International Journal of Education, Business and Economics Research (IJEBER)

ISSN: 2583-3006

Vol. 5, Issue 3, May-June 2025, pp 398-421

To cite this article: Owen Tonga Oro (2025). Integration Of Comprehensive School Safety Framework (Cssf) In The School Improvement Plans Of Public Secondary Schools In The Division Of Albay. International Journal of Education, Business and Economics Research (IJEBER) 5 (3): 398-421

INTEGRATION OF COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL SAFETY FRAMEWORK (CSSF) IN THE SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLANS OF PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN THE DIVISION OF ALBAY

Owen Tonga Oro

Bicol College Graduate School
Corner Rizal & R.F Tabuena Sts., Daraga, Philippines, 4501
Orcid No. 0009-0000-8160-4006

https://doi.org/10.59822/IJEBER.2025.5321

ABSTRACT

Effective approach to disaster preparedness in schools is exhibited in the school's initiatives in providing opportunities for the learning community to comply with the standards of the School Disaster Risk Reduction and Management by integrating the Comprehensive School Safety Framework that support their responsibilities. Hence, this research determined the level of integration of the CSSF into the School Improvement Plans (SIPs) of public secondary schools in Guinobatan, Camalig, and Daraga, Albay. The study used descriptive method research design utilizing survey technique, interview, and documentary analysis. This study involved 19 public secondary schools in the identified setting and conducted the study with the school heads. The analyzed data revealed that the three pillars of the CSSF namely safe school learning facilities (3.53), school disaster management (3.61), and risk reduction and resilience education (3.64) are integrated in the SIPs. It was also found out that most of the challenges encountered by the respondents are relevant to issues related to insufficient resources, training, and infrastructure while best practices are characterized by proactive engagement, effective communication, and continuous improvement. It was also identified that public secondary schools have plans, activities, projects, and programs focused on hazard mapping (3.19), prevention and mitigation (3.28), preparedness (3.37), response (3.49), and rehabilitation and recovery (3.54) where respondents strongly agreed in the survey supported by the evidence in their SIPs. Therefore, the level of integration of the CSSF in the SIPs of public secondary schools is high, however, the plans and activities embedded in the SIPs did not capture a holistic integration of the CSSF, this study recommends a strategic action plan for school heads on effective integration of the Comprehensive School Safety Framework that can be included in the development of the next School Improvement Plans.

KEYWORDS: - Comprehensive School Safety Framework, School Improvement Plans, Disaster Risk Reduction and Management, Challenges and Best Practices, Plans, Programs, and Activities.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Ensuring disaster preparedness in schools is critical to protecting learners, staff, and facilities. School heads play a central role in organizing and supervising preparedness efforts. Globally, frameworks like the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015–2030 emphasize the importance of embedding disaster risk reduction (DRR) across all sectors, including education. The Comprehensive School Safety Framework (CSSF) 2022–2030, developed by GADRRRES, provides a strategic approach to ensuring safe and uninterrupted learning. It rests on three pillars: Safe Learning Facilities, School Disaster Management, and Risk Reduction and Resilience Education. These pillars guide schools in reducing risks, ensuring preparedness, and building resilience among students and staff. According to UNESCO (2021) and UNDRR (2020), integrating DRR into school governance and curriculum not only protects lives but also supports psychological stability and community resilience during emergencies.

At its core, school safety refers to safeguarding the learning environment from a range of potential dangers. This includes strategies for preventing bullying, supporting mental health, enhancing physical protection, and preparing for emergencies (Grmuša & Hong, 2024). A truly comprehensive school safety approach also considers psychological wellness and effective disaster response planning. According to Syahputri et al. (2022), while many nations have adopted emergency management frameworks, gaps remain in the training of teachers and staff and in fully embedding safety into the curriculum.

In the Philippines, DepEd Orders No. 51, s. 2011 and No. 37, s. 2015 require schools to implement DRRM plans aligned with the Comprehensive School Safety Framework (CSSF), with school heads leading preparedness and response efforts. The DRRMS ensures DRRM, Climate Change Adaptation (CCA), and Education in Emergencies (EiE) are integrated into schools. Republic Act 9729, the Climate Change Act, underscores the country's vulnerability to environmental disasters and promotes national-local collaboration. Republic Act 10121 mandates the inclusion of DRR education across formal and nonformal learning systems and emphasizes DRR training for public sector workers.

The expanded literature further underscores the multifaceted and collaborative nature of effective disaster risk reduction (DRR) in educational settings. Kalogiannidis et al. (2022) emphasized that schools, as pivotal social institutions, shape social behaviors and norms, and their integration of DRR content into the academic curriculum significantly enhances community resilience, particularly in underprivileged areas of Greece. In China, Wang et al. (2023) found that disaster education plays a critical mediating role between school readiness and student preparedness. Petal et al. (2020) proposed a scalable framework for child-centered risk reduction (CCRR) and school safety by applying collective impact theory and recommending improvements such as research-

practice collaboration and capacity building. Amri et al. (2022), examining Indonesia's DRR education post-Hyogo Framework, revealed that although school-based DRR has expanded, its implementation is still paternalistic and overly reliant on local governments, with limited funding and institutional support. In Japan, Kawasaki et al. (2020) demonstrated the importance of strong parent-teacher collaboration in disaster readiness, with findings suggesting a lack of parental involvement and preparedness compared to educators, particularly among those with limited disaster experience. Pooley, Nunez, and Whybro (2021) contributed by consolidating 25 evidence-based practices into an empirical framework to guide fire safety education programs for children. Segarra et al. (2023) introduced a geolocation-based public health tool to assess students' exposure to natural hazards in Puerto Rico, revealing that improved data systems are essential for effective emergency response planning. Meanwhile, Rofia et al. (2021) identified six key elements for integrating inclusive DRR education in primary schools in Yogyakarta, such as adapting infrastructure for children with special needs, empowering students, and involving all stakeholders in disaster education efforts.

The body of literature on Comprehensive School Safety (CSS) and Disaster Risk Reduction and Management (DRRM) in educational settings highlights both global and localized efforts to ensure school preparedness and resilience against natural and human-induced hazards. Paci-Green et al. (2020) emphasized that while many countries have policies for emergency management and safe school infrastructure, funding gaps, limited technical capacity, and weak integration of disaster education in curricula and teacher training remain key barriers. Similarly, Stilwell et al. (2024) advocated for an ecological and equity-centered model in the United States, linking physical and psychological safety to improved student outcomes and underscoring the need for holistic and inclusive frameworks. Cels et al. (2023), studying tsunami-prone schools in Sri Lanka, found reliance on limited early warning systems and poor evacuation planning, though opportunities were seen in leveraging school safety committees and teacher training to boost readiness.

Tong et al. (2024) examined Vietnam's school safety policies and found gaps between national guidelines and school-level implementation—underscoring the global relevance of aligning SIPs with actionable DRRM strategies. Covaciu (2021) and Cvetković et al. (2024) both emphasized the value of inclusive disaster education and the need to consider demographic factors and student involvement in preparedness strategies.

In the Philippine context, Mamon (2019) found that senior high school students perceive their schools as generally safe, with resilient structures and strong DRRM practices such as contingency planning and risk reduction education. Cabilao-Valencia et al. (2019) further documented the integration of DRR in Philippine school curricula, recommending its mandatory inclusion and a multidisciplinary teaching approach to cultivate a safety-oriented culture. Alarte (2024) confirmed the thorough implementation of DRRM across prevention, preparedness, response, and recovery in Rizal public schools, noting better compliance in inclusive schools, while calling for policy enhancement to meet global standards.

Agra (2023) explored the relationship between SIP implementation and school performance in Laguna, revealing that while SIPs did not directly correlate with academic metrics, active

engagement from teachers and stakeholders was vital to success. Cresencio and Yabut (2023) assessed SDRRMS implementation in coastal schools in Pampanga and found consistent DRR practices but noted weak areas in coastal safety protocols. Tabilon-Tizon and Comighud (2019) highlighted that the strength of DRRM implementation significantly influenced school leaders' capacity to respond to hazards, recommending continuous training and adequate resource provision. Widowati et al. (2023) identified 23 critical indicators essential for disaster-resilient schools, emphasizing policy, risk assessment, infrastructure, and training. These indicators align with the pillars of the Comprehensive School Safety Framework (CSSF), reinforcing the need to embed DRRM components into school improvement planning. Together, these studies suggest that for SIPs to be effective in disaster-prone areas, they must be contextually responsive, inclusive, and aligned with DRRM and CSSF frameworks.

Unlike previous studies that focus broadly on disaster risk reduction education, community resilience, or policy gaps at national or regional levels, this study specifically examines how the Comprehensive School Safety Framework (CSSF) is integrated into the School Improvement Plans (SIPs) of public secondary schools in Albay, a disaster-prone area in the Philippines. This study fills that gap by providing a localized, document-based analysis of SIPs to assess their effectiveness in embedding comprehensive disaster preparedness and response measures tailored to Albay's unique hazard context.

In disaster-prone areas like Albay—particularly the municipalities of Guinobatan, Camalig, and Daraga—the need for strong disaster preparedness in schools is especially urgent. Albay is frequently affected by typhoons, volcanic eruptions from Mayon Volcano, landslides, floods, and earthquakes. These hazards pose significant risks to both life and property, especially in densely populated and vulnerable communities. This study evaluated the extent of integrating Disaster Risk Reduction and Management in the School Improvement Plans of public secondary schools in Guinobatan, Camalig, and Daraga, Albay. Specifically, it assessed the alignment of the school's plans and activities with the three pillars of the CSSF as mandated in the School Disaster Risk Reduction and Management policies and guidelines.

2.0 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This study is grounded on several theories such as Resiliency Theory, Theory of Planned Behavior, and Educational Change Theory. Resiliency Theory (Masten, 2001) is a conceptual model that emphasizes the ability of an individual to adapt and thrive despite adversity of significant stress. Resiliency theory stresses not the nature of adversity but the way an individual deal with it. In the context of thus study, resiliency theory becomes a bases for determining approaches and strategies in observance with the four components of disaster risk reduction and management namely preventing and mitigating, preparing, responding, and recovering and rehabilitating. The Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) (Ajzen, 1991) evolved from the Theory of Reasoned Action (1980) and aims to predict an individual's intention to engage in specific behaviors at certain times and locations. In the context of this study, the theory suggests that school administrators' attitudes, social expectations, and perceived resources or barriers influence their decision to integrate the Comprehensive School Safety Framework (CSSF) into School Improvement Plans (SIPs). Educational Change Theory (Fullan, 2007) examines how schools implement new programs,

policies, or frameworks and the factors that facilitate or hinder this process. It considers the roles of leadership, stakeholder buy-in, resource availability, and organizational culture. This theory supports the analysis of CSSF integration as a form of educational change within schools. It provides insights into the challenges and best practices in embedding new safety standards into SIPs, focusing on the roles of school leaders and stakeholders. Sustainable Safety Practices is a framework built on three foundational principles: Resilient Systems, Behavioral Intentions, and Dynamic Change Processes, forming a triadic approach to achieving sustainable school safety. This theory is developed based on its relevance to the study and according to the concepts of the three theories that served as the foundation for this research undertaking.

2.1 Objectives of the Study

This study determined the integration of the Comprehensive School Safety Framework (CSSF) in the School Improvement Plans (SIPs) of public secondary schools in the Division of Albay. Specifically, it aimed to determine the extent of integrating the CSSF into the SIPs of schools in Guinobatan, Camalig, and Daraga, Albay along the three pillars: Safe School Facilities, School Disaster Management, and Risk Reduction Education. It also sought to identify the challenges and best practices of school heads in aligning their SIPs with the CSSF. Additionally, the study examined the plans, activities, or programs outlined in the SIPs related to key components of school disaster management and risk reduction, including hazard mapping, prevention and mitigation, preparedness, response, and rehabilitation and recovery. Finally, based on the findings, the study proposed an action plan addressing the identified challenges within the three CSSF pillars.

3.0 METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

This study employed mixed method descriptive research design. For quantitative part, it used the descriptive research method utilizing a survey technique to determine the extent of integration of the Disaster Risk Reduction and Management (DRRM) principles into the School Improvement Plans (SIPs) of public secondary schools, describe the perception of school heads on the alignment of their School Improvement Plans (SIPs) with the School Disaster Risk Reduction and Management policies and guidelines, and identify challenges and best practices of school heads in aligning their School Improvement Plans (SIPs) with the Comprehensive School Safety Framework.

3.2 Study Site

The study site for this research was the public secondary schools located in the municipalities of Guinobatan, Camalig, and Daraga, Albay. These areas are highly vulnerable to various natural disasters such as volcanic eruptions from Mayon Volcano, typhoons, floods, and landslides. These schools are not only places of education but also serve as evacuation centers during emergencies, further highlighting the need to evaluate their disaster preparedness.

3.3 Participants

The respondents for this study were 19 school heads from public secondary schools located in Guinobatan, Camalig, and Daraga, Albay. These school heads must currently hold the position of

principal or head of the school and are responsible for overseeing and implementing the School Improvement Plan (SIP).

3.4 Instrumentation

The research instrument that was used in this study is a researcher-made survey questionnaire based on the indicators on the Comprehensive School Safety Framework Manual which is composed of three (3) parts.The first part of the research instrument was a survey questionnaire containing indicators on the extent of integration of the Disaster Risk Reduction and Management (DRRM) principles into the School Improvement Plans (SIPs) of public secondary schools in Guinobatan, Camalig, and Daraga, Albay. The second part of the research instrument was a survey questionnaire containing indicators that describes the perception of school heads on the alignment of their School Improvement Plans (SIPs) with the School Disaster Risk Reduction and Management policies and guidelines. The third part was a surveyto identify challenges and best practices of school heads in aligning their School Improvement Plans (SIPs) with the Comprehensive School Safety Framework. Likert's scale was used in the interpretation of the total weighted mean results.

3.5 Data Analysis

The study used quantitative descriptive method of research. This study utilized frequency count and weighted mean to describe the extent of integration of Comprehensive School Safety Framework in the School Improvement Plans, describe the perception of school heads on the alignment of their School Improvement Plans (SIPs) with the School Disaster Risk Reduction and Management policies and guidelines, identify challenges and best practices of school heads in aligning their School Improvement Plans (SIPs) with the Comprehensive School Safety Framework, anddescribe the plans, activities or programs outlined in the School Improvement Plans along the three pillars of comprehensive school safety framework.

4.0 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The following discussion aims to clarify the meaning of the observed results, highlight any unexpected outcomes, and explore their significance.

Extent of Integrating the Comprehensive School Safety Framework (CSSF) into the School Improvement Plans (SIPs) of Public Secondary Schools. Extent of integration describes how thoroughly the components of Comprehensive School Safety Framework are woven into the School Improvement Plans (SIPs).

Pillar 1: Safe School Facilities. The findings revealed that Pillar 1: Safe School Facilities was well integrated into the SIPs of public secondary schools in Guinobatan, Camalig, and Daraga under the Division of Albay rated with a total weighted mean of 3.53 highlighting the indicators with highest weighted mean of 3.68 on continuous monitoring, financing, and oversight into ongoing facilities maintenance and safety. However, though the indicators in this pillar were well integrated, it was found out that constructing of classrooms/facilities with inclusive disaster-resilient design was rated lowest among all indicators with an average weighted mean of 3.02. The results revealed that aspects that are prioritized by public secondary schools are mostly confined to maintaining and

overseeing existing facilities while the new infrastructure development especially disaster-resilient and inclusive structures lag behind.

This result can be aligned with the broader concept of school disaster management as outlined by Varchetta (2019) specifically among the emphasis on ensuring children's access to schools free from physical risks which supports the idea of maintaining a safe learning environment. Similarly, the study of Iqbal & Nauman (2024) aimed to evaluate the disaster preparedness level of secondary school teachers in the public school district of Attock, Pakistan utilizing the Comprehensive School Safety Framework (CSSF). Their findings showed that most schools demonstrated preparedness in key CSSF components, including safe learning facilities, disaster management, disaster risk reduction, and resilience education.

Table 1.1. *Pillar 1: Safe School Facilities*

Indicators **Pillar 1: Safe School Facilities**	**Guinobatan** **N=6**		**Camalig** **N=5**		**Daraga** **N=8**		**Average**		
	$\bar{x}$	**AI**	$\bar{x}$	**AI**	$\bar{x}$	**AI**	$\bar{x}$	**AI**	**Rank**
1. Constructing of classroom/facilities with inclusive disaster-resilient design.	3.00	I	2.80	I	3.25	WI	**3.02**	**I**	**9**
2. Minimizing structural, non-structural, and infrastructural risks to make buildings/facilities/classrooms safe for survival evacuation	3.50	WI	3.20	I	3.62	WI	**3.44**	**WI**	**7**
3. Designing and constructing buildings/facilities /classrooms are accessible and safe for people with disabilities	3.33	WI	3.40	WI	3.75	WI	**3.49**	**WI**	**5**
4. Engaging communities in safe school construction	3.33	WI	3.00	I	3.62	WI	**3.32**	**WI**	**8**
5. Ensuring children's access to schools free from physical risks	3.67	WI	4.00	WI	3.75	WI	**3.81**	**WI**	**1**
6. Adapting water and sanitation facilities to potential risks	3.50	WI	3.60	WI	3.75	WI	**3.62**	**WI**	**4**
7. Implementing climate-smart interventions to enhance water, energy, and food security	3.17	I	3.40	WI	3.88	WI	**3.48**	**WI**	**6**
8. Continuous monitoring, financing, and oversight into ongoing facilities	3.50	WI	3.80	WI	3.75	WI	**3.6**	**WI**	**3**

maintenance and safety							**8**		
9. Preventing and responding to attacks on education, including use of schools by parties to armed conflict	3.50	WI	3.80	WI	4.00	WI	**3.77**	**WI**	**2**
AVERAGE	**3.39**	**WI**	**3.44**	**WI**	**3.75**	**WI**	**3.53**	**WI**	

Pillar 2: School Disaster Management. The findings revealed that Pillar 2: School Disaster Management was well integrated into the SIPs of public secondary schools in Camalig, Guinobatan, and Daraga, Albay with a total average mean of 3.61. The schools well integrated establishing committees and full-time focal points to lead comprehensive school safety efforts with a weighted mean of 3.77. However, developing, training, institutionalizing and monitoring and evaluating school committees was rated lowest with a weighted mean of 3.41 but still rated well-integrated. Despite the variations, the overall aggregation of Pillar 2: School Disaster Management over the Albay Division, with an average mean value of 3.61, reveals that the schools are performing well in reality to incorporate disaster preparation and response procedures into their organizational system.
The results from Albay align with the findings of Tabilon-Tizon & Comighud's (2019) study on the Disaster Risk Reduction and Management (DRRM) program in Bayawan City Division. Their study found that schools with strong response capabilities to hazards demonstrated effective implementation of disaster management strategies. Paci-Green et al. (2020) emphasized that technical capacity and funding as critical elements in implementing comprehensive school safety (CSS) policies. They found out that most countries have embraced emergency management policies, yet issues such as inadequate funding and the absence of teacher training in DRR continue to exist.

Table 1.2. *Pillar 2: School Disaster Management*

Indicators **Pillar 2: School Disaster Management**	**Guinobatan**		**Camalig**		**Daraga**		**Average**		
	N=6		**N=5**		**N=8**				
	$\overline{x}$	**AI**	$\overline{x}$	**AI**	$\overline{x}$	**AI**	$\overline{x}$	**AI**	**Rank**
1. Establishing committees and full-time focal points to lead comprehensive school safety efforts	3.50	WI	3.80	WI	4.00	WI	**3.77**	**WI**	**1**
2. Identifying school-based risk reduction and resilience focal-points to be trained as leaders of school safety	3.16	I	3.80	WI	4.00	WI	**3.65**	**WI**	**3**
3. Providing policies and guidance for ongoing site-based multi-hazard assessment, risk reduction, and response preparedness	3.17	I	3.60	WI	3.88	WI	**3.55**	**WI**	**10**

4. Developing, training, institutionalizing, and monitoring and evaluating school committees	3.00	I	3.60	WI	3.62	WI	**3.41**	**WI**	**11**
5. Establishing contingency plans to support educational continuity	3.16	I	4.00	WI	3.62	WI	**3.59**	**WI**	**6.5**
6. Linking education and disaster management sectors, and public policies and plans at each level of social organization.	3.33	WI	3.60	WI	3.75	WI	**3.56**	**WI**	**8.5**
7. Adopting standard operating procedures as needed to hazard with and without warnings.	3.16	I	3.80	WI	3.88	WI	**3.61**	**WI**	**5**
8. Learning safety rules for specific hazards faced	3.33	WI	3.80	WI	3.75	WI	**3.63**	**WI**	**4**
9. Engaging schools in making early warning and early action systems meaningful and effective	3.33	WI	4.00	WI	3.88	WI	**3.74**	**WI**	**2**
10. Engaging schools in building social cohesion and peacebuilding	3.16	I	3.60	WI	4.00	WI	**3.59**	**WI**	**6.5**
11. Conducting regular school-wide and community-linked simulation drills to practice, critically evaluate, and improve response preparedness	3.33	WI	3.60	WI	3.75	WI	**3.56**	**WI**	**6.5**
AVERAGE	**3.24**	**I**	**3.75**	**WI**	**3.83**	**WI**	**3.61**	**WI**	

Pillar 3: Risk Reduction and Resilience Education Pillar 3: Risk Reduction and Resilience Education for public secondary schools in Guinobatan, Albay, with an average weighted mean of 3.29, 3.73 for public secondary schools in Camalig, Albay, and 3.90 in Daraga, Albay, were all well-integrated in their respective School Improvement Plans. Furthermore, conducting hazard mapping was well-integrated across all municipalities with an average weighted mean of 3.89.

On the other hand, developing scope and sequence to detail learning outcomes and competencies to integrate risk reduction and resilience into regular curriculum and infusing risk reduction throughout the curriculum and providing guidelines for integrating risk reduction and resilience into carrier subjects both with an average weighted mean of 3.45. Overall, the total weighted mean for Pillar 3 across the three municipalities is 3.64. This finding can be supported by the results of the study conducted by Kalogiannidis et al. (2022). The study specifically addressed the potential of using school systems as a tool for enhancing disaster risk reduction in underprivileged regions of Greece. Findings confirmed that incorporating disaster risk management content into the academic curriculum positively and significantly contributes to risk reduction. Educating students on civil protection concepts and embedding disaster risk topics into school instruction are considered essential strategies to improve national disaster resilience.

Table 1.3. *Pillar 3: Risk Reduction and Resilience Education*

Indicators **Pillar 3: Risk Reduction and Resilience Education**	**Guinobatan** **N=6**		**Camalig** **N=5**		**Daraga** **N=8**		**TOTAL WEIGHTED MEAN**		**Rank**
	$\overline{x}$	**AI**	$\overline{x}$	**AI**	$\overline{x}$	**AI**	$\overline{x}$	**AI**	
1. Creating public awareness campaigns	3.33	WI	3.80	WI	4.00	WI	**3.71**	**WI**	**5**
2. Engaging students and staff in real-life school and community disaster management activities	3.50	WI	4.00	WI	4.00	WI	**3.83**	**WI**	**2**
3. Developing school-based contingency plans	3.50	WI	3.80	WI	3.75	WI	**3.68**	**WI**	**6**
4. Implementing regular school drills for relevant hazards	3.50	WI	4.00	WI	3.75	WI	**3.75**	**WI**	**4**
5. Conducting hazard-mapping	3.67	WI	4.00	WI	4.00	WI	**3.89**	**WI**	**1**
6. Developing scope and sequence to detail learning outcomes and competencies to integrate risk reduction and resilience into regular curriculum	3.00	I	3.60	WI	3.75	WI	**3.45**	**WI**	**11.5**
7. Infusing risk reduction throughout the curriculum and providing guidelines for integrating risk reduction and resilience into carrier subjects	3.00	I	3.60	WI	3.75	WI	**3.45**	**WI**	**11.5**
8. Developing quality teaching and learning materials for students and teachers	2.84	I	3.60	WI	4.00	WI	**3.48**	**WI**	**10**
9. Identifying and disseminating key messages for safety and preparedness	3.67	WI	3.80	WI	4.00	WI	**3.82**	**WI**	**3**
10. Building community risk reduction capacity	3.16	I	3.60	WI	3.75	WI	**3.50**	**WI**	**9**
11. Providing pre-service and in-service training on risk-reduction curriculum materials and methods	3.17	I	3.60	WI	4.00	WI	**3.59**	**WI**	**7**
12. Developing strategies to encourage teachers to integrate topics into formal curriculum.	3.17	I	3.40	WI	4.00	WI	**3.52**	**WI**	**8**
AVERAGE	**3.29**	WI	**3.73**	WI	**3.90**	WI	**3.64**	**WI**	

Challenges and best practices of school heads in aligning their School Improvement Plans (SIPs) with the Comprehensive School Safety Framework. The Comprehensive School Safety Framework (CSSF) provides a strategic approach to achieve this goal through three key pillars: Safe Learning Facilities, School Disaster Management, and Risk Reduction and Resilience Education.

Challenges. The findings on the challenges encountered by the school heads in aligning School Improvement Plans in the standards of CSSF showed that public secondary schools in the Division of Albay find it challenging to meeting mandated safety regulations and standards due to either outdated infrastructure or limited resources with an average weighted mean of 3.51 while absence of clear procedure for reporting and addressing safety concerns at various levels within the school system was generally not encountered with a weighted mean of 2.21. Overall, the general weighted average for the challenges resulted to a total weighted average mean of 2.86 across all municipalities. These findings suggest a need for more comprehensive funding, resource allocation, and training in school safety and disaster preparedness across all three areas. Amri et al. (2022) discovered that the integration of Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) in schools and the adoption of DRR education remain paternalistic, with schools heavily reliant on local government initiatives. They concluded that these institutional gaps and delays hinder the advancement of DRR education and its integration into schools.

Table 2.1. *Challenges*

Indicators CHALLENGES	**Guinobatan**		**Camalig**		**Daraga**		**Average**		
	N=6		**N=5**		**N=8**				
	$\bar{x}$	**AI**	$\bar{x}$	**AI**	$\bar{x}$	**AI**	$\bar{x}$	**AI**	**Rank**
1. Insufficient funding, materials, and personnel make it difficult to allocate resources	3.50	SA	3.00	A	3.50	SA	**3.33**	**SA**	**2**
2. Limited access to training for staff on safety protocols and preparedness	3.66	SA	2.80	A	3.50	SA	**3.32**	**SA**	**3**
3. Meeting mandated safety regulations and standards due to either outdated infrastructure or limited resources	3.34	SA	3.20	A	4.00	SA	**3.51**	**SA**	**1**
4. Involving parents, community members, and local stakeholders consistently in safety planning and decision-making processes.	3.16	A	3.00	A	3.75	SA	**3.30**	**SA**	**4**
5. Inconsistent or limited collaboration with local disaster management authorities, emergency responders, and health services.	2.83	A	1.80	D	3.25	SA	**2.63**	**A**	**10**
6. Lack of a systematic process for	2.8	A	1.4	SD	3.2	SA	**2.4**	**D**	**13**

	monitoring, evaluating, and updating safety-related activities and protocols within the SIP.	3		0		5		**9**		
7.	Integrating the three pillars of the Comprehensive School Safety Framework	2.67	A	3.20	A	3.12	A	**3.00**	**A**	**7**
8.	Limited time to conduct regular safety activities, such as drills	2.83	A	1.60	SD	3.25	SA	**2.56**	**A**	**12**
9.	Lack of safe and resilient facilities that meet safety standards	2.83	A	2.20	D	3.25	SA	**2.76**	**A**	**9**
10.	Incorporating risk reduction and resilience education into an already full curriculum	2.51	A	3.20	A	3.50	SA	**3.07**	**A**	**5**
11.	Maintaining systematic documentation of safety policies, drills, incidents, and improvements as part of the SIP.	3.00	A	2.40	D	3.75	SA	**3.05**	**A**	**6**
12.	Resistance from staff or community members to new safety protocols or frameworks	2.50	A	1.20	SD	3.12	A	**2.27**	**D**	**14**
13.	Limited communication channels or ineffective communication strategies for disseminating safety information	2.66	A	1.80	D	3.25	SA	**2.57**	**A**	**11**
14.	Absence of a clear procedure for reporting and addressing safety concerns at various levels within the school system.	2.50	A	1.00	SD	3.12	A	**2.21**	**D**	**15**
15.	Tailoring the Comprehensive School Safety Framework's guidelines to specific local risks and community needs within the SIP.	2.83	A	2.40	D	3.25	SA	**2.83**	**A**	**8**
AVERAGE		**2.91**	**A**	**2.28**	**D**	**3.39**	**SA**	**2.86**	**A**	

Best Practices. Best practices are proven methods or strategies that consistently yield Across the three municipalities, public secondary schools strongly agreed that engaging teachers, students, parents, and the community in planning and keeping everyone informed about safety practices for safety with a weighted mean of 3.46. The lowest weighted mean in terms of best practice was setting aside funds, materials, and personnel for safety efforts in the SIP with a weighted mean of 3.15. Overall, the total weighted mean was 3.34 and strongly agreed upon by the school heads.

Cabilao-Valencia et al. (2019) explored the different initiatives for integrating Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) into the curriculum across educational institutions in the Philippines. Their findings highlighted key components such as an overview of DRR and the initiatives of Philippine schools to incorporate DRR into the curricula at both the basic and tertiary levels. The study also

revealed that the implementation of DRR in Philippine schools has been strengthened by the passage of international and national laws on DRR.

Table 2.2. *Best Practices*

Indicators **BEST PRACTICES**	**Guinobatan** **N=6**		**Camalig** **N=5**		**Daraga** **N=8**		**Average**		
	$\overline{x}$	**AI**	$\overline{x}$	**AI**	$\overline{x}$	**AI**	$\overline{x}$	**AI**	**Rank**
1. Including specific, measurable safety goals in the SIP aligned with safety standards.	3.33	SA	3.40	SA	3.25	SA	**3.33**	**SA**	**16**
2. Setting aside funds, materials, and personnel for safety efforts in the SIP.	3.00	A	3.20	A	3.25	SA	**3.15**	**A**	**18**
3. Engaging teachers, students, parents, and the community in planning for safety.	3.67	SA	3.20	A	3.50	SA	**3.46**	**SA**	**1.5**
4. Offering regular training for staff and students on safety protocols	3.16	A	2.80	A	3.25	SA	**3.07**	**A**	**19**
5. Scheduling regular safety drills and inspections to ensure preparedness.	3.33	SA	3.40	SA	3.25	SA	**3.33**	**SA**	**16**
6. Using a system to track and improve safety measures in the SIP.	3.00	A	2.80	A	3.25	SA	**3.02**	**A**	**20**
7. Working with local disaster and emergency services for school safety.	3.16	A	3.60	SA	3.25	SA	**3.34**	**SA**	**13**
8. Addressing safe facilities, disaster management, and safety education in the SIP.	3.33	SA	3.60	SA	3.25	SA	**3.39**	**SA**	**8**
9. Prioritizing repairs and upgrades to make buildings safer	3.50	SA	3.40	SA	3.25	SA	**3.38**	**SA**	**11**
10. Including safety and resilience education in the curriculum.	3.33	SA	3.40	SA	3.25	SA	**3.33**	**SA**	**16**
11. Keeping records of all safety policies, drills, and incidents.	3.33	SA	3.60	SA	3.25	SA	**3.39**	**SA**	**8**
12. Collaborating with local organizations to support safety.	3.50	SA	3.60	SA	3.25	SA	**3.45**	**SA**	**4**
13. Regularly identifying and addressing potential safety risks.	3.17	A	3.60	SA	3.25	SA	**3.34**	**SA**	**13**
14. Encouraging active participation in safety activities.	3.50	SA	3.60	SA	3.25	SA	**3.45**	**SA**	**4**
15. Tailoring safety plans to local risks and community needs.	3.17	A	3.60	SA	3.25	SA	**3.34**	**SA**	**13**
16. Keeping everyone informed about safety practices.	3.33	SA	3.80	SA	3.25	SA	**3.46**	**SA**	**1.5**

17. Using incident data to update safety measures.	3.50	SA	3.60	SA	3.25	SA	**3.45**	**SA**	**4**
18. Developing a clear process for reporting safety issues.	3.33	SA	3.60	SA	3.25	SA	**3.39**	**SA**	**8**
19. Building a culture of awareness and preparedness.	3.33	SA	3.60	SA	3.25	SA	**3.39**	**SA**	**8**
20. Gathering feedback on safety practices to keep improving.	3.33	SA	3.60	SA	3.25	SA	**3.39**	**SA**	**8**
AVERAGE	**3.32**	**SA**	**3.45**	**SA**	**3.26**	**SA**	**3.34**	**SA**	

Plans, Activities, or Programs outlined in the School Improvement Plans along the Key Components of School Disaster Management and Risk Reduction. School Improvement Plans (SIPs) has a component for resiliency and well-being as one of the pillars and it is expected to include activities, programs, and strategies that focus on disaster management and risk reduction. The integration of key components of school disaster management forms the backbone of a comprehensive approach to creating safe learning environments.

Hazard Mapping. The result highlights variations in the implementation of hazard mapping in public secondary schools across the three municipalities. In Camalig, school heads demonstrated the strongest commitment to disaster preparedness, excelling in training staff and students, displaying hazard maps, and updating risk assessments. School heads in Daraga performed moderately well but showed room for improvement in training teachers and orienting students on hazard maps. Guinobatan public secondary schools had the lowest overall rating, with a significant gap in training teachers and staff, which could hinder effective disaster response. These findings suggest that while progress has been made, further investment in capacity-building efforts, particularly in teacher training and student engagement, is essential for strengthening disaster risk management across schools. Overall, the general weighted average on the plans, programs, and activities in the SIPs of public secondary schools across 3 municipalities strongly agreed on promoting risk reduction measures, such as securing heavy objects and using fire resistant materials in classrooms where the weighted mean the total average weighted mean of 3.33. On the other hand, the indicator with the lowest weighted mean of 3.15 was reducing environmental hazards, such as managing waste preventing fire risks.

Table 3.1. *Hazard Mapping*

Indicators HAZARD MAPPING	**Guinobatan N=6**		**Camalig N=5**		**Daraga N=8**		**Total $\overline{x}$**	**AI**	**Rank**
	$\overline{x}$	**AI**	$\overline{x}$	**AI**	$\overline{x}$	**AI**			
1. comprehensive hazard assessment to identify potential risks such as earthquakes, floods, or fires.	3.33	SA	3.40	SA	3.12	A	**3.28**	**SA**	**3**

2. displaying hazard maps, evacuation routes and safe zones.	3.16	A	3.40	SA	3.38	SA	**3.31**	**SA**	**1**
3. updating and reflecting on any new risks or changes in the surrounding environment.	3.33	SA	3.20	A	3.25	SA	**3.26**	**SA**	**4**
4. training teachers and staff to interpret and use the hazard map during emergencies.	2.00	D	3.40	SA	3.00	A	**2.80**	**A**	**5**
5. orienting students with the hazard map and its importance during disaster drills.	3.50	SA	3.40	SA	3.00	A	**3.30**	**SA**	**2**
AVERAGE	**3.06**	**A**	**3.36**	**SA**	**3.15**	**A**	**3.19**	**A**	

These results concur with the study of Segarra et al. (2023) who evaluated the feasibility and potential benefits of merging information on schools, student socioeconomic status, and neighbourhood characteristics with geographical hazard data to develop a public health tool that visualizes student risk of exposure to natural hazards. The study demonstrated that improving administrative data is an important first step that is needed to be able to effectively use student information and geolocation technology for emergency planning.

Prevention and Mitigation. Public secondary schools in Guinobatan demonstrated a strong commitment to prevention and mitigation, achieving an overall rating of 3.26. The school improvement plans on implementing structural improvements, reducing environmental hazards, promoting risk reduction measures, with a weighted mean of 3.33. They agreed on collaborating with local authorities to reduce community level risks that could affect the school and adopting awareness programs regularly to educate students and staff on disaster prevention with the weighted mean of 3.16.Public secondary schools across 3 municipalities in the division of Albay strongly agreed that their School Improvement Plans have plans, activities, or programs along the key components of school disaster management and risk reduction in terms of prevention and mitigation particularly on reducing environmental hazards with a weighted mean of 3.44 as the highest and implementing structural improvements as the lowest with a weighted mean of 3.15.

Table 3.2. *Prevention and Mitigation*

Indicators PREVENTION AND MITIGATION	**Guinobatan N=6**		**Camalig N=5**		**Daraga N=8**		**Total** $\bar{x}$	**AI**	**Rank**
	$\bar{x}$	**AI**	$\bar{x}$	**AI**	$\bar{x}$	**AI**			
1. implementing structural improvements.	3.33	SA	3.00	A	3.12	A	**3.15**	**A**	**5**
2. reducing environmental hazards, such as managing waste and	3.33	SA	3.60	SA	3.38	SA	**3.44**	**SA**	**1**

preventing fire risks.									
3. promoting risk-reduction measures, such as securing heavy objects and using fire-resistant materials, in classrooms.	3.33	SA	3.40	SA	3.25	SA	**3.33**	**SA**	**2**
4. collaborating with local authorities to reduce community-level risks that could affect the school.	3.16	A	3.60	SA	3.00	A	**3.25**	**SA**	**3.5**
5. conducting awareness programs regularly to educate students and staff on disaster prevention.	3.16	A	3.60	SA	3.00	A	**3.25**	**SA**	**3.5**
AVERAGE	**3.26**	**SA**	**3.44**	**SA**	**3.15**	**A**	**3.28**	**SA**	

Effective disaster mitigation education in schools requires a strong initiative for self-initiated DRR programs, inclusive infrastructure modifications, diverse learning methods, and active child participation. School management awareness and strategic planning, along with extensive stakeholder involvement, are crucial for successful implementation. These elements collectively enhance the effectiveness of disaster mitigation education in schools. This was the findings of the study conducted by Rofian et al. (2021).

Preparedness. Generally, public secondary schools in the three municipalities of the division of Albay demonstrated a strong agreement on the indicator participating in regular disaster drills are integrated in the plans activities and programs outlined in their school improvement plans with a total average weighted mean of 3. 57. The highest indicator wasparticipating in regular disaster drills (e.g., fire, earthquake, or lockdown drills) to ensure they know how to act in an emergency with an average weighted mean of 3.57 while the lowest indicator was regular training on disaster response protocols and 1st aids with a total average weighted mean of 3.18. The results reflect a strong emphasis on preparedness in schools, with practices focused on training, drills, having response teams, and ensuring the availability of emergency resources. These efforts aim to create a disaster-ready environment, ensuring that all members of the school community are equipped to respond effectively and ensure the safety and well-being of all during emergencies. However, capacity building is less prioritized in their School Improvement Plans when considering disaster preparedness.

In the study of Widowati et al. (2023), there were 23 key indicators proposed including: commitment, policy and regulation, teamwork, SOPs, risk assessment, planning, budgeting, monitoring and evaluation, coordination, information system, curriculum integration, integration to learning act, technical guideline, resource mobilization, trained teachers, training program, dissemination of information, infrastructures, assembly points, safe zones, sister school, student cadres/agents, and safety competition. These 23 indicators, when included in the three pillars of the Comprehensive School Safety program, consist of nine out of 23 indicators (39%) included as the pillars of school disaster management, five indicators (22%) included as the pillars of safe school facilities, and nine other indicators (22%) included as the pillars of risk reduction education.

Table 3.3. *Preparedness.*

Indicators PREPAREDNESS	**Guinobatan N=6**		**Camalig N=5**		**Daraga N=8**		**Total** $\bar{x}$	**AI**	**Rank**
	$\bar{x}$	**AI**	$\bar{x}$	**AI**	$\bar{x}$	**AI**			
1. having a written disaster preparedness plan that is reviewed and updated annually.	3.33	SA	3.40	SA	3.25	SA	**3.33**	**SA**	**4**
2. undergoing regular training on disaster response protocols and first aid.	3.00	A	3.40	SA	3.13	A	**3.18**	**A**	**5**
3. participating in regular disaster drills (e.g., fire, earthquake, or lockdown drills) to ensure they know how to act in an emergency.	3.50	SA	3.60	SA	3.62	SA	**3.57**	**SA**	**1**
4. maintaining emergency supplies, such as first aid kits and flashlights, readily available and accessible in all school buildings.	3.33	SA	3.60	SA	3.12	A	**3.35**	**SA**	**3**
5. designating emergency response teams, including staff and students, who are trained to take leadership roles in crises.	3.50	SA	3.60	SA	3.25	SA	**3.45**	**SA**	**2**
AVERAGE	**3.33**	**SA**	**3.52**	**SA**	**3.27**	**SA**	**3.37**	**SA**	

Response. Along response component of disaster risk reduction and management, establishing clear communication systems is included in the School Improvement Plans of public secondary schools across three municipalities in the Division of Albay with a weighted average mean of 3.75. The highest weighted mean in this component was establishing clear communication systems to quickly inform students, staff, and parents during disaster with a weighted mean of 3.62 while having partnerships with local emergency responders was the lowest mean of 3.36 buts still strongly agreed upon by the respondents.

Table 3.4. *Response.*

Indicators RESPONSE	**Guinobatan N=6**		**Camalig N=5**		**Daraga N=8**		**Total** $\bar{x}$	**AI**	**Rank**
	$\bar{x}$	**AI**	$\bar{x}$	**AI**	$\bar{x}$	**AI**			
1. establishing clear communication systems to quickly inform students, staff, and parents during a disaster.	3.50	SA	3.60	SA	3.75	SA	**3.62**	**SA**	**1**

2. designating crisis management team prepared to take action immediately in the event of a disaster.	3.16	A	3.60	SA	3.75	SA	**3.50**	**SA**	**3**
3. ensuring that all staff are trained in basic emergency response skills, such as firefighting and first aid.	2.83	A	3.60	SA	3.75	SA	**3.39**	**SA**	**4**
4. conducting emergency evacuation drills regularly to ensure that all students and staff can evacuate safely and swiftly.	3.33	SA	3.60	SA	3.75	SA	**3.56**	**SA**	**2**
5. having partnerships with local emergency responders to ensure swift and coordinated action during a disaster.	3.17	A	3.40	SA	3.50	SA	**3.36**	**SA**	**5**
AVERAGE	**3.20**	**A**	**3.56**	**SA**	**3.70**	**SA**	**3.49**	**SA**	

Wang, Han, & Li (20223) investigated the mediating role of disaster education between school preparedness and student preparedness. The results reveal that both school preparedness and disaster education are positively correlated with higher levels of student preparedness. These findings underscore the paramount importance of seamlessly integrating effective school preparedness and disaster education initiatives, equipping students to confidently navigate potential disasters and emergencies.

Rehabilitation and Recovery. Generally, the weighted mean for all indicators for rehabilitation and recovery across public secondary schools in the three municipalities, the highest weighted mean of 3.64 on ensuring that academic activities are resumed quickly after a disaster with minimal disruption while having a recovery plan that includes psychological support services for those affected by disasters had the lowest weighted mean of 3.45.Schools in Guinobatan, Camalig, and Daraga, Albay have integrated disaster recovery and rehabilitation plans into their School Improvement Plans (SIPs). These results highlight that disaster management is a clear priority in school planning across the three municipalities.

Table 3.5. *Rehabilitation and Recovery*

Indicators REHABILITATION AND RECOVERY	**Guinobatan N=6**		**Camalig N=5**		**Daraga N=8**		**Total** $\bar{x}$	**AI**	**Rank**
	$\bar{x}$	**AI**	$\bar{x}$	**AI**	$\bar{x}$	**AI**			
1. having a recovery plan that includes psychological support services for students and staff	3.33	SA	3.40	SA	3.62	SA	**3.45**	**SA**	**5**

affected by disasters.									
2. conducting post-disaster assessments to evaluate the damage and develop a rebuilding or restoration strategy.	3.33	SA	3.60	SA	3.62	SA	**3.52**	**SA**	**3**
3. ensuring that academic activities are resumed quickly after a disaster with minimal disruption.	3.50	SA	3.80	SA	3.62	SA	**3.64**	**SA**	**1**
4. allocating financial resources and support to ensure the school can recover from disaster-related damage.	3.50	SA	3.60	SA	3.62	SA	**3.57**	**SA**	**2**
5. having clear protocols in place for the reintegration of students and staff after a disaster, including addressing trauma and emotional well-being.	3.50	SA	3.4	SA	3.62	SA	**3.51**	**SA**	**4**
AVERAGE	**3.43**	**SA**	**3.56**	**SA**	**3.62**	**SA**	**3.54**	**SA**	

UNESCO (2021) highlights the critical role of schools in fostering resilience and reducing vulnerability to disasters through educational preparedness. The report stresses that integrating disaster risk reduction (DRR) into the curriculum, as well as school management plans, empowers students with life-saving knowledge and skills. This connection between education and disaster preparedness ensures not only physical safety but also emotional and psychosocial well-being, contributing to long-term educational stability.

An Action Plan on the Challenges Identified Along the Three Pillars of the Comprehensive School Safety Framework. The Action Plan on the Challenges Identified along the Three Pillars of the Comprehensive School Safety Framework (CSSF) aims to empower public secondary schools in Guinobatan, Camalig, and Daraga, Albay to create safer, more resilient, and disaster-prepared learning environments. Rooted in the CSSF 2022–2030, which promotes a multi-hazard and child-centered approach, this action plan responds to the urgent need to align school operations and planning with the principles of disaster risk reduction and resilience. It is especially critical in a province like Albay, one of the most disaster-prone areas in the Philippines, where schools not only serve educational purposes but also act as evacuation centers during emergencies.

The primary objective of this plan is to guide school heads in integrating the CSSF into their School Improvement Plans (SIPs), focusing on the development of Pillar 4: Resiliency and Well-Being. It outlines a systematic approach that includes organizing a School Safety Team (SST), conducting relevant training and workshops, formulating a school safety action plan aligned with the three CSSF pillars (Safe School Facilities, School Disaster Management, and Risk Reduction and

Resilience Education), and embedding disaster preparedness into all aspects of school planning. It also targets the establishment of partnerships with local emergency responders, the development of monitoring systems, and the provision of psychosocial recovery support post-disaster.

The action plan consists of several key parts: (1) Introduction and Background, (2) Objectives, (3) Detailed Activities across the CSSF pillars, (4) Monitoring and Evaluation Matrix, (5) Sustainability Measures, (6) Communication and Outreach Strategies, and (7) Approval and Authorization. This document will be used primarily by school heads, SIP planning teams, SDRRM coordinators, and stakeholders from the LGUs, BFP, Red Cross, and local emergency responders. Its goal is not only compliance but transformation: turning schools into models of disaster resilience, community safety, and learner well-being.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions were formulated based on the findings of the study.

1. Public secondary schools in Guinobatan, Camalig, and Daraga have highly integrated the Comprehensive School Safety Framework (CSSF) into their School Improvement Plans (SIPs). School heads emphasized creating and maintaining safe and conducive physical environments and prioritizing disaster preparedness and resilience education within their plans. However, construction of facilities is a major challenge among the school heads. Resiliency Theory highlights the importance of protective factors that help schools and students withstand risks.
2. School heads face challenges in aligning their SIPs with the CSSF, particularly regarding funding, access to training opportunities, limited resources for safety regulations and standards, and planning and decision-making with stakeholders. The best practices employed by school heads to align SIPs with the CSSF are characterized by collaboration with outside organizations, encouraging active participation, informing everyone about safety practices, and using incident data for safety measures. This means that school heads are actively adopting best practices to integrate safety measures into their SIPs, emphasizing collaboration, communication, and continuous learning. These practices reflect a commitment to creating an inclusive and transparent approach to school safety, ensuring all stakeholders understand their roles and responsibilities in maintaining a secure environment.
3. School heads had plans, programs, and activities with an adjectival interpretation of "agree" along hazard mapping, prevention and mitigation, preparedness, response, and rehabilitation and recovery. This means that these disaster risk reduction and management components are at a high level of alignment with the school improvement plans of the public secondary schools in Guinobatan and Camalig, Albay. From the perspective of educational change theory, which emphasizes the transformation process in educational systems, incorporating these disaster risk reduction and management components into SIPs signifies a shift toward a culture of safety and preparedness. This change is driven by a need to adapt to emerging challenges like climate change and disaster risks. It reflects a systematic effort to institutionalize safety and resiliency as core elements of educational planning.
4. Based on the findings, the researcher proposed an action plan that addresses the challenges encountered by school heads in integrating the Comprehensive School Safety Framework (CSSF) into public secondary schools' School Improvement Plans (SIPs) and adhering with

the requirements of the School Disaster Risk Reduction and Management. These challenges are identified through the conducted survey where indicators with the lowest weighted mean are taken into consideration for potential solutions.

6.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the data gathered and conclusions, the researcher recommends the following:

1. The Department of Education may prioritize the construction and renovation of classroom facilities in alignment with current national safety standards and hazard-resilient design principles. This includes allocating sufficient funds for structural retrofitting, expanding classroom space to reduce overcrowding, and incorporating accessibility features for learners with disabilities. DepEd may collaboration with local government units (LGUs), the Department of Public Works and Highways (DPWH), and the DepEd Planning Office for technical assessments, engineering plans, and infrastructure permits. Schools should be proactive in identifying critical areas needing construction support and must include infrastructure upgrades as key components in their School Improvement Plans (SIPs).
2. The Department of Education may develop comprehensive training programs for school personnel and institutionalizing monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems are crucial for sustaining improvements in disaster risk reduction and management. Trainings may cover disaster preparedness, safety drills, hazard mapping, first aid, and psychosocial support, and must be conducted regularly to ensure knowledge retention and skills reinforcement. M&E systems must be established at the school level, with clear indicators, tools, and schedules to track progress, assess impact, and make data-driven decisions. It is further recommended that schools form M&E committees and capacitate them through workshops and mentoring to promote long-term resilience, accountability, and continuous improvement.
3. The Department of Education may ensure the continued improvement and maintenance of physical infrastructure while cultivating a supportive environment. Local and national education authorities should consider allocating more resources and providing technical support for schools to implement climate-smart interventions and adapt water and sanitation facilities to potential risks. Schools may also prioritize leadership development and stakeholder engagement to ensure continuous integration of disaster management strategies into SIPs and further build on successful initiatives such as establishing safety committees and early warning systems.
4. DepEd may foster partnerships with local businesses, non-governmental organizations, and governments to acquire financial and technical support for CSSF implementation. Schools can also investigate innovative funding models such as crowdfunding for safety and infrastructure projects. Schools may continue implementing best practices such as regular safety drills, transparent communication of safety measures to stakeholders, and data-driven decision-making.
5. DepEd may continually update hazard maps to address emerging threats, involving students in hazard identification and ensuring accessibility and understanding within the school community. Building a culture of prevention through awareness programs, collaboration with local authorities and integrating disaster mitigation into community-wide strategies is essential. Disaster preparedness should be prioritized through regular drills, year-round disaster teams, and participation in disaster networks to adopt standardized protocols.

Effective crisis communication systems are critical for real-time coordination, requiring policymakers to equip schools with the necessary technology and resources. Lastly, schools should formalize recovery plans focusing on mental health support, ensuring a smooth reintegration for students and staff. At the same time, governments provide financial and technical aid for rapid restoration and emotional well-being.

6. To align disaster risk reduction and management while complying with the standards set by the Comprehensive School Safety Framework, school heads my adopt the proposed action plan developed by the researcher to address the challenges along the three pillars of the Comprehensive School Safety Framework. secondary schools of Guinobatan, Camalig, and Daraga, Albay.

REFERENCES

Agra, R. M. (2023). Implementation of School Improvement Plan (SIP) on the School Performance: Basis for Enhancement Program. International Journal of Research Publications, 124(1), 1264-1274. https://doi.org/10.47119/IJRP1001241520234953

Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 50(2), 179-211. https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T

Amri, A., Lassa, J. A., Tebe, Y., Hanifa, N. R., Kumar, J., & Sagala, S. (2022). Pathways to disaster risk reduction education integration in schools: Insights from SPAB evaluation in Indonesia. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction, 73*, 102860. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2022.102860

Cabilao-Valencia, M. I., Ali, M., Maryani, E., & Supriatna, N. (2019). Integration of disaster risk reduction in the curriculum of Philippine educational institution. In *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research* (Vol. 253, 3rd Asian Education Symposium). Atlantis Press. https://doi.org/10.2991/aes-18.2019.1

Cels, J., Rossetto, T., Little, A. W., & Dias, P. (2023). Tsunami preparedness within Sri Lanka's education system. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction, 84*, 103473. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2022.103473

Covaciu, A.-I. (2021). School-based disaster preparedness: A route to societal resilience? The case study of Ljungby municipality, Sweden

Cresencio, M., & Yabut, E. (2023). Implementation of school disaster risk reduction in coastal schools: Basis for a plan of action. *Journal of Education and e-Learning Research, 10*(2), 270-277. https://doi.org/10.20448/jeelr.v10i2.4592

Fullan, M. (2006). Change theory: A force for school improvement. Centre for Strategic Education Seminar Series Paper No. 157.

Global Alliance for Disaster Risk Reduction & Resilience in the Education Sector (GADRRRES). (2022). *Comprehensive school safety framework 2022-2030 for child rights and resilience in the education sector*. gadrrres.net. https://gadrrres.net

Grmuša, A., & Hong, J. S. (2024). Preventing and reducing bullying victimization in high schools: Which works better? Physical or psychological safety measures. *Australian Psychologists and Counsellors in Schools, 34*(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/20556365241236607

Iqbal, S., & Nauman, S. (2024). Assessment of School Teacher's Disaster Preparedness by Using Comprehensive School Safety Framework. Qlantic Journal of Social Sciences, 5(1), 64-70. https://doi.org/10.55737/qjss.379718229

Kalogiannidis, S., Toska, E., Chatzitheodoridis, F., & Kalfas, D. (2025). Using school systems as a hub for risk and disaster management: A case study of Greece. *Risks, 10*(5), 89. https://doi.org/10.3390/risks10050089

Kawasaki, H., Yamasaki, S., Rahman, M. M., Murata, Y., Iwasa, M., & Teramoto, C. (2020). Teachers-parents cooperation in disaster preparation when schools become evacuation centers. International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction, 44, 101445. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2019.101445

Mamon, M. A. C. (2019). Implementation and practices of the comprehensive school safety framework: Views of senior high school students. International Journal of Educational Researchers, 10(3), 49–60.

Masten, A. S. (2001). *Ordinary magic: Resilience processes in development*. American Psychologist, 56(3), 227–238. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.56.3.227

Paci-Green, R., Varchetta, A., McFarlane, K., Iyer, P., & Goyeneche, M. (2020). Comprehensive school safety policy: A global baseline survey. International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction, 44, 101399. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2019.101399

Petal, M., Ronan, K., Ovington, G., & Tofa, M. (2020). Child-centred risk reduction and school safety: An evidence-based practice framework and roadmap. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction, 49*, 101633. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2020.101633

Pooley, K., Nunez, S., & Whybro, M. (2021). Evidence-based practices of effective fire safety education programming for children. *The Australian Journal of Emergency Management, 36*(2), 34-41.

Republic Act No. 10121. (2010). An Act strengthening the Philippine disaster risk reduction and management system, providing for the national disaster risk reduction and management framework and institutionalizing the national disaster risk reduction and management plan, appropriating funds therefor, and for other purposes. Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines. https://lawphil.net/statutes/repacts/ra2010/ra_10121_2010.html

Republic Act No. 10821. (2016). *An Act providing for the protection of children in situations of armed conflict and appropriating funds therefor*. https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/2016/05/18/republic-act-no-10821/

Republic Act No. 9729. (2009). An Act mainstreaming climate change into government policy formulations, establishing the framework strategy and program on climate change, creating for this purpose the Climate Change Commission, and for other purposes. Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines. https://lawphil.net/statutes/repacts/ra2009/ra_9729_2009.html

Ribeiro, F. L., Candeias, P. X., Correia, A. A., Carvalho, A. R., & Campos Costa, A. (2022). Risk and resilience assessment of Lisbon's school buildings based on seismic scenarios. *Applied Sciences, 12*(17), 8570. https://doi.org/10.3390/app12178570

Rofiah, N. H., Kawai, N., & Hayati, E. N. (2021). Key elements of disaster mitigation education in inclusive school settings in the Indonesian context. Jàmbá: Journal of Disaster Risk Studies, 13(1), 1159. https://doi.org/10.4102/jamba.v13i1.1159

Segarra, A., Rivera, M., & Ramos, M. (2023). Mapping Puerto Rican student vulnerability and risk to improve school emergency planning. Natural Hazards Center.

Stilwell, S. M., Heinze, J. E., Hsieh, H. F., Torres, E., Grodzinski, A., & Zimmerman, M. (2024). Positive youth development approach to school safety: A comprehensive conceptual framework. Journal of School Health. https://doi.org/10.1111/josh.13485

Syahputri, D. M., Aris, Y., Hafida, S. H. N., Widiyatmoko, W., Anwar, Y., & Dewi, R. P. (2022). Implementation of comprehensive school safety: the risk reduction and resilience education pillar in State Senior High School 1 of Pacitan and Islamic State Senior High School 1 of Pacitan, Indonesia. IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science, 986(1), 012016. https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/986/1/012016

Tabilon-Tizon, R., & Comighud, S. M. T. (2019). Implementation of the Public Schools' Disaster Risk Reduction Management Program and Level of Capabilities to Respond. Education Program Supervisor, Department of Education – Bayawan City Division.

Tizon, Roselene Tabilon and Comighud, Sheena Mae Trestiza, "Implementation of the Public Schools' Disaster Risk Reduction Management Program and Level of Capabilities to Respond" (2020). UBT International Conference. 1. https://knowledgecenter.ubt-uni.net/conference/2020/ed/1

Tong, T. M. T., Sakurai, A., Shaw, R., Nguyen, N. H., Nguyen, T. H., Do, K. T., & Kieu, T. K. (2024). Assessment of comprehensive school safety in Vietnam: From policy to practice. Progress in Disaster Science, 24, 100364. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pdisas.2024.100364

UNESCO. (2021). Strengthening disaster preparedness and response in schools: Building resilience through education systems. Retrieved from https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000379112.

United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNDRR). (2020). Comprehensive school safety: A global framework in support of the worldwide initiative for safe schools. Retrieved from https://www.undrr.org/publication/comprehensive-school-safety-global-framework.

Varchetta, A. (2019). Evaluating comprehensive school safety through a global baseline survey of disaster risk reduction policies in the education sector. WWU graduate school collection. Retrieved from https://cedar.wwuGubalane,.edu/wwuet/878

Wang, Z., Han, Z., & Li, Y. (2023). The interplay between school preparedness and student's individual protective actions: The mediating role of disaster education. *Sustainability, 15*(20), 14888. https://doi.org/10.3390/su152014888

Widowati, E., Koesyanto, H., & Sugiharto. (2023). Disaster Preparedness and Safety School as a Conceptual Framework of Comprehensive School Safety. SAGE Open, 13(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440231211209

