

ASSESSMENT of the Capability of Stakeholders and Implementation of Disaster Risk Reduction and Management among Public Schools: Basis For An Action PLAN

Johannes T. Latras ¹, Mona L. Laya, PhD²

¹Teacher, DepEd Davao Oriental Regional Science High School
johannes.latras@deped.gov.ph

²Graduate School Department, University of the Immaculate Conception, Davao City, Philippines
mlaya@uic.edu.ph

ABSTRACT

This study determined the level of capability of stakeholders and implementation of the Disaster Risk Reduction and Management (DRRM) programs in public schools. It employed a quantitative research design using the descriptive-comparative method. Adopted, validated, and reliability-tested questionnaires were used to collect the data. The respondents were the school heads and school DRRM coordinators chosen through complete enumeration, while teachers, parents, and secondary students were chosen using stratified quota sampling in the five pre-selected schools. The Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), standard deviation, and mean were used in the analysis of the data. The overall results showed that the level of capability of stakeholders and implementation of school DRRM programs were moderate, which implied that there is still room for improvement. Results also showed that school heads and school DRRM coordinators significantly differ in implementing school DRRM programs regarding disaster prevention and mitigation, disaster preparedness, disaster response, and disaster rehabilitation and recovery. It is also stated in the results that when schools are grouped according to stakeholders, there is a significant difference in terms of material facilities, knowledge, innovation education, and capacities and mechanisms, while no significant differences were found in terms of human resources and policies, plans, and procedures. An action plan was established based on the findings of the study.

KEYWORDS: *Education, school disaster, implementation, stakeholders, mitigation, recovery, response, rehabilitation, school heads*

INTRODUCTION

Schools, as vital components of any community, serve as centers for knowledge acquisition, skill development, and values instillation. According to the study of Seidler et al. (2018), disaster risk mitigation is now considered a crucial aspect of sustainable development programs. Therefore, given their pivotal role, educational institutions must develop and implement an extensive Disaster Risk Reduction Management (DRRM) plan. Usman, (2017) emphasized that the plan should include a detailed assessment of potential hazards that could affect the school, such as natural disasters like earthquakes, floods, or storms, and measures should be taken to reduce their impact.

Schools worldwide are gradually recognizing the importance of disaster planning and management, and as of today, many are incorporating it into their curricula. A case study conducted in the Lao PDR aimed to examine the National Strategy Plan for Disaster Risk Management and how it was included in the curriculum. The study revealed that 80 percent of the students could competently respond to a fire reaction test, indicating that they were trained to evacuate in case of a fire, report flames to teachers, and assemble at designated locations. Furthermore, teachers have become better equipped to implement disaster risk reduction management after the disaster in Palu, Central Sulawesi, Indonesia. This has helped them and improve their learning about disaster risk reduction and effectively incorporate it into their lessons (Kanyasan et al., 2018).

To withstand the dangers brought by disaster, the Philippine government has been increasing its ability by employing disaster risk management in its operations and procedures. A study by Guiamel and Lee (2020) emphasized that educational institutions have a crucial role in terms of mitigating and managing disaster risks in the Philippines. Since the country is geographically vulnerable to natural hazards like floods, earthquakes, and tropical cyclones, they strongly underscored that a community framework implementing a disaster-resilient school is a very effective strategy in community development. In the study of Catanus (2018), he emphasized that since the schools in the Philippines are commonly impacted by hazards that sometimes results in extreme damage to the infrastructure, an evaluation of the recent policies related to disaster must be done.

DRRM in education is seen by Torani et al. (2019) as an efficient,

realistic, and reasonably valued method of controlling the hazards connected with disasters. As part of this approach, people and communities will be educated about potential hazards and how to reduce them. Furthermore, it was highlighted by Amri et al. (2017) that the goal of school-based disaster preparedness is to foster a culture of safety and readiness among school communities. The goal is to provide parents, teachers, and students with the information and abilities they need to handle emergencies competently. Education about disaster risk reduction can help create a safer and more secure future for everyone by enhancing the resilience of school communities.

A study by Sarker et al. (2020) stated that the school DRRM plans will be carried out efficiently if the stakeholders acquire essential skills and information. They added that this is an important element to guarantee the safety and resilience of the whole school community during a disaster. A recent study by Morcilla (2023) concluded that the effectiveness of the school's disaster recovery and mitigation program relies heavily on the involvement of external stakeholders such as parents and students. Parents have a vital role to play in disaster preparedness by assisting their children in developing plans for individual and family disasters and addressing any concerns they may have. It was also emphasized in the study of Cubillas (2016) that the identification of the needs of the stakeholders in schools after disasters is required for them to be properly addressed. Otherwise, the school will likely recover late, and more problems will likely arise. Without stakeholders' help, the SDRRM program's implementation would not have been possible. Because they bring a variety of viewpoints and levels of experience to the table, stakeholders are essential to the risk assessment process (Molarius et al., 2018).

In school DRRM, disaster prevention and mitigation are critical, according to Seidler et al. (2018), particularly in South Asia, where risks from natural disasters and climate change are growing. When disaster risk reduction management (DRRM) techniques are combined with climate change adaption tactics, schools can make a big difference in disaster preparedness and prevention. To create an integrated school disaster plan that works, Fale (2022) stressed how important it is to comprehend how resilient secondary school teachers are to disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation. Schools can better safeguard their staff and teachers against future calamities by preparing teachers ahead of time.

Multiple stakeholders must work together to ensure that schools are

adequately prepared for disasters (Parkash, 2015). Comprehensive disaster preparation plans, efficient training programs, and coordinated emergency response operations can be created by combining the resources and expertise of school administrators, teachers, students, parents, local government officials, and community organizations. Schools rely heavily on the safety and well-being of both teachers and students. According to Fuentes (2023), in order to put teachers and students' safety first during a crisis, effective disaster risk reduction and management (DRRM) measures must be put into place.

Habibi and Panjaitan (2022) emphasized the need for human resources in the successful implementation of disaster risk reduction and management plans in schools. According to Chondekar (2018), educators play a critical role in disaster preparedness, and as human resources, their expertise needs to be periodically evaluated in lesson design. It is also worth noting that schools must have risk-free non-structural and structural features, and all facilities must be open to everyone (Napoli et al., 2019). They also emphasized that a few of the most important duties of schools are choosing safe school sites, making sure that disaster-resilient design and construction are followed to guarantee that every new school is a safe school.

Burnette et al. (2019) have pointed out that schools must be prepared for crises that may arise throughout the school day. It was suggested that educational establishments consider the risks that their students encounter and respond quickly to resolve the situation. By putting emergency preparedness procedures in place and educate students about potential hazards, schools can lower the amount of mishaps, fatalities, and property damage. Moreover, the study by Daimon et al. (2022) highlights the need to bridge the knowledge gap on DRR between teachers and students. It is essential to keep students' knowledge of DRR at a steady state in schools. Furthermore, because everyone is vulnerable to disaster based on their exposure and capacities, everyone has accountability and responsibility for disaster resilience.

DRRM programs have been implemented in the 72 public schools of the Schools Division of the City of Mati. However, the level of capability of the stakeholders to execute DRRM programs in schools throughout the public schools was not evaluated in any of the studies that the researcher came across with. Furthermore, there were no action plan-based techniques accessible to show how effective the several activities and initiatives listed in DepEd Order No. 21, s. in 2015. This order outlines the responsibilities and roles of school

administrators and school DRRM Coordinators to ensure that DRRM is efficiently implemented in schools. The researcher was motivated to conduct this study considering the difficulties and problems that commonly happen after every disaster, which demands cautious assessment. Assessing and evaluating the DRRM implementation among all public schools in the City of Mati is beneficial in increasing knowledge regarding disaster management strategies.

The study was anchored on Amartya Sen's Theory of Capability Approach (1980). The Capability Approach, coined by Amartya Sen, is a crucial concept in comprehending the effective collaboration of stakeholders in School DRRM. By applying the Capability Approach to School DRRM stakeholders, a comprehensive framework can be established to evaluate and improve the disaster resilience of educational institutions. When we examine how disaster risk reduction and management (DRRM) intersects with broader urban development processes, we see that schools have a crucial role in building resilience and promoting a culture of preparedness among students, staff, and the wider community. Using Sen's capability approach, we can evaluate how effective current DRRM strategies are and identify areas for improvement. Schools can increase their ability to mitigate risks and respond to disasters more proactively and inclusively by promoting a holistic understanding of stakeholders' capabilities and freedoms. In conclusion, utilizing Amartya Sen's capability approach among School DRRM stakeholders is valuable for promoting resilience, inclusivity, and empowerment within educational settings. By acknowledging and leveraging the diverse capabilities of all stakeholders, schools can enhance their disaster preparedness efforts and contribute to their communities' overall safety and well-being. By adopting collaborative and participatory approaches guided by Sen's capability approach, schools can help build a more sustainable and resilient future for everyone.

METHODS

Research Design

This study employed a quantitative approach, specifically a descriptive-comparative design. According to Creswell (2013), quantitative research emphasizes objective measurements and statistical, mathematical, or numerical data analysis. This data can be collected through polls, questionnaires, surveys, or by manipulating preexisting statistical data using computational techniques. The focus is gathering numerical data and extending it across groups or explaining a specific phenomenon. A descriptive-comparative research design is intended to describe the differences among groups in a population without

manipulating the independent variable (Cantrell, 2011). The descriptive approach was used to determine the extent of implementing Disaster Risk Reduction and Management in public schools of the Schools Division of the City of Mati regarding Disaster Prevention and Mitigation, Disaster Preparedness, Disaster Response, and Disaster Rehabilitation and Recovery. Additionally, a comparative design was utilized in this study to enable the researcher to look at the variations and parallels among the various variables (Kumar, 2018). It was used to compare the capability of the stakeholders when grouped according to their role as School Head, Faculty, Parents, and Junior High School Students in implementing the DRRM in terms of Human Resources, Material Facilities, Knowledge, Innovation and Education, Policies, Plans, and Procedures and Capacities and Mechanisms.

Respondents

The respondents of the study were the 72 School Heads and 72 School DRRM Coordinators from the four districts of the Schools Division of the City of Mati who had worked for the Department of Education or in the assigned school for at least three years. Another set of participants was chosen from three different categories by the researcher using a stratified quota sampling methodology: parents, students, and faculty members. Five predetermined schools were selected for each group, of which twenty people were selected. Individuals under the age of eighteen participated in the "students" category. All participants, regardless of group, were able to meet the inclusion requirements, which include having a sufficient understanding of school disaster risk reduction and having been linked with their particular schools for more than one year. Since participation in this study is voluntary, respondents, particularly student learners who submitted their Informed Consent Form (ICF) signed by their parents, were chosen to participate in this study.

Statistical Tools

The collected data were treated using descriptive and comparative statistical tools, among others, frequency, mean, standard deviation, t-test, and the analysis of variance (ANOVA). Frequency was used to measure the distribution of stakeholders in the study. Mean was used to measure the status of implementation of school DRRM programs and the level of capability of stakeholders to implement it. Standard deviation was used to determine how spread out or how close the stakeholder's capability in implementing DRRM programs is from their mean. A t-test was used to determine the significant difference in the status of schools implementing DRRM programs when grouped

according to the school heads and school DRRM coordinators. ANOVA was used to determine the significant difference of the schools' capability level in implementing school DRRM programs when grouped according to stakeholders.

RESULTS

Distribution of stakeholders in the study

Table 1

Distribution of stakeholders in the study

Profile	Frequency	Percentage
School Head	61	14.1
School DRRM Coordinators	72	16.6
Faculty	100	23.1
Secondary Students	100	23.1
Parents	100	23.1

Shown in Table 1 is the distribution of the stakeholders involved in the study. It provides a breakdown of all the stakeholders involved. The study included a total of 433 respondents, consisting of 61 school heads, with only 61 meeting the pre-defined criteria for inclusion. The remaining 11 schools had recently appointed new school heads. Additionally, there were 72 school DRRM coordinators, 100 teachers, 100 parents, and 100 secondary students from five different schools. To ensure consistency, each school had 20 respondents for teachers, parents, and secondary students. The respondents from the five predetermined schools were selected using stratified quota sampling.

Revealed in the analysis that school heads had a 14.1 distribution percentage, school DRRM coordinators had 16.6, and the remaining three stakeholders had an equal percentage of 23.1 each.

Status of Implementation of the School DRRM Programs as assessed by the School Heads and School DRRM Coordinators

Table 2

Status of the Implementation of the School DRRM Programs as assessed by the School Heads and School DRRM Coordinators

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
Disaster Prevention and Mitigation	3.05	0.50	Moderate
Disaster Preparedness	2.99	0.59	Moderate
Disaster Response	2.91	0.53	Moderate
Disaster Rehabilitation and Recovery	2.86	0.60	Moderate
Overall Mean	2.96	0.38	Moderate

Table 2 presents the status of implementing school DRRM programs as assessed by the school heads and school DRRM coordinators. Four indicators of DRRM programs, including disaster prevention and mitigation, disaster preparedness, disaster response, and disaster rehabilitation and recovery, are presented with the corresponding mean and standard deviation. Results show that the overall mean is 2.96, which is described as moderate, indicating that the status of the implementation of school DRRM programs is sometimes evident. The overall standard deviation is at 0.38, which shows that the respondents have ratings that are practically almost the same, indicating the same consistency in the responses.

The indicator with the highest mean is prevention and mitigation. Its means ranged from 2.39 to 3.81. The category mean is 3.05, described as moderate, which means that the DRRM programs under disaster prevention and mitigation are sometimes evident. It shows that considerable developments have been made to enhance the disaster resilience of school infrastructure. Such findings concur with the study of Cruz (2022), who suggested that public schools should establish systems for suitable risk reduction protection measures by keeping an eye on the maintenance of structural safety in building regulations and school infrastructures. Meanwhile the indicator with the lowest mean is rehabilitation and recovery. The means of this indicator ranged from 2.68 to 3.03. The category mean is 2.86, described as moderate, which means that DRRM programs under rehabilitation and recovery are sometimes evident. It reveals extensive shortcomings in the mental health care provided to victims of

disasters. The findings align with the study of Umeda et al. (2020), who emphasized that the recovery and rehabilitation of disaster victims, especially in the educational environment, greatly depend on psychological assistance.

Level of Capability of Public Schools in Implementing DRRM Programs

Table 3

Level of Capability of Public Schools in Implementing DRRM Programs

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
Human Resources	3.31	0.67	Moderate
Material Facilities	3.31	0.70	Moderate
Knowledge, Innovation, and Education	3.30	0.77	Moderate
Policies, Plans, and Procedures	3.29	0.68	Moderate
Capacities and Mechanisms	3.30	0.72	Moderate
Overall Mean	3.30	0.71	Moderate

Table 3 presents the level of capability of public schools in implementing DRRM programs. Five indicators, with the corresponding mean and standard deviation, are depicted in the table. These indicators include human resources, material facilities, knowledge, innovation and education, policies, plans and procedures, and capacities and mechanisms. Results show that the overall mean is 3.30, which is described as moderate, indicating that the level of capability of public schools is sometimes demonstrated. This signifies that schools have made efforts and allocated resources towards disaster risk reduction and management. However, there is still room for improvement in the impact and effectiveness of these efforts. Furthermore, the standard deviation of the ratings is 0.71, which indicates that the respondents' ratings are almost the same, implying a high level of consistency in their responses.

The indicators with the highest mean are human resources and material facilities. The means of the human resources indicator ranged from 2.68 to 3.58. The category mean is 3.31, described as moderate, which means that public schools sometimes demonstrate their capability to implement DRRM programs regarding human resources. It shows that the school community has an organized system to enable and coordinate disaster risk reduction and management operations. The results are also consistent with the study of Rico (2022), who concluded that an organized school disaster risk management team

is a definite indication that the several significant organizations in charge of disaster preparedness in the area are actively involved in collaborative efforts. Another indicator that got the highest mean is material facilities, with a mean ranging from 3.16 to 3.43. The category mean is 3.31, which means that the level of capability of public schools in implementing DRRM programs is sometimes demonstrated. This shows that although early warning systems are in place, there is room for improvement in coverage and efficacy. The results share the same goal with the study of Huq et al. (2021), who pointed out that installing an early warning system is essential for efficiently responding to and lessening the effects of school disasters. Meanwhile, the indicator with the lowest mean is Policies, Plans and Procedures. The means ranged from 3.23 to 3.39. The category mean is 3.29 described as moderate, which means that public schools sometimes demonstrate their capability to implement DRRM programs regarding policies, plans, and procedures. It shows that the school's operations and curriculum align with sustainable practices to mitigate the impact of climate-related issues and natural disasters. The findings are consistent with the study of El-Halwagi et al. (2020), who emphasized that integrating sustainable practices into the curriculum might enable educational institutions to prepare students better to confront and comprehend critical concerns like climate change and disasters.

Significance of the difference in the status of schools in implementing DRRM programs when grouped according to the school heads and school DRRM coordinators

Table 4

Significant difference in the status of schools in implementing DRRM programs when grouped according to the school heads and school DRRM coordinators

Implementation of DRRM Programs	Profile	t	Sig.	Decision
Disaster Prevention and Mitigation				
School Head	2.92	-5.014	.000	Significant
Coordinator	3.32			
Disaster Preparedness				
School Head	2.77	-3.473	.001	Significant
Coordinator	3.11			

Disaster Response				
School Head	2.79	-3.800	.000	Significant
Coordinator	3.12			
Rehabilitation and Recovery				
School Head	2.56	-5.610	.000	Significant
Coordinator	3.08			

Table 4 presents the t-test analysis to determine the significance of the difference in schools' status in implementing DRRM programs when grouped according to the school heads and school DRRM coordinators. Upon analyzing the table, it is evident that there are substantial variations in how schools have implemented Disaster Risk Reduction and Management (DRRM) programs. These differences are apparent when the schools are categorized according to coordinators and school heads across all four indicators. Specifically, under disaster prevention and mitigation, the t value is 5.014 with a significance level of .000. In disaster preparedness, the t value is -3.473 with a significance level of .001. Regarding disaster response, the t value is -3.800 with a significance level of .000. Finally, regarding disaster rehabilitation and recovery, the t value is -5.610 with a significance level of .000.

It raises the possibility of differences in leaders' vision and guidance about disaster preparedness. It suggests that coordinators and school heads within the organization may have communication and priority alignment issues. These differences might lead to different staff training levels, an unequal allocation of resources, and an uneven integration of DRRM into the policies and curriculum of the schools.

As studied by Patel et al. (2017) pointed out, roles, duties, and action plans may be unclear or confusing if effective communication and priority setting aren't followed. This may result in a disorganized disaster response, insufficient resource allocation, and delays in implementing emergency plans. As emphasized in the study of Rofiah et al. (2021), being prepared for disasters is essential to guarantee the security and welfare of employees and students in educational settings. As a result, school administrators and disaster coordinators must have a common and unified vision and direction regarding disaster preparedness (Sithulisiwe Bhebhe, 2019).

Significance of the difference in the Level of Capability of Schools in implementing the DRRM Programs when Grouped according to Stakeholders

Table 5

Significant difference in the level of capability in implementing the DRRM programs when grouped according to stakeholders

Implementation of DRRM Programs	Profile	F	Sig.	Decision
Human Resource				
School Head	3.62	2.118	.098	Not Significant
Faculty	3.58			
Students	3.56			
Parents	3.38			
Material Facilities				
School Head	3.36	7.584	.000	Significant
Faculty	3.73	School Head vs. Faculty	.003	
Students	3.46			
Parents	3.27			
Knowledge, Innovation and Education				
School Head	3.45	2.688	.046	Significant
Faculty	3.61	Faculty vs. Parents	.044	
Students	3.46			
Parents	3.30			
Policies, Plans and Procedures				
School Head	3.31	2.123	.097	Not Significant
Faculty	3.51			
Students	3.42			
Parents	3.28			
Capacities and Mechanisms				
School Head	3.14	4.692	.003	Significant

Faculty	3.47	School Head vs. Faculty	.020
Students	3.40	Faculty vs. Parents	.015
Parents	3.13		

Table 5 shows the results of the ANOVA analysis, which aimed to identify any significant differences in schools' capability levels in implementing DRRM programs when categorized by stakeholders. The table indicates no significant differences in implementing the school DRRM programs under Human Resources and Policies, Plans, and Procedures. The F value is 2.118 with a Sig. of 0.98 for Human Resources and 2.123 with a Sig. of 0.97 for Policies, Plans, and Procedures. However, there is a significant difference in material facilities when implementing the School DRRM Programs when grouped according to stakeholders, specifically between the school head and faculty. The F value is 7.584, with a Sig. of .000 for the school head and Sig. of .003 for the faculty. Another significant difference was observed concerning Knowledge, Innovation, and Education in implementing the School DRRM Programs when grouped according to stakeholders, specifically between the faculty and parents. The F value is 7.584, with a Sig. of .000 for the school head and Sig. of .003 for faculty, students, and parents. Furthermore, a significant difference was identified regarding Capacities and Mechanisms in implementing the School DRRM Programs when grouped according to stakeholders, specifically between the school head and faculty and between the faculty and parents. It has an F value of 4.692 with a Sig. of .003 for the school head, 0.20 for faculty, and 0.15 for students and parents.

The results raise possible issues with coordination, leadership, or resource distribution inside the DRRM framework. The difference can result from varying preparation levels, priorities, or knowledge of roles and duties in disaster response and management. It also indicates different degrees of readiness, involvement, or comprehension of DRRM strategies. The difference would indicate that specific measures to increase parental empowerment and engagement in DRRM programs and communication strategies are needed.

The results align with the study of Winangsih & Kurniati (2020), who stated that since they work as experts in the field of education, faculty members

should be more knowledgeable about DRRM principles and techniques. Conversely, parents might not have had much exposure to or comprehension of DRRM concepts. Furthermore, the results are also congruent with the study of Shah et al. (2020), who concluded that strong collaboration and cooperation between teachers and parents is essential when implementing Disaster Risk Reduction and Management strategies in schools. This guarantees all stakeholders have a common concept, knowledge base, and tactics to mitigate possible hazards and safeguard children and educational procedures.

Action Plan

Table 6 displays the action plan crafted in response to the study's findings. School (DRRM) activities were moderately implemented and supported by the research. This plan describes strategic actions to strengthen DRRM capabilities and encourage a preparedness culture throughout public school communities to address these findings fully. The action plan aims to address the identified gaps and enhance the effectiveness of DRRM initiatives across public schools.

Table 6
Action Plan

Key Result Area	Objectives	Activity	Persons Involved	Time Frame
1. Assessment and Review	Assess the current DRRM programs in each school and identify strengths, weaknesses, and areas for improvement	Comprehensive Evaluation Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •School Heads •School DRRM Coordinators •Parent-Teachers Association •Supreme Secondary Learner Government 	1 st Month of the School Year
	Engage students, teachers, parents, local community	Stakeholders Convergence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •School Heads •School DRRM Coordinators Parent-Teachers Association 	1 st Month of the School Year

	members, and relevant authorities to gather feedback and insights on existing DRRM initiatives.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Supreme Secondary Learner Government •Purok and Brgy. Officials 	
2. Capacity Building	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Provide specialized training sessions for students, parents, teachers, and staff to enhance their understanding of DRRM principles and best practices 	Resilience Camp	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •School Heads •School DRRM Coordinators •Parent-Teachers Association •Supreme Secondary Learner Government •Philippine Red Cross •City and Provincial DRRM Office 	2nd to 3rd Month of the School Year
3. Infrastructure and Resources	Prioritize structural upgrades based on vulnerability assessments to enhance the resilience of school buildings against specific hazards.	Upgrading Facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •School Heads •School DRRM Coordinators •Parent-Teachers Association •DepEd Architect and Engineer 	1st to 2nd Month of the School Year.

4. Community Engagement	Foster partnerships with local government agencies, NGOs, and community organizations to create a collaborative DRRM network.	Community Resilience Forum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •School Heads •School DRRM Coordinators •Heads of NGOs •Heads of Community Organizations •Local Government Unit Heads/ Personnel 	1st to 3rd Month of the School Year
5. Implementation and Monitoring	Create a detailed DRRM action plan tailored to each school's needs, outlining specific goals, responsibilities, and timelines.	School Safety Summit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •School Heads •School DRRM Coordinators •Parent-Teachers Association •Supreme Secondary Learner Government •Purok and Brgy. Officials 	Last Quarter of the School Year
6. Integration and Sustainability	Integrate DRRM practices into daily school routines and activities to cultivate a culture of preparedness.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •School Heads •School DRRM Coordinators •Parent-Teachers Association •Supreme Secondary Learner Government 	All Year Round

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of this study, the following conclusions were deduced: The evaluation of the implementation of school DRRM programs

shows that the overall results were moderate. The school DRRM protocol is being followed to some extent, but there is room for improvement. The four indicators received moderate results, suggesting that more coordination and collaboration are required for effective school disaster risk reduction and management. The capability of public schools to implement DRRM programs was evaluated as moderately evident. This suggests that while some resources and efforts have been allocated to DRRM, there is still room for development regarding impact and efficacy. The five indicators - human resources, material facilities, knowledge, innovation and education, policies, plans and procedures, and capacities and mechanisms - share the same result of moderately evident, respectively. This implies room for improvement regarding accessibility, coverage, and efficacy of early warning systems and data on risks and vulnerabilities. Additionally, there is a need for improvement in the accessibility and availability of materials to ensure thorough knowledge and readiness among stakeholders. According to the results, there are significant differences in implementing DRRM programs among schools based on leadership and coordination, potentially affecting staff training, resource allocation, and integration of DRRM into school policies and curricula. The study grouped schools according to stakeholders and found significant differences in three indicators, indicating potential issues with resource distribution, knowledge, and coordination within the DRRM framework.

REFERENCES

- Amri, A., Bird, D. K., Ronan, K., Haynes, K., & Towers, B. (2017). Disaster risk reduction education in Indonesia: Challenges and recommendations for scaling up. *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences*, 17(4), 595–612. <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-17-595-2017>
- Burnette, A. G., Huang, F., Maeng, J. L., & Cornell, D. (2019). School threat assessment versus suicide assessment: Statewide prevalence and case characteristics. *Psychology in the Schools*, 56(3), 378–392. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.22194>
- Catanus, R. J. (2018). *Disaster risk reduction management in elementary schools*. Foundation University, Dumaguete City, Philippines.
- Chondekar, N. R. (2018). Role of teachers in disaster management. *International Journal of Science and Research*, 8(8), 2294–2296.
- Cruz, R. D. D., & O. R. C. G. (2022). Disaster risk reduction management implementation in the public elementary schools of the Department of Education, Philippines. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Management*, 1–15.

- Cubillas, A. U. (2016). The school disaster risk reduction and management program of the disaster-prone elementary schools. *International Review of Humanities and Scientific Research*.
- Daimon, H., Nakano, G., Takahara, K., & Miyamae, R. (2022). The Noah's Ark effect: Radicalization of social meanings of disaster preparedness in communities facing a major disaster. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 82, Article 103372. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdr.2022.103372>
- El-Halwagi, M. M., Sengupta, D., Pistikopoulos, E. N., Sammons, J., Eljack, F., & Kazi, M.-K. (2020). Disaster-resilient design of manufacturing facilities through process integration: Principal strategies, perspectives, and research challenges. *Frontiers in Sustainability*, 1. <https://doi.org/10.3389/frsus.2020.595961>
- Fale, M. (2022). Climate change adaptation, disaster risk reduction management, and resiliency of secondary school teachers: Basis for integrated school disaster plan. *Climate Change Adaptation, Disaster Risk Reduction Management (DRRM) and Resiliency of Secondary School Teachers: Basis for Integrated School Disaster Plan*.
- Fuentes, E. (2023). School disaster preparedness, response, and recovery: Teachers in focus. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 646–668.
- Guiamel, I. A., & Lee, H. S. (2020). Watershed modelling of the Mindanao River Basin in the Philippines using the SWAT for water resource management. *Civil Engineering Journal*, 6(4), 626–648. <https://doi.org/10.28991/cej-2020-03091496>
- Habibi, R., & Panjaitan, A. C. (2022). A model for blood bank facility-location problem at post-disaster area. *ADI Journal on Recent Innovation*, 4(2), 128–137. <https://doi.org/10.34306/ajri.v4i2.849>
- Huq, M. E., Sarker, M. N. I., Prasad, R., Kormoker, T., Hossain, M. A., Rahman, M. M., & Al Dughairi, A. A. (2021). Resilience for disaster management: Opportunities and challenges. In *Handbook of disaster risk reduction for resilience*(pp. 425–442). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-77259-8_22
- Kanyasan, K., Nonaka, D., Chatouphonexay, A., Hernandez, P. M., Kounnavong, S., & Kobayashi, J. (2018). Implementation of disaster risk reduction and management policies in a school setting in Lao PDR: A case study. *Tropical Medicine and Health*, 46, Article 42. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41182-018-0124-7>
- Molarius, R., Wessberg, N., Keränen, J., & Murtonen, M. (2018). Foresight in

- sight: How to improve urban resilience with collaboration among public authorities? In *Urban disaster resilience and security* (pp. 397–412). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-68606-6_23
- Morcilla, R. (2023). Participation of internal stakeholders in school disaster risk reduction and management program among public schools in Catanauan District: Basis for developmental training program. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 170–182.
- Napoli, M., Krech, P. R., & Holley, L. C. (2019). Mindfulness training for elementary school students. *Journal of Applied School Psychology*, 21(1), 99–125. https://doi.org/10.1300/J370v21n01_05
- Parkash, S. (2015). Cooperation, coordination, and team issues in disaster management: The need for a holistic and integrated approach. *Geological Society, London, Special Publications*, 419(1), 57–61. <https://doi.org/10.1144/SP419.5>
- Patel, R., Wattamwar, K., Kanduri, J., Nahass, M., Yoon, J., Oh, J., Shukla, P., & Lacy, C. R. (2017). Health care student knowledge and willingness to work in infectious disease outbreaks. *Disaster Medicine and Public Health Preparedness*, 11(6), 694–700. <https://doi.org/10.1017/dmp.2017.18>
- Rico, J. J. (2022). Island schools-communities' preparedness and resiliency for disaster management. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Studies*, 4(3), 48–66. <https://doi.org/10.32996/jhsss.2022.4.3.5>
- Rofiah, N. H., Kawai, N., & Nur Hayati, E. (2021). Key elements of disaster mitigation education in inclusive school setting in the Indonesian context. *Jambá: Journal of Disaster Risk Studies*, 13(1). <https://doi.org/10.4102/jamba.v13i1.1159>
- Sarker, M. N. I., Peng, Y., Yiran, C., & Shouse, R. C. (2020). Disaster resilience through big data: Way to environmental sustainability. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 51, Article 101769. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdr.2020.101769>
- Seidler, R., Dietrich, K., Schweizer, S., Bawa, K. S., Chopde, S., Zaman, F., Sharma, A., Bhattacharya, S., Devkota, L. P., & Khaling, S. (2018). Progress on integrating climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction for sustainable development pathways in South Asia: Evidence from six research projects. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 31, 92–101. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdr.2018.04.023>
- Shah, A. A., Gong, Z., Pal, I., Sun, R., Ullah, W., & Wani, G. F. (2020). Disaster risk management insight on school emergency preparedness: A case study of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. *International Journal of*

Disaster Risk Reduction, 51, Article 101805.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdr.2020.101805>

- Bhebhe, S., Runhare, T., & Monobe, R. J. (2019). Strategic approaches for developing a culture of safety management in schools: Indications from literature studies. *Jàmbá: Journal of Disaster Risk Studies*.
- Torani, S., Majd, P. M., Maroufi, S. S., Dowlati, M., & Sheikhi, R. A. (2019). The importance of education on disasters and emergencies: A review article. *Journal of Education and Health Promotion*, 8, Article 85. https://doi.org/10.4103/jehp.jehp_262_18
- Umeda, M., Chiba, R., Sasaki, M., Agustini, E. N., & Mashino, S. (2020). A literature review on psychosocial support for disaster responders: Qualitative synthesis with recommended actions for protecting and promoting the mental health of responders. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(6), Article 2011. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17062011>
- Usman, A. (2017). Integrated disaster risk management in Indian environment: Prediction, prevention, and preparedness. In *2017 IEEE Global Humanitarian Technology Conference* (pp. 1–6). <https://doi.org/10.1109/GHTC.2017.8239246>
- Winangsih, I., & Kurniati, E. (2020). Disaster mitigation in early childhood education. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Early Childhood Education and Parenting 2019*. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.200808.058>