities use systematic data collection tools," with a mean of 5.44 (SD = 1.33), interpreted as agree. This indicates that respondents recognize the presence of structured tools and formal mechanisms in gathering monitoring data. The relatively lower variability suggests stronger agreement that monitoring processes are guided by organized and standardized instruments.

In contrast, the lowest mean was recorded for the statement, "Data collection ensures accuracy of program evaluation," with a mean of 5.04 (SD = 1.40), interpreted as slightly agree. Although still positive, this comparatively lower rating suggests that some respondents may have reservations regarding the precision or comprehensiveness of the data gathered. The variation in responses indicates differing levels of confidence in the accuracy of evaluation outcomes derived from collected data.

Overall, the findings suggest that systematic tools are in place for monitoring, and data collection procedures generally follow structured approaches. However, strengthening validation processes and ensuring data accuracy may further enhance confidence in evaluation results and decision-making processes. These findings are supported by the study of Ayele et al. (2024) which emphasized that effective monitoring systems in education programs require reliable and systematic data collection methods.

Table 9. Extent of Adopt-A-School Program Monitoring in terms of Stakeholder Involvement

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Stakeholders are actively involved in monitoring activities.	5.19	1.36	Slightly Agree
Parents participate in providing feedback during monitoring.	5.35	1.46	Agree
LGUs and private partners are included in monitoring processes.	5.15	1.41	Slightly Agree
Teachers contribute insights during monitoring activities.	5.19	1.41	Slightly Agree
Student representatives are consulted in monitoring activities.	5.28	1.41	Slightly Agree
Stakeholder involvement improves accountability in program monitoring.	5.05	1.46	Slightly Agree
Feedback from stakeholders is valued in decision-making.	5.23	1.31	Slightly Agree
Weighted Mean	5.21		
SD.	0.67		
Verbal Interpretation	Slightly Agree		

Table 9 presents the extent of Adopt-A-School Program monitoring in terms of stakeholder involvement. The overall mean of 5.21 (SD = 0.67) indicates that respondents slightly agree that stakeholders are engaged in monitoring activities. The standard deviation reflects a moderate degree of consistency in perceptions, suggesting that while stakeholder participation is generally observed, the extent of involvement may differ across groups and contexts.

The highest mean was obtained by the statement, "Parents participate in providing feedback during monitoring," with a mean of 5.35 (SD = 1.46), interpreted as agree. This indicates that parental involvement is a relatively strong component of the monitoring process. The finding suggests that parents are given opportunities to share feedback, which contributes to transparency and strengthens school–community linkages in program oversight.

In contrast, the lowest mean was recorded for the statement, "Stakeholder involvement improves accountability in program monitoring," with a mean of 5.05 (SD = 1.46), interpreted as slightly agree. Although still positive, this comparatively lower rating suggests that respondents may not fully perceive stakeholder participation as consistently translating into stronger accountability mechanisms. The variability in responses indicates differing views regarding how stakeholder input influences monitoring outcomes and decision-making processes.

Overall, the findings suggest that stakeholders, particularly parents, are involved in monitoring activities, and their feedback is generally considered in program implementation. However, reinforcing clearer accountability structures and demonstrating how stakeholder input directly informs decisions may further strengthen confidence in participatory monitoring practices. These findings are supported by the study of Awoonor (2025)., which emphasized that participatory governance mechanisms enhance accountability in development programs when stakeholder engagement is meaningful and systematically integrated into decision-making processes.

Table 10 presents the extent of Adopt-A-School Program monitoring in terms of reporting procedures. The overall mean of 5.19 (SD = 0.73) indicates that respondents slightly agree

regarding the effectiveness and clarity of reporting mechanisms. The standard deviation suggests moderate consistency in perceptions, implying that reporting practices are generally observed but may vary in execution across contexts.

Table 10. Extent of Adopt-A-School Program Monitoring in terms of Reporting Procedures

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Monitoring results are reported in a timely manner.	5.10	1.39	Slightly Agree
Reports are clear and comprehensive.	5.31	1.40	Agree
Monitoring results are disseminated to all stakeholders.	5.16	1.43	Slightly Agree
Reports include recommendations for program improvement.	5.27	1.47	Slightly Agree
Reporting procedures follow DepEd standards.	5.09	1.46	Slightly Agree
Reports are made accessible to the school community.	5.08	1.36	Slightly Agree
Reports reflect transparency and accountability.	5.34	1.37	Agree
Weighted Mean	5.19		
SD.	0.73		
Verbal Interpretation	Slightly Agree		

The highest mean was obtained by the statement, "Reports reflect transparency and accountability," with a mean of 5.34 (SD = 1.37), interpreted as agree. This indicates that respondents perceive reporting procedures as mechanisms that promote openness and responsibility in program implementation. The relatively strong agreement suggests that reports serve not only as documentation tools but also as instruments for maintaining trust among stakeholders.

In contrast, the lowest mean was recorded for the statement, "Reports are made accessible to the school community," with a mean of 5.08 (SD = 1.36), interpreted as slightly agree. Although still positive, this comparatively lower rating suggests that accessibility of reports may not always be maximized. Some stakeholders may have limited access to monitoring outcomes, which can affect transparency and shared understanding of program progress.

Overall, the findings suggest that reporting procedures are generally structured and perceived as transparent, particularly in reflecting accountability. However, improving the dissemination and accessibility of reports may further strengthen stakeholder awareness and engagement in monitoring processes. These findings are supported by the study of Waddington (2019), which emphasized that transparency initiatives in governance are more effective when reporting systems are accessible, comprehensive, and designed to actively inform stakeholders, thereby strengthening accountability and institutional trust.

Extent of Adopt-A-School Program Monitoring in terms of Use of Data for Improvement

Table 11 presents the extent of Adopt-A-School Program monitoring in terms of the use of data for improvement. The overall mean of 5.23 (SD = 0.73) indicates that respondents slightly agree that monitoring data are utilized to enhance program implementation. The standard deviation reflects moderate consistency in perceptions, suggesting that while data use is generally observed, its depth and consistency may vary across stakeholders.

Table 11. Extent of Adopt-A-School Program Monitoring in terms of Use of Data for Improvement

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Data from monitoring is used to improve project implementation.	5.30	1.33	Agree
Results of monitoring are integrated into school planning.	5.21	1.33	Slightly Agree
Teachers use data to enhance instructional practices.	5.24	1.38	Slightly Agree
Partners adjust their support based on monitoring results.	5.10	1.49	Slightly Agree
Data is used to identify gaps in program implementation.	5.12	1.47	Slightly Agree
Data analysis informs decision-making at the school level.	5.35	1.39	Agree
Continuous improvement is guided by monitoring results.	5.31	1.46	Agree
Weighted Mean	5.23		
SD.	0.73		
Verbal Interpretation	Slightly Agree		

The highest mean was obtained by the statement, "Data analysis informs decision-making at the school level," with a mean of 5.35 (SD = 1.39), interpreted as agree. This indicates that respondents recognize the role of analyzed data in guiding school-level decisions. The strong rating suggests that monitoring results are not merely documented but are considered in administrative and operational planning processes.

In contrast, the lowest mean was recorded for the statement, "Partners adjust their support based on monitoring results," with a mean of 5.10 (SD = 1.49), interpreted as slightly agree. Although still positive, this comparatively lower rating suggests that external partners may not consistently modify their interventions based on monitoring feedback. The higher variability in responses indicates differing perceptions regarding how responsive partners are to evaluation findings.

Overall, the findings suggest that monitoring data are generally used to inform school decisions and support continuous improvement efforts. However, strengthening mechanisms that ensure partners systematically adjust their support based on evidence may further enhance program responsiveness and impact. These findings are supported by the study of Chitwood (2018), which emphasized that effective data-driven improvement in educational settings requires not only data collection and analysis but also consistent application of findings in decision-making and collaborative action among stakeholders.

Table 12. Composite Table of Extent of Adopt-A-School Program Monitoring

Aspects	Mean	SD	Remarks
Frequency of Monitoring Visits	5.12	0.674	Slightly Agree
Data Collection Methods	5.2	0.693	Slightly Agree
Stakeholder Involvement	5.21	0.668	Slightly Agree
Reporting Procedures	5.19	0.725	Slightly Agree
Use of Data for Improvement	5.23	0.732	Slightly Agree
Weighted Mean	5.19		
SD.	0.499		
Verbal Interpretation:	Slightly Agree		

Alegria A. De Lumban, "Adopt-A-School Program Management in Fostering Safe Learning Environment and School Performance," *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Publications (IJMRAP)*, Volume 8, Issue 12, pp. 180-193, 2026.

Table 12 presents the composite results of the extent of Adopt-A-School Program monitoring across its major dimensions. The overall mean of 5.19 (SD = 0.499) indicates that respondents slightly agree regarding the effectiveness of the program's monitoring system. The relatively low standard deviation suggests consistency in perceptions across the different monitoring components, although the overall interpretation reflects a moderate rather than strong level of affirmation.

Among the dimensions, Use of Data for Improvement obtained the highest mean of 5.23 (SD = 0.732), interpreted as slightly agree. This indicates that respondents most strongly recognize the role of monitoring data in guiding improvement efforts. The finding suggests that schools are making efforts to apply evaluation results in planning and decision-making processes, reinforcing a culture of evidence-informed practice.

In contrast, Frequency of Monitoring Visits registered the lowest mean of 5.12 (SD = 0.674), also interpreted as slightly agree. Although still positive, this comparatively lower rating suggests that regularity and scheduling of monitoring visits may require strengthening. Variations in perceptions indicate that not all schools may experience consistent or timely monitoring engagements.

Overall, the composite findings suggest that while monitoring mechanisms are present and functioning, there is room to enhance their consistency, depth, and systematic implementation. Strengthening structured monitoring schedules, reinforcing stakeholder engagement, and ensuring comprehensive reporting practices may further elevate the effectiveness of the monitoring system.

These findings are supported by the study of Matlala (2025), which emphasized that sustainable education reform initiatives require coherent monitoring frameworks that integrate regular oversight, systematic data collection, and structured feedback loops to drive continuous improvement and accountability.

Table 13. Level of Safety Learning Environment in terms of Physical Security

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
School premises have adequate fencing or security measures.	5.05	1.36	High
Entry and exit points in the school are properly monitored.	5.22	1.46	High
Security personnel or staff are available to ensure safety.	5.05	1.42	High
Classrooms are equipped with locks and safety devices.	5.15	1.43	High
Students feel physically safe while in school.	5.2	1.28	High
The school has protocols for handling intruders.	5.22	1.43	High
Physical structures meet safety standards.	5.07	1.46	High
Weighted Mean	5.14		
SD.	0.63		
Verbal Interpretation	High		

Table 13 presents the level of safety learning environment in terms of physical security. The overall mean of 5.14 (SD = 0.63) indicates a high level of physical security within the school environment. The relatively low standard deviation reflects consistent perceptions among respondents, suggesting a shared view that safety measures and protective structures are adequately established.

The highest mean was obtained by the statements, "Entry and exit points in the school are properly monitored" and "The school has protocols for handling intruders," both with a mean of 5.22 (SD = 1.46 and SD = 1.43, respectively), interpreted as high. This indicates that structured access control and established safety protocols are perceived as strong components of the school's physical security framework. The findings suggest that regulated entry systems and clear emergency procedures contribute significantly to maintaining a secure learning environment.

In contrast, the lowest mean was recorded for the statements, "School premises have adequate fencing or security measures" and "Security personnel or staff are available to ensure safety," both with a mean of 5.05 (SD = 1.36 and SD = 1.42, respectively), although still interpreted as high. While the ratings remain positive, these comparatively lower values suggest that certain aspects of visible security infrastructure and personnel presence may require further strengthening to enhance overall safety perception.

Overall, the findings suggest that the school maintains a strong physical security system, particularly in monitoring access points and establishing safety protocols. These findings are supported by the study of Darling-Hammond & Cook-Harvey (2018), which found that well-implemented physical security measures, including controlled access and clear safety procedures, significantly contribute to students' perception of safety and the overall quality of the school climate.

Level of Safety Learning Environment in terms of Psychological Safety

Table 14 presents the level of safety learning environment in terms of psychological safety. The overall mean of 5.09 (SD = 0.68) indicates a high level of psychological safety within the school. The standard deviation suggests moderate consistency in responses, reflecting a generally shared perception that the school fosters a supportive and emotionally secure environment for learners.

Table 14. Level of Safety Learning Environment in terms of Psychological Safety

Statements	**Mean**	**SD**	**Interpretation**
Students feel respected and accepted in school.	5.1	1.45	High
Teachers promote a positive and inclusive classroom environment.	5.11	1.38	High
Bullying incidents are addressed promptly by the school.	5.04	1.39	High
Guidance counseling services are available to learners.	5.07	1.41	High
Students can express concerns without fear of ridicule.	5.08	1.45	High
Teachers are approachable for emotional support.	5.07	1.45	High
The school promotes mental health awareness.	5.18	1.4	High
Weighted Mean	5.09		
SD.	0.68		
Verbal Interpretation	High		

The highest mean was obtained by the statement, "The school promotes mental health awareness," with a mean of

Alegria A. De Lumban, "Adopt-A-School Program Management in Fostering Safe Learning Environment and School Performance," *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Publications (IJMRAP)*, Volume 8, Issue 12, pp. 180-193, 2026.

5.18 (SD = 1.40), interpreted as high. This indicates that initiatives related to mental health promotion are visibly recognized by respondents. The finding suggests that the school actively engages in activities or programs that raise awareness about emotional well-being, contributing to a culture that values students' psychological health.

In contrast, the lowest mean was recorded for the statement, "Bullying incidents are addressed promptly by the school," with a mean of 5.04 (SD = 1.39), although still interpreted as high. While the rating remains positive, the comparatively lower value suggests that responsiveness to bullying cases may be an area that requires continued attention.

Overall, the findings suggest that the school maintains a psychologically supportive environment characterized by respect, inclusivity, and mental health awareness. Strengthening timely responses to bullying and reinforcing safe channels for reporting concerns may further enhance students' sense of emotional security.

These findings are supported by the study of Aldridge et al. (2020), which found that schools that actively promote psychological safety and positive relationships experience improved student well-being, engagement, and overall school climate.

Table 15. Level of Safety Learning Environment in terms of Disaster Preparedness

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The school conducts regular earthquake and fire drills.	5.25	1.42	High
Emergency exits are clearly marked and functional.	4.95	1.37	High
Students are trained on disaster response procedures.	4.79	1.45	High
First aid kits are available in classrooms or offices.	5.04	1.44	High
The school has an updated disaster preparedness plan.	5.21	1.43	High
Teachers are trained in disaster management.	5.29	1.41	High
Disaster drills are conducted in coordination with LGUs.	4.95	1.4	High
Weighted Mean	5.07		
SD.	0.68		
Verbal Interpretation	High		

Table 15 presents the level of safety learning environment in terms of disaster preparedness. The overall mean of 5.07 (SD = 0.68) indicates a high level of disaster preparedness within the school. The standard deviation reflects moderate consistency in responses, suggesting that respondents generally perceive preparedness measures to be established, although experiences may vary slightly across areas.

The highest mean was obtained by the statement, "Teachers are trained in disaster management," with a mean of 5.29 (SD = 1.41), interpreted as high. This indicates that capacity-building initiatives for teachers in disaster response are strongly recognized. The finding suggests that equipping teachers with knowledge and skills in disaster management is a key strength of the school's preparedness efforts, reinforcing its ability to respond effectively during emergencies.

In contrast, the lowest mean was recorded for the statement, "Students are trained on disaster response procedures," with a mean of 4.79 (SD = 1.45), although still interpreted as high. This comparatively lower rating suggests that while disaster preparedness measures are in place, student-focused training may require further strengthening to ensure that learners are fully aware of appropriate response actions during emergencies. The variability in responses indicates differing perceptions regarding the extent of student involvement in preparedness activities.

Overall, the findings suggest that the school demonstrates a strong commitment to disaster preparedness, particularly in teacher training and formal planning mechanisms. However, expanding student-centered training and reinforcing visible emergency features such as clearly marked exits may further enhance readiness and resilience. These findings are supported by the study of Richardson (2025), which emphasized that comprehensive school disaster preparedness requires not only institutional planning and staff training but also active student engagement to ensure effective and coordinated emergency responses.

Table 16. Level of Safety Learning Environment in terms of Health and Hygiene

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Restrooms are clean and well-maintained.	5.14	1.36	High
Handwashing facilities are available and functional.	5.29	1.41	High
The school promotes good hygiene practices among learners.	4.96	1.48	High
A school clinic or health corner is available to address health needs.	5.12	1.39	High
Nutrition programs (e.g., feeding) are implemented regularly.	5.13	1.39	High
Waste management practices are followed in the school.	5.17	1.47	High
Health services are accessible to both teachers and students.	4.91	1.42	High
Weighted Mean	5.10		
SD.	0.67		
Verbal Interpretation	High		

Table 16 presents the level of safety learning environment in terms of health and hygiene. The overall mean of 5.10 (SD = 0.67) indicates a high level of health and hygiene practices within the school.

The relatively low standard deviation suggests a consistent perception among respondents that sanitation, health services, and hygiene-related initiatives are adequately maintained.

The highest mean was obtained by the statement, "Handwashing facilities are available and functional," with a mean of 5.29 (SD = 1.41), interpreted as high. This indicates that the availability and functionality of handwashing facilities are strongly recognized by respondents as a key strength of the school's health environment. The finding suggests that infrastructure supporting hygiene practices is visibly present and accessible, contributing to disease prevention and overall student well-being.

In contrast, the lowest mean was recorded for the statement, "Health services are accessible to both teachers and students," with a mean of 4.91 (SD = 1.42), although still

Alegria A. De Lumban, "Adopt-A-School Program Management in Fostering Safe Learning Environment and School Performance," *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Publications (IJMRAP)*, Volume 8, Issue 12, pp. 180-193, 2026.

interpreted as high. While the rating remains positive, the comparatively lower value suggests that accessibility of health services may require further enhancement to ensure that all members of the school community can readily obtain medical assistance when needed.

Overall, the findings suggest that the school maintains strong hygiene practices and functional sanitation facilities, particularly in promoting handwashing and waste management. However, strengthening access to comprehensive health services and reinforcing hygiene promotion initiatives may further improve the overall health climate of the school.

These findings are supported by the study of Frimpong (2024), which emphasized that adequate water, sanitation, and hygiene facilities in schools significantly contribute to improved student health outcomes, attendance, and overall learning conditions.

Table 17 presents the level of safety learning environment in terms of conflict resolution mechanisms. The overall mean of 5.12 (SD = 0.64) indicates a high level of effectiveness in the school's conflict resolution practices.

Table 17. Level of Safety Learning Environment in terms of Conflict Resolution Mechanisms

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The school has policies for addressing student conflicts.	4.97	1.45	High
Teachers mediate conflicts fairly and promptly.	5.09	1.43	High
Peer mediation is encouraged in resolving disputes.	5.06	1.4	High
Conflict resolution procedures are transparent.	5.13	1.37	High
Students are taught peaceful ways of managing disagreements.	5.11	1.52	High
Conflicts are resolved without bias or favoritism.	5.11	1.4	High
School leadership ensures a harmonious school environment.	5.34	1.46	Very High
Weighted Mean	5.12		
SD.	0.64		
Verbal Interpretation	High		

The relatively low standard deviation reflects consistent perceptions among respondents that systems and procedures for managing conflicts are generally established and functioning.

The highest mean was obtained by the statement, "School leadership ensures a harmonious school environment," with a mean of 5.34 (SD = 1.46), interpreted as very high. This indicates that leadership plays a central role in maintaining harmony and setting the tone for fair and structured conflict management. The finding suggests that administrative guidance and leadership presence significantly influence the overall climate of peace and order within the school.

In contrast, the lowest mean was recorded for the statement, "The school has policies for addressing student conflicts," with a mean of 4.97 (SD = 1.45), although still interpreted as high. While the rating remains positive, the comparatively lower value suggests that awareness or visibility of formal policies may require strengthening. The variation in responses indicates that some stakeholders may not be fully familiar with established guidelines for handling student disputes.

Overall, the findings suggest that the school demonstrates strong conflict resolution practices, particularly through leadership-driven efforts to sustain harmony. Reinforcing awareness and communication of formal conflict resolution policies may further enhance transparency.

These findings are supported by the study of Gregory et al. (2016), which found that strong school leadership and restorative approaches to conflict resolution contribute significantly to positive school climate, fairness perceptions, and reduced disciplinary disparities.

Table 18. Composite Table of Level of Safety Learning Environment

Aspects	Mean	SD	Remarks
Physical Security	5.14	0.634	High
Psychological Safety	5.09	0.679	High
Disaster Preparedness	5.07	0.684	High
Health and Hygiene	5.1	0.67	High
Conflict Resolution Mechanisms	5.12	0.644	High
Weighted Mean	5.1		
SD.	0.429		
Verbal Interpretation	High		

Table 18 presents the composite results of the level of safety learning environment across its major dimensions. The overall mean of 5.10 (SD = 0.429) indicates a high level of safety within the school learning environment. The relatively low standard deviation reflects strong consistency in respondents' perceptions, suggesting a shared view that safety measures are systematically established across different domains.

Among the dimensions, Physical Security obtained the highest mean of 5.14 (SD = 0.634), interpreted as high. This indicates that structural safeguards, monitored access points, and established safety protocols are perceived as the strongest components of the school's safety framework. The finding suggests that visible and tangible security measures significantly contribute to stakeholders' confidence in the school's protective environment.

In contrast, Disaster Preparedness registered the lowest mean of 5.07 (SD = 0.684), although still interpreted as high. While preparedness measures such as drills and planning mechanisms are present, the comparatively lower rating suggests that further strengthening of coordinated drills, student training, or emergency readiness initiatives may enhance overall preparedness capacity.

Overall, the composite findings indicate that the school maintains a comprehensive and balanced approach to safety, encompassing physical, psychological, health-related, and conflict management aspects. The consistently high ratings across all domains suggest an integrated safety system that supports both protection and well-being.

These findings are supported by the study of Thapa (2024), which emphasized that a multidimensional approach to school safety that integrates physical security, emotional well-being, and structured policies is essential in fostering a positive and secure school climate conducive to learning.

Alegria A. De Lumban, "Adopt-A-School Program Management in Fostering Safe Learning Environment and School Performance," *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Publications (IJMRAP)*, Volume 8, Issue 12, pp. 180-193, 2026.

Level of School Performance based on their Office Performance Commitment and Review Rating when grouped according to School Categories

Table 19 presents the level of school performance based on the Office Performance Commitment and Review (OPCR) rating when grouped according to school categories. The results show that overall performance across all school categories falls within the very satisfactory range, indicating that schools consistently meet performance standards set by the evaluation framework.

Table 19. Level of School Performance based on their Office Performance Commitment and Review Rating when grouped according to School Categories

School Categories	Mean	SD	Remarks
Small School	4.45	0.0501	Very Satisfactory
Medium School	4.63	0.0966	Very Satisfactory
Large School	4.42	0.0748	Very Satisfactory
Weighted Mean	*5.1*		
SD.	*0.429*		
Verbal Interpretation	*Very Satisfactory*		

Among the categories, Medium Schools obtained the highest mean of 4.63 (SD = 0.0966), interpreted as very satisfactory. The relatively low standard deviation indicates consistency in performance ratings within this category. This suggests that medium-sized schools may benefit from a balanced structure, where administrative manageability and resource availability are optimally aligned to support effective implementation of programs and operational targets.

In contrast, Large Schools recorded the lowest mean of 4.42 (SD = 0.0748), although still interpreted as very satisfactory. While performance remains commendable, the slightly lower mean suggests that larger school populations and broader operational demands may pose additional challenges in consistently achieving higher performance indicators. Small Schools followed closely with a mean of 4.45 (SD = 0.0501), also within the very satisfactory level, indicating stable performance despite potentially limited resources.

Overall, the findings suggest that school size does not significantly hinder the attainment of very satisfactory performance levels, although medium-sized schools demonstrate a slight advantage in overall ratings. These findings are supported by the study of Leithwood et al. (2020), which highlighted that school organizational structure and leadership capacity influence performance outcomes, and that schools with manageable size and effective administrative coordination often demonstrate stronger institutional performance indicators.

Test of Significant Relationship Between Adopt a School Program Implementation and Safety Learning Environment

Table 20 presents the test of significant relationship between Adopt-A-School Program implementation and the Safety Learning Environment. The results reveal that all correlations are positive and statistically significant, as evidenced by p-values less than 0.05, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis in all tested dimensions. The correlation coefficients range from .190 to .401, indicating weak to moderate positive relationships between program implementation components and various aspects of school safety.

Table 20. Test of Significant Relationship Between Adopt a School Program Implementation and Safety Learning Environment

Adopt a School Program Implementation	Safety Learning Environment	r - value	p - value	Remarks
Adequacy	Physical Security	.361**	<.001	Significant
	Psychological Safety	.280**	0.001	Significant
	Disaster Preparedness	.378**	<.001	Significant
	Health and Hygiene	.319**	<.001	Significant
	Conflict Resolution Mechanisms	.249**	0.002	Significant
Relevance	Physical Security	.377**	<.001	Significant
	Psychological Safety	.401**	<.001	Significant
	Disaster Preparedness	.242**	0.003	Significant
	Health and Hygiene	.313**	<.001	Significant
	Conflict Resolution Mechanisms	.328**	<.001	Significant
Stakeholder Participation	Physical Security	.293**	<.001	Significant
	Psychological Safety	.356**	<.001	Significant
	Disaster Preparedness	.391**	<.001	Significant
	Health and Hygiene	.238**	0.003	Significant
	Conflict Resolution Mechanisms	.242**	0.003	Significant

Table 20 continued ...

Adopt a School Program Implementation	Safety Learning Environment	r - value	p - value	Remarks
Efficiency	Physical Security	.282**	<.001	Significant
	Psychological Safety	.387**	<.001	Significant
	Disaster Preparedness	.360**	<.001	Significant
	Health and Hygiene	.316**	<.001	Significant
	Conflict Resolution Mechanisms	.319**	<.001	Significant
Monitoring, Evaluation, and Feedback Mechanisms	Physical Security	.230**	0.005	Significant
	Psychological Safety	.377**	<.001	Significant
	Disaster Preparedness	.347**	<.001	Significant
	Health and Hygiene	.190*	0.02	Significant
	Conflict Resolution Mechanisms	.193*	0.018	Significant

Overall, the findings indicate that stronger implementation of the Adopt-A-School Program is associated with higher levels of safety across physical, psychological, preparedness, health, and conflict management domains. The consistent pattern of positive correlations suggests that program adequacy, relevance, stakeholder engagement, efficiency, and monitoring mechanisms collectively contribute to strengthening the overall safety climate of schools. These findings are supported by the study of Spencer (2023), which emphasized that well-implemented school-community partnerships and structured institutional supports are significantly associated with improved school safety outcomes and a more positive school climate.

Test of Significant Relationship Between Adopt a School Program Implementation and School Based Performance

Alegria A. De Lumban, "Adopt-A-School Program Management in Fostering Safe Learning Environment and School Performance," *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Publications (IJMRAP)*, Volume 8, Issue 12, pp. 180-193, 2026.

Table 21 presents the test of significant relationship between Adopt-A-School Program implementation and school-based performance when grouped according to school category. The results indicate that none of the correlations reached statistical significance, as all p-values are greater than 0.05. Consequently, the null hypothesis is retained across all dimensions of program implementation and school categories

Table 21. Test of Significant Relationship Between Adopt a School Program Implementation and School Based Performance

Adopt a School Program Implementation	School Based Performance	r - value	p - value	Remarks
Adequacy	Small School	-0.104	0.558	Not Significant
	Medium School	-0.013	0.915	Not Significant
	Large School	-0.065	0.653	Not Significant
Relevance	Small School	-0.162	0.36	Not Significant
	Medium School	-0.217	0.081	Not Significant
	Large School	-0.09	0.533	Not Significant
Stakeholder Participation	Small School	-0.034	0.849	Not Significant
	Medium School	-0.085	0.496	Not Significant
	Large School	-0.089	0.54	Not Significant
Efficiency	Small School	0.316	0.069	Not Significant
	Medium School	0.067	0.592	Not Significant
	Large School	-0.064	0.658	Not Significant
Monitoring, Evaluation, and Feedback Mechanisms	Small School	0.255	0.146	Not Significant
	Medium School	0.159	0.201	Not Significant
	Large School	-0.145	0.314	Not Significant

The absence of significant relationships suggests that school-based performance, as measured by OPCR ratings, may be influenced by broader institutional, administrative, or contextual factors beyond the scope of the Adopt-A-School Program.

Overall, the findings suggest that while the Adopt-A-School Program demonstrates strong implementation and positive associations with school safety, its direct statistical relationship with formal school performance ratings is not evident across school categories. This implies that performance outcomes reflected in OPCR ratings may depend on multiple variables such as leadership effectiveness, internal management systems, or resource allocation processes rather than partnership implementation alone.

These findings are supported by the study of Al-Mahdy et al. (2018), which emphasized that school performance outcomes are typically shaped by complex, multi-layered leadership and organizational factors, and that external partnership programs may indirectly contribute to performance but do not always produce immediate measurable effects on formal evaluation ratings.

Test of Significant Relationship Between Adopt a School Program Monitoring and Safety Learning Environment

Table 22 presents the test of significant relationship between Adopt-A-School Program monitoring and the Safety Learning Environment.

The results show that all correlations are positive and statistically significant, with p-values less than 0.05 across all dimensions. This leads to the rejection of the null hypothesis in every tested pair, indicating that stronger monitoring practices are significantly associated with higher levels of school safety.

Table 22. Test of Significant Relationship Between Adopt a School Program Monitoring and Safety Learning Environment

Adopt a School Program Monitoring	Safety Learning Environment	r - value	p - value	Remarks
Frequency of Monitoring Visits	Physical Security	.351**	<.001	Significant
	Psychological Safety	.249**	0.002	Significant
	Disaster Preparedness	.326**	<.001	Significant
	Health and Hygiene	.196*	0.016	Significant
	Conflict Resolution Mechanisms	.185*	0.024	Significant
Data Collection Methods	Physical Security	.232**	0.004	Significant
	Psychological Safety	.354**	<.001	Significant
	Disaster Preparedness	.298**	<.001	Significant
	Health and Hygiene	.205*	0.012	Significant
	Conflict Resolution Mechanisms	.171*	0.037	Significant
Stakeholder Involvement	Physical Security	.272**	0.001	Significant
	Psychological Safety	.367**	<.001	Significant
	Disaster Preparedness	.236**	0.004	Significant
	Health and Hygiene	.327**	<.001	Significant
	Conflict Resolution Mechanisms	.196*	0.016	Significant

Table 22 continued ...

Adopt a School Program Monitoring	Safety Learning Environment	r - value	p - value	Remarks
Reporting Procedures	Physical Security	.365**	<.001	Significant
	Psychological Safety	.402**	<.001	Significant
	Disaster Preparedness	.320**	<.001	Significant
	Health and Hygiene	.280**	0.001	Significant
	Conflict Resolution Mechanisms	.253**	0.002	Significant
Use of Data for Improvement	Physical Security	.433**	<.001	Significant
	Psychological Safety	.333**	<.001	Significant
	Disaster Preparedness	.344**	<.001	Significant
	Health and Hygiene	.344**	<.001	Significant
	Conflict Resolution Mechanisms	.346**	<.001	Significant

Overall, the findings suggest that comprehensive monitoring practices, particularly the effective use of data and structured reporting systems, play a substantial role in strengthening various aspects of the school safety environment. The consistent pattern of positive correlations indicates that systematic monitoring not only ensures accountability but also reinforces both physical and psychosocial dimensions of safety.

These findings are supported by the study of Datnow and Park (2018), which emphasized that sustained data use and structured monitoring systems in schools are significantly associated with improved organizational practices and positive school climate outcomes.

Alegria A. De Lumban, "Adopt-A-School Program Management in Fostering Safe Learning Environment and School Performance," *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Publications (IJMRAP)*, Volume 8, Issue 12, pp. 180-193, 2026.

Test of Significant Relationship Between Adopt a School Program Monitoring and School Based Performance

Table 23 presents the test of significant relationship between Adopt-A-School Program monitoring and school-based performance when grouped according to school category. The results reveal that only two relationships reached statistical significance, both within the small school category.

A significant positive relationship was found between Data Collection Methods and Small Schools ($r = 0.336$, $p = 0.05$). This moderate positive correlation indicates that in small schools, the use of systematic and structured data collection tools is associated with higher school-based performance ratings. This suggests that when monitoring activities employ organized instruments such as surveys, observations, and documented evaluation tools, small schools may be better positioned to translate gathered information into performance gains.

Table 23. Test of Significant Relationship Between Adopt a School Program Monitoring and School Based Performance

Adopt a School Program Monitoring	School Based Performance	r - value	p - value	Remarks
Frequency of Monitoring Visits	Small School	0.04	0.824	Not Significant
	Medium School	0.144	0.247	Not Significant
	Large School	-0.029	0.843	Not Significant
Data Collection Methods	Small School	0.336	0.05	Significant
	Medium School	-0.082	0.51	Not Significant
	Large School	-0.027	0.85	Not Significant
Stakeholder Involvement	Small School	0.12	0.498	Not Significant
	Medium School	0.13	0.296	Not Significant
	Large School	-0.015	0.919	Not Significant
Reporting Procedures	Small School	0.148	0.402	Not Significant
	Medium School	-0.114	0.362	Not Significant
	Large School	0.063	0.663	Not Significant
Use of Data for Improvement	Small School	-0.424	0.012	Significant
	Medium School	-0.114	0.362	Not Significant
	Large School	0.013	0.929	Not Significant

The relatively streamlined structure of small schools may allow collected data to be processed and utilized more efficiently, thereby influencing formal performance outcomes. All other relationships across medium and large schools were not statistically significant. Overall, the findings highlight that monitoring practices show measurable associations with school-based performance only within small schools, particularly in terms of how data are collected and utilized. These findings are supported by the study of Keuning et al. (2016), which found that data use initiatives tend to have more observable performance effects in smaller educational settings where decision-making processes are less complex and implementation structures are more centralized.

IV. Conclusion and Recommendations

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

The implementation of the Adopt-A-School Program has a significant relationship with the safety learning environment in Cluster IV schools in the Division of Laguna. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected. It is therefore concluded that stronger implementation of program components contributes to improvements in various aspects of school safety, including physical security, psychological safety, health and hygiene, disaster preparedness, and conflict resolution mechanisms.

However, the findings also revealed that the implementation of the Adopt-A-School Program does not have a significant relationship with school performance across the different school categories. Thus, the null hypothesis was not rejected. It is therefore concluded that while the program contributes to strengthening school processes and improving safety conditions, it does not directly influence formal performance ratings as measured through the Office Performance Commitment and Review (OPCR). School performance outcomes appear to be influenced by broader organizational and contextual factors beyond program implementation.

Furthermore, the study found that the monitoring practices of the Adopt-A-School Program have a significant relationship with the safety learning environment. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected. It is therefore concluded that systematic monitoring activities, including regular monitoring visits, data collection, stakeholder involvement, and the use of data for improvement, contribute to enhancing safety conditions within schools. Effective monitoring mechanisms help ensure accountability, facilitate evidence-based decision-making, and support continuous improvement in school safety practices.

Lastly, the relationship between program monitoring and school performance was found to be limited. Significant relationships were observed only among small schools, where structured data collection and the use of data for improvement demonstrated measurable associations with school performance. In contrast, no significant relationships were observed among medium and large schools, indicating that the influence of monitoring practices on institutional performance may vary depending on school size and organizational context. Thus, the null hypothesis was generally not rejected, except in the case of small schools where significant relationships were observed. It is therefore concluded that the influence of monitoring practices on school performance varies depending on school size and organizational context, with more observable effects in smaller schools.

In light of the conclusions drawn, the following recommendations are offered:

School heads and Adopt-A-School Program coordinators may strengthen monitoring schedules by ensuring the consistent implementation of planned monitoring visits to

enhance accountability and improve the overall effectiveness of the program monitoring system.

Program implementers and administrative staff may improve reporting accessibility and transparency by establishing clear and systematic reporting procedures to ensure that monitoring results and program updates are effectively communicated to school administrators, stakeholders, and community partners.

Schools, with the support of teachers, may further enhance disaster preparedness initiatives through student-centered training and awareness programs to strengthen the safety learning environment and complement existing capacity-building efforts.

School heads may institutionalize structured data validation and utilization processes to ensure that monitoring results are systematically analyzed and used to inform planning, decision-making, and continuous program improvement.

For small schools, structured data collection and utilization practices may be sustained and refined, as these practices demonstrated measurable associations with school performance and may contribute to improved institutional outcomes.

The Schools Division Office may consider adopting and pilot-testing the proposed Adopt-A-School Program Enhancement Framework in Cluster IV schools to strengthen the integration of program implementation, monitoring mechanisms, safety initiatives, and long-term school performance systems. Future researchers may further investigate mediating variables, such as leadership practices, school climate factors, or governance mechanisms, to better explain the relationship between partnership programs and formal school performance ratings..

REFERENCE

[1]. Al-Mahdy, Y. F. H., Emam, M. M., & Hallinger, P. (2018). Assessing the contribution of principal instructional leadership and collective teacher efficacy to teacher commitment in Oman. Teaching and Teacher Education, 69(1), 191-201.

[2]. Aldridge, J. M., McChesney, K., & Afari, E. (2020). Associations between school climate and student life satisfaction: resilience and bullying as mediating factors. Learning Environments Research, 23(1), 129-150.

[3]. Awoonor, M. D. A. M. D. (2025). Enhancing local governance through community participation in rural development projects in Nigeria: Literature review. African Journal on Impact Economic and Social studies (AJIESS), 3(002).

[4]. Ayele, C., Bekele, M., & Tafasse, M. (2024). Monitoring and Evaluation Practices: Implication to Education Policy Implementation in Gambella Region, Ethiopia. Education Journal, 13(3), 115-123.

[5]. Brinkerhoff, D. W., & Wetterberg, A. (2016). Gauging the effects of social accountability on services, governance, and citizen empowerment. Public Administration Review, 76(2), 274-286.

[6]. Bultema, S. A. (2022). Linking Collaboration Dynamics and Outcomes in Collaborative Governance. University of Colorado at Denver.

[7]. Caayaman, T. A. (2023). The Mentoring and Monitoring Practices of Schools District Supervisors. International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research, 4(3), 686-691. http://dx.doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.04.03.01

[8]. Chitwood, N. R. (2018). The Effectiveness of Leadership Behaviors in Influencing Data-Driven Decision-Making by Teachers. University of California, Los Angeles.

[9]. Darling-Hammond, L., & Cook-Harvey, C. M. (2018). Educating the Whole Child: Improving School Climate to Support Student Success. Learning Policy Institute.

[10]. Datnow, A., & Park, V. (2018). Professional collaboration with purpose: Teacher learning towards equitable and excellent schools. Routledge.

[11]. FitzGerald, A. M., & Quiñones, S. (2019). Working in and with community: Leading for partnerships in a community school. Leadership and Policy in Schools, 18(4), 511-532.

[12]. Frimpong, J. A. (2024). Availability of School-Based Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) Facilities: Implications for Menstrual Hygiene Management, School Attendance and Learning Outcomes in Ghana (Doctoral dissertation, University of Ghana).

[13]. Gregory, A., Clawson, K., Davis, A., & Gerewitz, J. (2016). The promise of restorative practices to transform teacher-student relationships and achieve equity in school discipline. Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 26(4), 325-353.

[14]. Keuning, T., Van Geel, M., Visscher, A., & Fox, J. P. (2016). The Effects of a Schoolwide Data-Based Decision Making Intervention on Elementary Schools' Student Achievement Growth for Mathematics and Spelling. Society for Research on Educational Effectiveness.

[15]. Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. School leadership & management, 40(1), 5-22.

[16]. Matlala, L. S. (2025). Harnessing citizen-based monitoring for sustainable governance in South Africa: A framework for achieving SDGs through enhanced governance practice. OIDA International Journal of Sustainable Development, 18(08), 109-128.

[17]. Palingcod, R. (2022). Implementation of DepEd Support Programs: Basis for an Enhanced Monitoring and Evaluation Mechanism. Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 3(5), 2-11. https://10.5281/zenodo.6964618

[18]. Read, L., & Atinc, T. M. (2018). Information for accountability: Transparency and citizen engagement for improved service delivery in education systems.

[19]. Richardson, J. L. (2025). Collaborative Resilience: Integrating Departmental Functions for Campus Emergency Preparedness and Business Continuity (Master's thesis, Pratt Institute).

[20]. Rodriguez-Segura, D., Campton, C., Crouch, L., & Slade, T. S. (2022). Looking Beyond Changes in Averages in Evaluating Foundational Learning: Some Inequality Measures.

[21]. Seo, D., Bryson, J. M., & Crosby, B. C. (2023). How can collaboration deliver? A structurational approach to understanding collaboration process and effectiveness. Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 34(2), 345-370.

[22]. Smith, R. A. (2022). Collaborative Service Delivery in Human Service Organizations: Evaluating Cross-Sector Collaboration and Contractual Partnerships. The Ohio State University.

[23]. Spencer, C. C. (2023). Role of inclusive stakeholder engagement on sustainable educational and community outcomes in Title I schools (Doctoral dissertation, University of St. Thomas (Houston)).

[24]. Thapa, R. (2024). The preparedness of schools in responding to emerging climate change impacts and risks in Bhutan(Doctoral dissertation, RMIT University).

[25]. Waddington, H., Sonnenfeld, A., Finetti, J., Gaarder, M., John, D., & Stevenson, J. (2019). Citizen engagement in public services in low-and middle-income countries: A mixed-methods systematic review of participation, inclusion, transparency and accountability (PITA) initiatives. Campbell Systematic Reviews, 15(1-2), e1025.