



(RESEARCH ARTICLE)



## LEVEL OF IMPLEMENTATION OF DISASTER RISK REDUCTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM AND RESPONSE CAPABILITIES OF PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS IN THE DIVISION OF QUEZON

Ingrid Jell L. Erandio \*

Department of Education (DepEd) Lopez West District – Division of Quezon Province, Institute of Open and Distance Education Open University System, Polytechnic University of the Philippines, Lopez Campus.

\* Corresponding Author

World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, 2026, 31(03), 1139–1154

Publication history: Received on 29 July 2026; revised on 09 September 2026; accepted on 11 September 2026

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2026.31.3.2340>

Copyright © 2026 Author(s) retain the copyright of this article. This article is published under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0

### ABSTRACT

This study determined the level of implementation of the Disaster Risk Reduction and Management (DRRM) Program and the response capabilities of public elementary schools in the Division of Quezon. It also examined the respondents' profile in terms of age, sex, position, highest educational attainment, and school size. The study assessed DRRM implementation in disaster prevention and mitigation, disaster preparedness, disaster response, and disaster recovery and rehabilitation. It also measured response capabilities in human resources, material facilities, knowledge, innovation and education, policies, plans and procedures, and capabilities and mechanisms. A descriptive quantitative research design was used with 209 school heads and DRRM coordinators as respondents from the Fourth Congressional District of Quezon selected through simple random sampling. A validated and pilot-tested survey questionnaire served as the main research instrument. Data were analyzed using frequency, percentage, weighted mean, and Chi-square test of independence. Findings revealed that most respondents were 21–30 years old, female, Teacher I–III, college graduates, and assigned in small schools. The DRRM Program was highly implemented in all areas mainly in disaster response. The schools were also rated highly capable in all response capability areas, although material facilities received the lowest rating. Problems encountered were generally less challenging, but limited resources and infrastructure vulnerability were moderately challenging. Significant relationships were found between most profile variables and DRRM implementation and response capabilities. Based on the findings, the study proposed a DRRM Sustainability Plan to strengthen school preparedness, response systems, resource support, infrastructure readiness, and role-based DRRM capacity-building.

**Keywords:** Polytechnic University of The Philippines, Disaster Risk Reduction Management, Response Capabilities, Elementary Schools

### 1 INTRODUCTION

Disaster Risk Reduction and Management, or DRRM, is a major concern in schools because disasters can place learners, teachers, personnel, and facilities at risk. Schools need clear systems that can prevent harm, prepare people, guide emergency response, and support recovery after disasters. Children are especially vulnerable because they spend much of their time inside the school environment (Shah et al., 2020).

Across the world, disasters continue to affect schools and learning communities. Floods, typhoons, earthquakes, fires, and other hazards can damage classrooms, learning materials, water systems, roads, and communication lines. These events can also disrupt classes and place children at greater risk because they spend many hours in school each day. For this reason, schools need a strong DRRM program that protects learners, personnel, facilities, and learning continuity before, during, and after disasters (Ryan et al., 2020; Shah et al., 2020). In Asia, disaster risk reduction has become a key policy concern because many countries are exposed to typhoons, floods, earthquakes, and other climate-related hazards. These risks show the need for schools to include disaster prevention, preparedness, response, recovery, and rehabilitation in their regular programs. This approach helps schools reduce possible losses and continue learning even during emergencies (Mohanty et al., 2019).

In the Philippines, DRRM is integrated into the education sector to strengthen school safety and resilience. The Department of Education promotes DRRM through policies, drills, school-based teams, contingency plans, and coordination with local government units and partner agencies. These efforts aim to protect learners and personnel while reducing class disruption during and after disasters (Cubillas et al., 2022).

Despite these efforts, some schools still face challenges in implementing DRRM. Common concerns include limited resources, inadequate training, weak infrastructure, and insufficient emergency materials. These problems may affect how quickly and effectively schools can respond during disasters (Manalo & Manalo, 2020). Public elementary schools in the Division of Quezon also experience disaster-related risks. The province is often exposed to typhoons, flooding, weather disturbances, and other emergencies. These conditions make it necessary to examine how schools implement DRRM programs and how capable they are in responding to disaster situations. Although existing policies support DRRM implementation in schools, local evidence is still needed. There is a need to assess the actual level of DRRM implementation, the response capabilities of schools, and the problems encountered by school personnel. Such evidence can help identify strengths, gaps, and areas that need support.

This study determined the level of implementation of the Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Program and the response capabilities of public elementary schools in the Division of Quezon. Specifically, it described the profile of the respondents in terms of age, sex, position, highest educational attainment, and school size. It also assessed the level of DRRM implementation in terms of disaster prevention and mitigation, disaster preparedness, disaster response, and disaster recovery and rehabilitation. The study further examined the response capabilities of public elementary schools in terms of human resources, material facilities, knowledge, innovation and education, policies, plans and procedures, and capabilities and mechanisms. It also identified the problems encountered in the implementation of DRRM and response capabilities. Finally, it tested the significant relationship between the respondents' profile and the level of DRRM implementation, as well as the significant relationship between the respondents' profile and the level of response capabilities.

### **1.1 Profile of Respondents**

The reviewed literature shows that respondent profile helps explain how school personnel assess DRRM implementation. Age, sex, position, educational attainment, and school size may shape awareness, roles, training needs, and school-based decisions. Previous studies found mixed results. Some studies reported links between age, educational attainment, and DRRM practices. Others found no clear difference when respondents were grouped by sex or educational level (Regis, 2020; Tolentino, 2019; Chung & Yen, 2020).

The literature also shows that school roles affect the implementation of DRRM programs. School heads guide planning, resource allocation, and policy implementation. Teachers help learners understand preparedness and participate in drills. DRRM coordinators serve as focal persons for school safety activities. These roles need clear coordination because DRRM implementation depends on shared responsibility within the school community (Cruz & Ormilla, 2022; Epe, 2023). In terms of DRRM implementation, the literature describes the program as a systematic approach to reduce disaster risks and protect school communities. It covers prevention and mitigation, preparedness, response, recovery, and rehabilitation. In the Philippine setting, DepEd supports DRRM through school plans, drills, training, curriculum integration, and coordination with local government units. These practices help schools build a culture of safety and resilience (Tizon & Comighud, 2020; Cubillas et al., 2022).

Several studies showed that schools generally implement DRRM practices at a satisfactory to high level. Strong areas often include preparedness drills, emergency response, communication, and coordination. However, some studies also reported gaps in mitigation, prevention, disaster response, and recovery. These gaps were linked to limited training, weak facilities, lack of resources, and uneven implementation across school contexts (Baluran, 2023; Bacus, 2020; Regis, 2020).

Taken together, the reviewed literature supports the need to examine DRRM implementation in public elementary schools in the Division of Quezon. Existing studies provide useful findings on school preparedness and disaster

response. However, local evidence is still needed because schools face different risks, resources, personnel profiles, and community conditions. This study addresses that gap by assessing the level of DRRM implementation and the response capabilities of public elementary schools as basis for a DRRM Sustainability Plan.

## **1.2 Level of Implementation of Disaster Risk Reduction Management**

The reviewed literature shows that the Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Program is a systematic approach that helps schools reduce risks and protect learners, personnel, and facilities. It covers prevention, mitigation, preparedness, response, recovery, and rehabilitation. In the Philippine setting, DepEd supports DRRM through school plans, drills, curriculum integration, capacity-building, and coordination with local government units and community partners (Tizon & Comighud, 2020; Cubillas et al., 2022).

Disaster prevention and mitigation focus on reducing school vulnerability before hazards occur. These practices include risk assessment, safer facilities, structural and non-structural measures, awareness campaigns, and community participation. Several studies reported positive implementation of prevention and mitigation activities in schools. However, some findings also showed low implementation due to limited training and recent exposure to DRRM activities (Baluran, 2023; Bacus, 2020).

Preparedness and response are also common strengths in school-based DRRM. Preparedness includes drills, emergency plans, response teams, first aid training, and communication systems. Response focuses on immediate action during disasters, such as evacuation, relief distribution, medical support, reporting, and coordination with authorities. Studies generally found that schools perform well in these areas when roles are clear and stakeholders work together (Tizon & Comighud, 2019; Baluran, 2023; Toledo et al., 2020).

Recovery and rehabilitation extend DRRM beyond immediate emergency action. These areas include damage assessment, repair, psychosocial support, learner reintegration, recovery planning, monitoring, and partnerships for added assistance. The literature shows that recovery practices are present in many schools, but they may require stronger support because they involve long-term needs and wider resources. Overall, the reviewed studies support the need to assess the actual level of DRRM implementation in public elementary schools in the Division of Quezon as basis for a sustainability plan that strengthens prevention, preparedness, response, and recovery practices (Regis, 2020; Tizon & Comighud, 2019; Baluran, 2023).

## **1.3 Level of Response Capabilities Among the Public Elementary Schools**

Response capabilities in DRRM refer to the readiness of schools to act during disasters and emergencies. These capabilities include people, facilities, knowledge, policies, plans, and response systems. The reviewed literature shows that schools need these areas to protect learners, teachers, personnel, and school property during hazardous events (Tizon & Comighud, 2020).

Human resources remain a major part of school response capability. Teachers, school heads, DRRM coordinators, and staff need training in evacuation, first aid, communication, and emergency coordination. When school personnel know their roles, they can guide learners better and reduce confusion during crisis situations (Lalamonan & Comighud, 2020). Additionally, material facilities also support effective disaster response. Schools need evacuation areas, first aid kits, fire extinguishers, emergency supplies, communication tools, and safe facilities. However, studies show that material facilities often receive lower ratings because schools have limited funds for DRRM equipment and facility improvement (Robielos et al., 2020; Tizon & Comighud, 2019).

Similarly, knowledge, innovation, and education strengthen the awareness and preparedness of the school community. DRRM concepts can be integrated into classroom lessons, drills, simulations, campaigns, and school activities. The literature shows that schools with stronger DRRM education can help learners and personnel understand risks and respond properly during emergencies (Valencia et al., 2019; Cubillas et al., 2022). Also, policies, plans, and procedures provide clear direction for school disaster response. These include emergency plans, role assignments, communication protocols, evacuation routes, and coordination procedures with local authorities. Clear policies help schools act in an organized manner and reduce uncertainty during emergencies (Manabo, 2023; Mamhot, 2019).

Furthermore, capabilities and mechanisms complete the school response system. These include early warning systems, emergency response teams, regular drills, communication networks, and post-incident evaluation. Studies show that schools need capable teams and practical training because quick and organized action can reduce injuries and support the return to normal school operations (Baluran, 2023; Toledo et al., 2020).

In general, the reviewed literature shows that response capability is not limited to one area of school readiness. It requires trained personnel, available materials, clear policies, strong knowledge systems, and functional response mechanisms. These findings support the need to assess the response capabilities of public elementary schools in the

Division of Quezon. The results can guide the development of a DRRM Sustainability Plan that strengthens school safety, resource support, training, coordination, and emergency response.

#### **1.4 Problems Encountered in the Implementation of DRRM and Response Capabilities**

The reviewed literature shows that schools continue to face several concerns in implementing DRRM programs and strengthening response capabilities. These concerns are linked to changing disaster risks, limited school resources, and the need for safe learning environments. DepEd has promoted DRRM initiatives to strengthen school resilience. However, implementation still requires sustained support, clear coordination, and practical solutions across school communities (Baluran, 2020; Comighud, 2020).

Funding and resources appear as common challenges in DRRM implementation. Schools need funds for training, emergency supplies, response equipment, facility repair, and infrastructure improvement. Limited budget can affect the readiness of schools, especially those located in vulnerable or resource-constrained areas. Studies also identified damaged school properties, lack of DRRM tools, clogged drainage systems, and limited emergency equipment as recurring concerns (Manabo, 2023; Bacus, 2020; Garcia, 2021). The literature also points to concerns in awareness, training, curriculum integration, and role clarity. Some school personnel may not fully understand their duties during emergencies. Learners, parents, teachers, and community members may also have different levels of awareness about disaster risks and preparedness practices. Integrating DRRM into classroom instruction also needs careful planning because teachers must balance disaster education with existing curriculum demands (Lalamonan & Comighud, 2020; Valencia et al., 2019; Bacus, 2020).

Overall, the reviewed studies suggest that DRRM implementation requires more than school compliance. It needs adequate funds, trained personnel, clear emergency roles, updated plans, strong monitoring, and active partnerships with local government units and community stakeholders. These findings support the need to identify the actual problems encountered by public elementary schools in the Division of Quezon. The results may serve as basis for a DRRM Sustainability Plan that addresses resources, training, facilities, coordination, and response systems (Tizon & Comighud, 2020; Tolentino, 2019; Benis et al., 2020).

#### *Synthesis*

The reviewed literature shows that the profile of respondents helps explain how DRRM programs are understood and implemented in schools. Age, sex, position, educational attainment, and school size may shape school personnel's awareness, roles, experiences, and decisions related to disaster preparedness and response. Studies also show that DRRM implementation covers prevention, mitigation, preparedness, response, recovery, and rehabilitation. These areas help reduce disaster risks and strengthen school resilience. In public elementary schools, response capability also depends on trained personnel, available materials, clear policies, knowledge sharing, and working response mechanisms (Tizon & Comighud, 2020; Cruz & Ormilla, 2022; Manabo, 2023). The literature also points to continuing gaps in school-based DRRM. These include limited funds, weak facilities, lack of equipment, training needs, uneven awareness, and the need to adapt to changing hazards. While previous studies discussed DRRM implementation and response capability in schools, limited local evidence focuses on public elementary schools in the Division of Quezon. This study addresses this gap by assessing the respondents' profile, the level of DRRM implementation, the response capabilities of schools, and the problems encountered. The findings served as basis for developing a DRRM Sustainability Plan suited to the needs and conditions of public elementary schools in the Division of Quezon (Tolentino, 2019; Garcia, 2021; Benis et al., 2020).

---

## **2 METHOD**

This study employed a quantitative research design using the descriptive method. This design was used to describe the profile of the respondents, the level of implementation of the Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Program, the response capabilities of public elementary schools, and the problems encountered in DRRM implementation. It also examined the significant relationship between the profile of the respondents and the two major variables of the study. The DRRM implementation was assessed in terms of disaster prevention and mitigation, disaster preparedness, disaster response, and disaster recovery and rehabilitation. The response capabilities were measured in terms of human resources, material facilities, knowledge, innovation and education, policies, plans and procedures, and capabilities and mechanisms. This method was appropriate because the study aimed to describe existing DRRM conditions and determine whether respondent profile was related to school DRRM implementation and response capabilities.

### **2.1 Participants**

The participants of the study were school heads and DRRM coordinators from public elementary schools in the Fourth Congressional District of Quezon. The study covered the municipalities of Alabat, Atimonan, Calauag, Gumaca, Guinayangan, Lopez, Plaridel, Quezon, and Tagkawayan. The target population consisted of 457 school heads and DRRM

coordinators. From this population, 209 respondents were selected using Cochran's formula. Simple random sampling was used to give every qualified respondent an equal chance of being included in the study. This sampling procedure helped provide a fair representation of the public elementary schools in the district.

## 2.2 Source of Data

Primary data were gathered from the school heads and DRRM coordinators through a modified survey questionnaire. The instrument was based on the National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Framework, DepEd Order No. 37, s. 2017, and related literature and studies. The questionnaire had four major parts. The first part gathered the profile of the respondents in terms of age, sex, position, highest educational attainment, and school size. The second part measured the level of DRRM implementation in terms of disaster prevention and mitigation, disaster preparedness, disaster response, and disaster recovery and rehabilitation. The third part assessed the response capabilities of public elementary schools in terms of human resources, material facilities, knowledge, innovation and education, policies, plans and procedures, and capabilities and mechanisms. The fourth part identified the problems encountered in DRRM implementation and response capabilities.

The research instrument was validated by three experts. These experts included a research expert, a district school head in charge of DRRM, and a municipal focal person for DRRM implementation. They reviewed the clarity, relevance, and alignment of the questionnaire items with the objectives of the study. After validation, the instrument was pilot-tested with 30 non-respondents from the Fourth District of Quezon. The reliability results showed acceptable to good internal consistency. All Cronbach's alpha values were above 0.70. This means that the instrument was reliable and suitable for actual data gathering.

## 2.3 Data Gathering Procedure

The data gathering process started with the review and consultation of the research instrument. After the instrument was finalized, the researcher secured permission from the Office of the Schools Division Superintendent of Quezon. The researcher also coordinated with the district offices and concerned schools before administering the questionnaire. After approval was granted, the survey questionnaire was converted into Google Forms. This made the data gathering process more accessible to the respondents. Clear instructions were provided to guide the school heads and DRRM coordinators in answering the items. The researcher monitored the responses and made follow-ups until the required number of respondents was reached. The collected data were then retrieved, organized, encoded, and prepared for statistical analysis. Ethical procedures were observed during the conduct of the study. The respondents were informed about the purpose of the research and their participation was voluntary. Their responses were treated with confidentiality. Personal information was not emphasized in the analysis. The data were used only for research purposes and the results were presented in summary form.

## 2.4 Analysis of Data

The collected data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Frequency and percentage were used to describe the profile of the respondents in terms of age, sex, position, highest educational attainment, and school size. Weighted mean was used to determine the level of DRRM implementation, response capabilities, and problems encountered.

The level of DRRM implementation was analyzed according to four areas: disaster prevention and mitigation, disaster preparedness, disaster response, and disaster recovery and rehabilitation. The response capabilities were analyzed according to five areas: human resources, material facilities, knowledge, innovation and education, policies, plans and procedures, and capabilities and mechanisms. The problems encountered were also analyzed using weighted mean. To determine the significant relationship between the profile of the respondents and the level of DRRM implementation, the chi-square test of independence was used. The same test was used to determine the significant relationship between the profile of the respondents and the level of response capabilities. A 0.05 level of significance served as the basis for accepting or rejecting the null hypotheses.

---

## 3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the discussion and interpretation of the findings on the level of implementation of the Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Program and the response capabilities of public elementary schools in the Division of Quezon.

Table 1 presents the profile of the 209 respondents in terms of age, sex, position, educational attainment, and school size. These profile variables give context to the assessment of DRRM implementation and response capabilities in public elementary schools in the Division of Quezon.

In terms of age, most respondents were 21–30 years old with 99 respondents or 47.4 percent. This was followed by the 31–40 age group with 76 respondents or 36.4 percent. This shows that most respondents were young to middle-aged school personnel. Their age profile suggests an active workforce that can take part in drills, coordination, reporting, learner guidance, and emergency response. The result differs from Regis (2020), who found that most DRRM respondents in Region VIII were within the 36–50 age group. Still, the finding supports Tolentino (2019), who noted that age and experience may shape school personnel's practices in disaster preparedness and management.

As to sex, female respondents formed the larger group. There were 120 female respondents or 57.4 percent. Male respondents accounted for 89 or 42.6 percent. This pattern may reflect the usual workforce composition of public elementary schools. The finding implies that DRRM activities must remain inclusive. Both male and female personnel should have equal access to training, planning, drills, and response roles. This supports Regis (2020) and Tolentino (2019), who reported that sex did not create major differences in school DRRM implementation.

**Table 1: Demographic Profile of the Respondents**

| Profile Variable       | Category                       | Frequency | Respondents % |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------|---------------|
| Age                    | 21–30 years old                | 99        | 47.4          |
|                        | 31–40 years old                | 76        | 36.4          |
|                        | 41–50 years old                | 26        | 12.4          |
|                        | 51–60 years old                | 8         | 3.8           |
|                        | Total                          | 209       | 100.0         |
| Sex                    | Male                           | 89        | 42.6          |
|                        | Female                         | 120       | 57.4          |
|                        | Total                          | 209       | 100.0         |
| Position               | Teacher I–III                  | 148       | 70.8          |
|                        | Master Teacher I–II            | 5         | 2.4           |
|                        | Head Teacher I–III             | 22        | 10.5          |
|                        | Principal I–IV                 | 25        | 12.0          |
|                        | Administrative Officer         | 5         | 2.4           |
|                        | Total                          | 209       | 100.0         |
| Educational Attainment | College Graduate               | 144       | 68.9          |
|                        | Master's Degree Graduate       | 57        | 27.3          |
|                        | Doctorate Degree Graduate      | 5         | 2.4           |
|                        | Post Doctorate Degree Graduate | 3         | 1.4           |
|                        | Total                          | 209       | 100.0         |
| School Size            | Small                          | 139       | 66.5          |
|                        | Medium                         | 55        | 26.3          |
|                        | Large                          | 12        | 5.7           |
|                        | Mega                           | 3         | 1.4           |
|                        | Total                          | 209       | 100.0         |

In terms of position, Teacher I–III had the highest number with 148 respondents or 70.8 percent. This means that the results were largely drawn from classroom teachers. Their responses are valuable because teachers are usually the first personnel who guide learners during drills, class suspensions, evacuation, and safety reminders. Principals, head teachers, master teachers, and administrative officers were also represented. Their participation added management and support perspectives. This finding agrees with Regis (2020), who stated that teachers, principals, and DRRM

coordinators hold key roles in school DRRM implementation. It also supports Tolentino (2019), who emphasized the role of teachers in guiding learners during preparedness activities.

**Table 2: Summary of the Level of Implementation of the Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Program**

| DRRM Implementation Area           | Grand Mean | Verbal Interpretation | Highest-Rated Indicator                                                                                          | Lowest-Rated Indicator                                                                                 |
|------------------------------------|------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Disaster Prevention and Mitigation | 4.32       | Highly Implemented    | Conducting regular risk assessments to identify potential hazards within school premises (M = 4.52)              | Implementing soil erosion control measures to prevent landslides and soil degradation (M = 4.05)       |
| Disaster Preparedness              | 4.30       | Highly Implemented    | Conducting regular drills and simulations to familiarize students and staff with emergency procedures (M = 4.53) | Stockpiling emergency supplies such as food, water, and medical kits for immediate response (M = 4.10) |
| Disaster Response                  | 4.34       | Highly Implemented    | Implementing protocols for the distribution of relief goods and supplies to affected individuals (M = 4.46)      | Providing psychosocial support services to students and staff affected by disasters (M = 4.22)         |
| Rehabilitation and Recovery        | 4.26       | Highly Implemented    | Establishing partnerships with NGOs and community organizations for additional support and resources (M = 4.39)  | Implementing livelihood support programs to help affected families recover economically (M = 4.08)     |
| Overall DRRM Implementation        | 4.31       | Highly Implemented    | Disaster Response obtained the highest grand mean (M = 4.34)                                                     | Rehabilitation and Recovery obtained the lowest grand mean (M = 4.26)                                  |

**Legend.** 1.00–1.50 Not Implemented; 1.51–2.50 Less Implemented; 2.51–3.50 Moderately Implemented; 3.51–4.50 Highly Implemented; 4.51–5.00 Very Highly Implemented.

For educational attainment, most respondents were college graduates with 144 respondents or 68.9 percent. This was followed by master's degree graduates with 57 respondents or 27.3 percent. Only a few respondents had doctorate and post-doctorate degrees. The result shows that most respondents had the basic professional preparation needed for their school roles. However, DRRM work should not depend on formal education alone. It also requires practical training, role clarity, teamwork, and actual participation in drills and emergency response. This agrees with Regis (2020), who found that educational attainment and DRRM training may relate to SDRRM implementation. In contrast, Chung and Yen (2020) reported that educational level did not clearly affect disaster prevention experience, attitude, or skills.

In terms of school size, most respondents came from small schools with 139 respondents or 66.5 percent. Medium schools followed with 55 respondents or 26.3 percent. Large and mega schools had fewer respondents. This result shows that the findings mainly reflect the condition of small public elementary schools in the Division of Quezon.

Small schools may have simpler communication and closer coordination among personnel. However, they may also have fewer staff, limited funds, fewer emergency supplies, and weaker facilities. This finding differs from Corpuz (2019), who noted that larger schools may show stronger disaster risk management activities because of wider facilities and greater resources. The implication is clear. The proposed DRRM Sustainability Plan should be practical and suited to small-school contexts. It should focus on low-cost preparedness activities, clear role assignments, basic emergency supplies, facility inspection, and strong partnerships with local government units and community stakeholders.

Table 2 presents the summary of the level of implementation of the Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Program in public elementary schools in the Division of Quezon. The overall grand mean was 4.31. This was interpreted as Highly Implemented. This result shows that schools generally carry out DRRM practices across prevention and mitigation, preparedness, response, and rehabilitation and recovery.

Among the four areas, disaster response obtained the highest grand mean of 4.34. This means that schools were strongest in actions done during emergency situations. The highest-rated indicator in this area was the implementation of protocols for relief goods and supply distribution. This result implies that schools can coordinate immediate support

for affected learners, personnel, and families. It also suggests that schools have working procedures for resource distribution during disasters. This finding supports Baluran (2023), who found a high level of disaster response implementation in schools. It also agrees with Tizon and Comighud (2019), who reported that public schools had well-implemented disaster response practices. In the present study, the strong result may be linked to the visible nature of response activities. Relief distribution, emergency reporting, and stakeholder coordination are usually observed during actual emergencies. These tasks are also supported by local government units, barangay officials, parents, and community partners.

Disaster prevention and mitigation ranked next with a grand mean of 4.32. The highest indicator was the conduct of regular risk assessments. This indicates that schools regularly inspect hazards and identify possible risks within school premises. This result suggests that schools have established routines for checking unsafe areas, damaged facilities, blocked pathways, drainage concerns, and other possible threats. The finding supports Baluran (2023), who emphasized that prevention and mitigation require both structural and non-structural measures. It also agrees with Cubillas et al. (2022), who noted that DepEd promotes DRRM through school planning and preparedness activities. Disaster preparedness obtained a grand mean of 4.30. Its highest-rated indicator was the regular conduct of drills and simulations. This shows that schools actively prepare learners and personnel for possible emergencies. Drills help school communities become familiar with evacuation routes, safety procedures, and emergency roles. This finding agrees with Toledo et al. (2020), who emphasized that preparedness programs should include drill conduct and emergency management training. It also supports Tizon and Comighud (2019), who stressed that preparedness requires shared responsibility among school stakeholders.

Despite the high ratings, some weaker areas were also noted. In disaster preparedness, stockpiling emergency supplies received the lowest mean. In disaster prevention and mitigation, soil erosion control received the lowest rating. In disaster response, psychosocial support had the lowest rating. These findings imply that schools perform well in routine and visible DRRM activities. However, they still need support in resource-heavy, technical, and care-centered practices. This contrasts with the ideal view of DRRM as a complete system that covers both physical safety and human recovery.

Rehabilitation and recovery obtained the lowest grand mean of 4.26, although it was still interpreted as Highly Implemented. The highest indicator was the establishment of partnerships with NGOs and community organizations. This suggests that schools rely on external partners for support after disasters. However, livelihood support for affected families received the lowest rating. This may be because livelihood recovery is beyond the usual capacity and mandate of schools. It often requires assistance from local government units, social welfare offices, and other partner agencies. The result is consistent with Baluran (2023), who explained that recovery and rehabilitation require data collection, recovery planning, financing, monitoring, and communication. It also agrees with Tizon and Comighud (2019), who found that disaster recovery and rehabilitation were well implemented. However, the present finding differs from Regis (2020), who reported that disaster relief and rehabilitation reached only a moderate level of implementation. In this study, recovery was highly implemented. Still, it remained the lowest among the four areas. This suggests that recovery activities need stronger planning and more sustained support.

In general, the findings indicate that public elementary schools in the Division of Quezon have established DRRM practices. Their strongest area is disaster response. Their weakest area is rehabilitation and recovery. This pattern suggests that schools are more prepared for immediate action than long-term recovery. The proposed DRRM Sustainability Plan should therefore sustain existing response practices while strengthening emergency supplies, erosion control, psychosocial support, livelihood referral systems, and post-disaster recovery planning.

Table 3 presents the summary of the level of response capabilities of public elementary schools in the Division of Quezon. The overall grand mean was 4.26. This was interpreted as Highly Capable. This result shows that schools generally have the personnel, facilities, knowledge systems, policies, and mechanisms needed to respond to disaster-related situations.

Among the five areas, human resources obtained the highest grand mean of 4.32. This means that school personnel were the strongest part of school response capability. The highest-rated indicator was the presence of well-trained DRRM coordinators and staff members. This finding implies that schools rely heavily on trained personnel during emergencies. Teachers, DRRM coordinators, school heads, and support staff help guide learners, communicate instructions, and coordinate immediate action. This finding supports Tizon and Comighud (2020), who described response capability as the readiness of people and institutions to respond during disasters. It also agrees with Lalamonan and Comighud (2020), who emphasized that teachers and school personnel need skills in evacuation, first aid, and emergency coordination. In the present study, the strong rating for human resources shows that schools have capable personnel who can support disaster response. However, the lowest indicator in this area was the recruitment and training of school safety marshals. This suggests that role assignment and task-specific training still need improvement.

**Table 3: Summary of Level of Response Capabilities of Public Elementary Schools**

| <b>Response Capability Area</b>      | <b>Grand Mean</b> | <b>Verbal Interpretation</b> | <b>Highest-Rated Indicator</b>                                                                                                                                  | <b>Lowest-Rated Indicator</b>                                                                                 |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Human Resources                      | 4.32              | Highly Capable               | Well-trained DRRM coordinators and staff members (M = 4.42)                                                                                                     | Recruitment and training of school safety marshals (M = 4.13)                                                 |
| Material Facilities                  | 4.19              | Highly Capable               | Regular maintenance and inspection of facilities to ensure readiness (M = 4.33)                                                                                 | Stockpiles of emergency supplies such as food, water, and medical kits (M = 4.02)                             |
| Knowledge, Innovation, and Education | 4.27              | Highly Capable               | Regular conduct of DRRM drills and simulations for staff and students (M = 4.52)                                                                                | Encouragement of student-led initiatives and participation in DRRM-related competitions and events (M = 4.03) |
| Policies, Plans, and Procedures      | 4.29              | Highly Capable               | Development and implementation of comprehensive emergency response plans (M = 4.39)                                                                             | Identification and training of personnel for specific emergency roles (M = 4.16)                              |
| Capabilities and Mechanisms          | 4.23              | Highly Capable               | Implementation of systems for tracking and accounting for students and staff and establishment of partnerships with NGOs and community organizations (M = 4.36) | Installation of monitoring devices for weather and seismic events (M = 4.06)                                  |
| Overall Response Capability          | 4.26              | Highly Capable               | Human Resources obtained the highest grand mean (M = 4.32)                                                                                                      | Material Facilities obtained the lowest grand mean (M = 4.19)                                                 |

**Legend:** 1.00–1.50 Not Capable; 1.51–2.50 Less Capable; 2.51–3.50 Moderately Capable; 3.51–4.50 Highly Capable; 4.51–5.00 Very Highly Capable.

Policies, plans, and procedures ranked second with a grand mean of 4.29. This was also interpreted as Highly Capable. The highest-rated indicator was the development and implementation of comprehensive emergency response plans. This result shows that schools have written plans and procedures that guide their actions during emergencies. These documents help clarify communication, evacuation, reporting, and coordination processes. The finding supports Manabo (2023), who noted that clear policies and plans guide school response capability. It also agrees with Mamhot (2019), who stated that well-defined procedures help reduce confusion during disasters.

Knowledge, innovation, and education obtained a grand mean of 4.27. The highest-rated indicator was the regular conduct of DRRM drills and simulations for staff and students. This finding indicates that schools use drills and school-based learning activities to strengthen preparedness. It also shows that learners and personnel are given opportunities to practice safety procedures. This supports Valencia et al. (2019), who emphasized the integration of DRRM in education. It also agrees with Cubillas et al. (2022), who found that schools showed strong knowledge in disaster risk management and resilience education in different contexts.

Capabilities and mechanisms obtained a grand mean of 4.23. This result means that schools have working systems for early warning, learner tracking, coordination, partnerships, and post-incident evaluation. The highest-rated indicators were the systems for tracking students and staff during emergencies and the establishment of partnerships with NGOs and community organizations. These findings suggest that schools value accountability and external support during disaster situations. This supports Toledo et al. (2020), who described response mechanisms as systems that include emergency teams, drills, simulations, and communication networks.

Material facilities received the lowest grand mean of 4.19, although it was still interpreted as Highly Capable. The highest-rated indicator was the regular maintenance and inspection of facilities. This shows that schools check their physical environment to support safety and readiness. However, the lowest-rated indicator was the stockpiling of emergency supplies such as food, water, and medical kits. This implies that schools may have available facilities but still need stronger support for emergency materials and supply management.

This finding is consistent with Robielos et al. (2020), who noted that material facilities support immediate assistance during emergencies. It also reflects the finding of Tizon and Comighud (2019), who reported that material facilities often

rank lower because of limited DRRM funds. In the present study, material facilities were still rated highly capable. However, the lower mean suggests that resource availability remains a concern. Schools may need more support in emergency supplies, storage systems, first aid materials, communication tools, and facility improvement.

In general, the findings show that public elementary schools in the Division of Quezon are highly capable of responding to disasters. Their strongest area is human resources, while their lowest area is material facilities. This means that schools have capable people and working systems, but they still need stronger physical and material support. The proposed DRRM Sustainability Plan should sustain personnel training, emergency planning, drills, and partnerships. It should also strengthen safety marshal training, emergency supply stockpiling, monitoring devices, learner-led DRRM activities, and role-specific response preparation.

**Table 4: Respondent's Assessment on the Problems Encountered in the Implementation and Response Capabilities**

| Problems Encountered |                                              | Mean | Verbal Interpretation  |
|----------------------|----------------------------------------------|------|------------------------|
| 1                    | Limited Resources                            | 2.71 | Moderately Challenging |
| 2                    | Inadequate Training                          | 2.36 | Less Challenging       |
| 3                    | Infrastructure Vulnerability                 | 2.59 | Moderately Challenging |
| 4                    | Inactive Community Engagement                | 2.25 | Less Challenging       |
| 5                    | Lack of Awareness                            | 1.88 | Less Challenging       |
| 6                    | Inadequate Emergency Plans                   | 2.11 | Less Challenging       |
| 7                    | Communication Gaps                           | 2.07 | Less Challenging       |
| 8                    | Logistical Challenges                        | 2.40 | Less Challenging       |
| 9                    | Policy Misalignment                          | 1.93 | Less Challenging       |
| 10                   | Non-participation of the Community / Schools | 1.90 | Less Challenging       |
| Grand Mean:          |                                              | 2.22 | Less Challenging       |

**Legend:** "Not Challenging (1.00 – 1.50)", "Less Challenging (1.51 – 2.50)", "Moderately Challenging (2.51 – 3.50)", "Highly Challenging (3.51 – 4.50)", "Very Challenging (4.51 – 5.00)"

Table 4 shows that the problems encountered in DRRM implementation and response capabilities were generally Less Challenging. The overall grand mean was 2.22. This means that public elementary schools in the Division of Quezon have working systems that help them manage DRRM activities. Awareness was the least challenging area. This suggests that schools already conduct drills, orientations, classroom discussions, and safety reminders. However, limited resources and infrastructure vulnerability were rated as Moderately Challenging. These results show that schools are more prepared in awareness-building than in areas that require funding, facilities, equipment, and technical support.

The findings suggest that the main concerns are not basic knowledge alone but material and structural readiness. Limited resources may affect the availability of emergency kits, first aid supplies, signage, communication tools, and facility repairs. Infrastructure vulnerability may also expose schools to risks linked to typhoons, flooding, poor drainage, aging buildings, and other site-related hazards. These results support Manabo (2023), Bacus (2020), Garcia (2021), and Tolentino (2019), who found that lack of funds, limited equipment, damaged facilities, and unavailable resources affect school DRRM implementation. However, the present study differs from Bacus (2020), where lack of awareness was a major concern. In this study, awareness was the least challenging area. Therefore, the proposed DRRM Sustainability Plan should sustain awareness activities while giving stronger attention to resource allocation, facility safety, emergency supplies, technical assistance, and partnerships with local government units and community stakeholders.

Table 5 presents the chi-square test summary on the significant relationship between the respondents' profile and the level of DRRM implementation. The profile variables include age, sex, position, educational attainment, and school size. The DRRM implementation areas include disaster prevention and mitigation, disaster preparedness, disaster response, and disaster recovery and rehabilitation.

The results show that age had a significant relationship with all four areas of DRRM implementation. The null hypothesis was rejected for disaster prevention and mitigation, disaster preparedness, disaster response, and disaster recovery and rehabilitation. This means that respondents from different age groups assessed DRRM implementation differently. The finding implies that age groups may vary in their exposure to risk assessment, drills, emergency response, and

recovery activities. It supports Regis (2020) and Tolentino (2019), who found that age may relate to school personnel's DRRM practices. However, the result should be read only as an association. It does not prove that age directly causes better or weaker DRRM implementation.

**Table 5: Chi-Square Test Summary on the Significant Relationship Between Respondents' Profile and Level of DRRM Implementation**

| Profile Variable       | DRRM Implementation Area             | Chi-Square Value | p-value | Decision            | Remarks         |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------|---------|---------------------|-----------------|
| Age                    | Disaster Prevention and Mitigation   | 50.0847          | 0.0000  | Reject Ho           | Significant     |
|                        | Disaster Preparedness                | 115.1112         | 0.0000  | Reject Ho           | Significant     |
|                        | Disaster Response                    | 169.1407         | 0.0000  | Reject Ho           | Significant     |
|                        | Disaster Recovery and Rehabilitation | 259.9350         | 0.0000  | Reject Ho           | Significant     |
| Sex                    | Disaster Prevention and Mitigation   | 13.2610          | 0.0101  | Reject Ho           | Significant     |
|                        | Disaster Preparedness                | 4.9489           | 0.2926  | Failed to Reject Ho | Not Significant |
|                        | Disaster Response                    | 4.1163           | 0.3905  | Failed to Reject Ho | Not Significant |
|                        | Disaster Recovery and Rehabilitation | 6.1831           | 0.1859  | Failed to Reject Ho | Not Significant |
| Position               | Disaster Prevention and Mitigation   | 66.2764          | 0.0000  | Reject Ho           | Significant     |
|                        | Disaster Preparedness                | 160.4011         | 0.0000  | Reject Ho           | Significant     |
|                        | Disaster Response                    | 203.3171         | 0.0000  | Reject Ho           | Significant     |
|                        | Disaster Recovery and Rehabilitation | 279.5867         | 0.0000  | Reject Ho           | Significant     |
| Educational Attainment | Disaster Prevention and Mitigation   | 34.5518          | 0.0006  | Reject Ho           | Significant     |
|                        | Disaster Preparedness                | 57.8645          | 0.0000  | Reject Ho           | Significant     |
|                        | Disaster Response                    | 76.2110          | 0.0000  | Reject Ho           | Significant     |
|                        | Disaster Recovery and Rehabilitation | 100.6239         | 0.0000  | Reject Ho           | Significant     |
| School Size            | Disaster Prevention and Mitigation   | 114.6363         | 0.0000  | Reject Ho           | Significant     |
|                        | Disaster Preparedness                | 142.1660         | 0.0000  | Reject Ho           | Significant     |
|                        | Disaster Response                    | 140.6817         | 0.0000  | Reject Ho           | Significant     |
|                        | Disaster Recovery and Rehabilitation | 172.6541         | 0.0000  | Reject Ho           | Significant     |

Note. Significant if p-value  $\leq$  0.05. Not significant if p-value  $>$  0.05.

Sex showed a different pattern. It had a significant relationship only with disaster prevention and mitigation. It had no significant relationship with disaster preparedness, disaster response, and disaster recovery and rehabilitation. This means that male and female respondents differed only in their assessment of prevention and mitigation practices. Their views on preparedness, response, and recovery were generally similar. This partly differs from Regis (2020) and Tolentino (2019), who reported no significant difference in DRRM implementation when respondents were grouped by sex. The finding suggests that schools should continue giving equal DRRM roles to male and female personnel while checking if prevention and mitigation tasks are equally shared.

Position, educational attainment, and school size were significantly related to all four DRRM areas. These results suggest that school roles, professional preparation, and institutional size may shape how respondents view DRRM implementation. Teachers, school heads, administrative officers, and DRRM coordinators may have different levels of involvement in planning, drills, documentation, emergency action, and post-disaster recovery. This supports Cruz and Ormilla (2022), who emphasized the shared but different roles of school heads, DRRM teams, and school personnel in maintaining safe schools. It also agrees with Corpuz (2019), who found that school characteristics may relate to disaster risk management activities.

The significant relationship between educational attainment and all DRRM areas suggests that respondents with different educational backgrounds may assess school DRRM practices in different ways. This may be due to differences in professional training, exposure, and understanding of safety procedures. The result supports Regis (2020), who linked educational attainment and DRRM training with school DRRM implementation. However, it contrasts with Chung and Yen (2020), who found that educational level did not clearly affect disaster prevention experience, attitude, or skills. This shows that formal education should be supported by practical DRRM training, drills, and role-based learning.

Overall, the findings indicate that most profile variables were related to the assessment of DRRM implementation. Age, position, educational attainment, and school size were significantly related to all DRRM areas. Sex was significant only in disaster prevention and mitigation. These results imply that the proposed DRRM Sustainability Plan should not use a one-size-fits-all approach. It should consider the age group, work position, training background, and school size of the personnel involved. The plan should include role-specific training, school-size-based planning, inclusive participation, and practical support for prevention, preparedness, response, and recovery activities.

Table 6 presents the chi-square test summary on the significant relationship between the respondents' profile and the level of response capabilities of public elementary schools. The profile variables include age, sex, position, educational attainment, and school size. The response capability areas include human resources, material facilities, knowledge, innovation, and education, policies, plans, and procedures, and capabilities and mechanisms.

The results show that age had a significant relationship with all five areas of response capability. The null hypothesis was rejected in human resources, material facilities, knowledge, innovation, and education, policies, plans, and procedures, and capabilities and mechanisms. The highest chi-square value under age was recorded in policies, plans, and procedures. This means that respondents from different age groups varied in their assessment of school response systems. The finding implies that age groups may differ in their exposure to emergency planning, facility checking, drills, communication procedures, and disaster response activities. This supports Lalamonan and Comighud (2020), who emphasized the need for school personnel to develop skills in evacuation, first aid, and emergency coordination. It also agrees with Baluran (2023), who noted that trained personnel help reduce risks during emergencies.

Sex showed a mixed result. It had a significant relationship with material facilities, knowledge, innovation, and education, policies, plans, and procedures, and capabilities and mechanisms. However, sex had no significant relationship with human resources. This means that male and female respondents had similar assessments of personnel readiness and staff mobilization. Still, they differed in their assessment of facilities, DRRM learning activities, plans, and response systems. The result suggests that sex may be linked to the type of DRRM tasks or school activities encountered by the respondents. This partly supports Tolentino (2019) and Regis (2020), who found that sex did not strongly relate to some DRRM practices. However, the significant results in four areas show that local assignments and school roles may shape how male and female personnel view response capability.

Position had a significant relationship with all response capability areas. This indicates that teachers, school heads, master teachers, and administrative personnel assessed response capability differently. The highest chi-square value under position was found in material facilities. This suggests that respondents may view emergency supplies, evacuation areas, medical kits, signage, and communication tools based on their specific duties in school. Teachers may focus on learner safety and classroom needs. School heads may focus on planning, procurement, and coordination. Administrative personnel may focus on inventory, records, and logistical support. This finding supports Manabo (2023), who explained that clear roles and procedures help guide school response. It also agrees with Robielos et al. (2020), who stressed that facilities and equipment support immediate disaster action.

Educational attainment was also significantly related to all five areas of response capability. This means that respondents with different educational backgrounds did not assess school response capability in the same way. The highest chi-square value under educational attainment was recorded in material facilities. This may mean that respondents with different levels of formal education evaluated the adequacy of facilities and equipment from different perspectives. Some may focus on technical standards and policy compliance. Others may base their assessment on actual classroom and school conditions. The finding supports Tizon and Comighud (2019), who identified knowledge, innovation, and education as a key part of response capability. However, it contrasts with Chung and Yen (2020), who

found that educational level did not clearly affect disaster-related experience, attitude, or skills. This suggests that formal education should be supported by practical training and actual participation in DRRM activities.

**Table 6: Chi-Square Test Summary on the Significant Relationship Between Respondents' Profile and Level of Response Capabilities**

| Profile Variable       | Response Capability Area             | Chi-Square Value | p-value | Decision            | Remarks         |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------|---------|---------------------|-----------------|
| Age                    | Human Resources                      | 266.0616         | 0.0000  | Reject Ho           | Significant     |
|                        | Material Facilities                  | 139.9894         | 0.0000  | Reject Ho           | Significant     |
|                        | Knowledge, Innovation, and Education | 149.4708         | 0.0000  | Reject Ho           | Significant     |
|                        | Policies, Plans, and Procedures      | 266.9956         | 0.0000  | Reject Ho           | Significant     |
|                        | Capabilities and Mechanisms          | 186.9732         | 0.0000  | Reject Ho           | Significant     |
| Sex                    | Human Resources                      | 8.7651           | 0.0672  | Failed to Reject Ho | Not Significant |
|                        | Material Facilities                  | 16.8514          | 0.0021  | Reject Ho           | Significant     |
|                        | Knowledge, Innovation, and Education | 19.1847          | 0.0007  | Reject Ho           | Significant     |
|                        | Policies, Plans, and Procedures      | 9.9344           | 0.0415  | Reject Ho           | Significant     |
|                        | Capabilities and Mechanisms          | 27.2860          | 0.0000  | Reject Ho           | Significant     |
| Position               | Human Resources                      | 181.9701         | 0.0000  | Reject Ho           | Significant     |
|                        | Material Facilities                  | 212.7417         | 0.0000  | Reject Ho           | Significant     |
|                        | Knowledge, Innovation, and Education | 200.4945         | 0.0000  | Reject Ho           | Significant     |
|                        | Policies, Plans, and Procedures      | 167.8057         | 0.0000  | Reject Ho           | Significant     |
|                        | Capabilities and Mechanisms          | 207.6936         | 0.0000  | Reject Ho           | Significant     |
| Educational Attainment | Human Resources                      | 75.6060          | 0.0000  | Reject Ho           | Significant     |
|                        | Material Facilities                  | 122.6937         | 0.0000  | Reject Ho           | Significant     |
|                        | Knowledge, Innovation, and Education | 79.3717          | 0.0000  | Reject Ho           | Significant     |
|                        | Policies, Plans, and Procedures      | 55.6273          | 0.0000  | Reject Ho           | Significant     |
|                        | Capabilities and Mechanisms          | 55.9115          | 0.0000  | Reject Ho           | Significant     |
| School Size            | Human Resources                      | 134.3849         | 0.0000  | Reject Ho           | Significant     |
|                        | Material Facilities                  | 152.4057         | 0.0000  | Reject Ho           | Significant     |
|                        | Knowledge, Innovation, and Education | 133.4772         | 0.0000  | Reject Ho           | Significant     |
|                        | Policies, Plans, and Procedures      | 161.0630         | 0.0000  | Reject Ho           | Significant     |
|                        | Capabilities and Mechanisms          | 132.4842         | 0.0000  | Reject Ho           | Significant     |

Note. If the p-value is less than or equal to 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected. If the p-value is greater than 0.05, the null hypothesis is not rejected.

School size had a significant relationship with all response capability areas. This means that respondents from small, medium, large, and mega schools differed in their assessment of response capability. The highest chi-square value under school size was recorded in policies, plans, and procedures. This result implies that school size may affect how emergency plans, communication systems, evacuation procedures, and role assignments are carried out. Small schools may have simpler coordination because they have fewer learners and personnel. However, they may also have limited manpower and resources. Larger schools may have more personnel and facilities. Yet they need more detailed systems for crowd control, learner tracking, and safe dismissal. This finding supports Corpuz (2019), who linked school size and school conditions with disaster risk management practices.

Generally, the findings show that most respondent profile variables were significantly related to school response capabilities. Age, position, educational attainment, and school size were significantly related to all five capability areas. Sex was significant in four areas but not in human resources. These findings imply that response capability is shaped by both personal and school-related factors. The proposed DRRM Sustainability Plan should therefore consider personnel profile, school role, educational background, and school size. It should include role-based training, school-size-based planning, inclusive facility assessment, emergency supply management, and clear response procedures. These actions may help schools strengthen their capacity to respond to disasters in a more organized and practical way.

---

#### 4 CONCLUSION

The study concludes that public elementary schools in the Division of Quezon have established DRRM practices and response systems. The respondents were mostly young to middle-aged female teachers. Most were Teacher I–III, college graduates, and assigned in small schools. The DRRM Program was highly implemented in prevention and mitigation, preparedness, response, and recovery and rehabilitation. Disaster response appeared as the strongest area, while recovery and rehabilitation still needed further support. The schools were also highly capable in terms of human resources, material facilities, knowledge, policies, and response mechanisms. Human resources obtained the strongest rating, while material facilities had the lowest rating. Problems were generally less challenging, but limited resources and infrastructure vulnerability remained the main concerns. The significant relationships also showed that age, position, educational attainment, and school size were related to most areas of DRRM implementation and response capability. This means that school profile and personnel characteristics may shape how DRRM practices are carried out and assessed.

Considering the given conclusions, the study recommends a practical and school-based DRRM Sustainability Plan. DepEd officials, public schools district supervisors, school heads, and DRRM coordinators may sustain regular risk assessments, drills, awareness campaigns, emergency planning, and post-disaster reporting. More support may be given to recovery planning, learner reintegration, mental health support, damage assessment, repair requests, and partnerships with LGUs and NGOs. Since material facilities received the lowest response capability rating, schools may improve emergency supplies, first aid kits, fire safety equipment, storage areas, signage, and facility inspection systems. Priority may be given to small schools and schools with damaged facilities, poor drainage, erosion risks, unsafe structures, and limited equipment. DRRM tasks may also be assigned according to position, training, experience, and school size. Teachers and learners may take more active roles in classroom safety checks, hazard mapping, preparedness lessons, awareness campaigns, and proper drill practices. Future researchers may conduct qualitative studies on DRRM sustainability, LGU support, emergency resources, and the long-term effect of DRRM training in public elementary schools.

---

#### STATEMENTS ON COMPLIANCE WITH ETHICAL STANDARDS

##### *Acknowledgments*

A special thank you to the **Department of Education in the Division of Quezon** for granting me the opportunity to conduct this study and for providing essential data and support. I am also thankful to the **school heads, DRRM coordinators, and other respondents** who participated in this study, contributing their valuable time and insights.

##### *Funding Source*

Details of funding source must be inserted here.

---

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Bacus, J. B. (2020). Disaster risk reduction management in Carcar Central Elementary School Cebu City. Central Mindanao University Journal of Science, 1, 19–25.

[https://js.cmu.edu.ph/uploads/disaster\\_risk\\_reduction\\_management\\_in\\_carcar\\_central\\_elementary\\_school\\_cebu\\_city.pdf](https://js.cmu.edu.ph/uploads/disaster_risk_reduction_management_in_carcar_central_elementary_school_cebu_city.pdf)

- [2] Baluran, A. G. S. (2023). The level of disaster risk reduction and management (DRRM) program implementation among public elementary schools: Basis for a proposed “Our School, Our Safe Zone” program. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 10(6). <http://oapub.org/edu/index.php/ejes/article/view/4859>
- [3] Benis, R. C., Jr., & Santos, M. A. I. (2020). DRR intensive and frequent active training (IFACT) in students and teachers: Increased DRR preparedness.
- [4] Chung, S.-C., & Yen, C.-J. (2016). Disaster prevention literacy among school administrators and teachers: A study on the plan for disaster prevention and campus network deployment and experiment in Taiwan. *Journal of Life Sciences*, 10, 203–214. <https://doi.org/10.17265/1934-7391/2016.04.006>
- [5] Comighud, S. M. (2020). Implementation of the public schools disaster risk reduction management program and level of capabilities to respond. *International Journal of Science and Research*. <https://doi.org/10.21275/SR20404215026>
- [6] Corpuz, A. C. (2019). Disaster risk management practices and readiness for disasters among selected schools in City of Biñan, Laguna, Philippines. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 9(3), 62–70.
- [7] Cruz, R. D. D., & Ormilla, 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*, 4(2), 1–15. <https://www.cceol.com/search/article-detail?id=1087257>
- [8] Cubillas, A. U., Aviles, G. M., & Cubillas, T. E. (2022). Awareness, compliance and implementation of disaster risk reduction and management in flood-prone public elementary schools in Butuan City, Philippines. *International Journal of Educational Policy Research and Review*, 9(5), 157. <https://journalissues.org/ijepr/abstract/awareness-compliance-and-implementation-of-disaster-risk-reduction-and-management-in-flood-prone-public-elementary-schools-in-butuan-city-philippines/>
- [9] Department of Education. (2015). DepEd Order No. 37, s. 2015: The Comprehensive Disaster Risk Reduction and Management in Basic Education Framework. Department of Education.
- [10] Epe, R. B. (2023). Children and disaster risk reduction: Building resilience from education, local government units, and communities. In *Disasters in the Philippines* (pp. 88–112). Bristol University Press. <https://bristoluniversitypressdigital.com/edcollchap/book/9781529222920/ch005.xml>
- [11] Garcia, M. S. (2021). Status and implementation of disaster risk reduction management in flood-prone schools in the Division of Laguna (Technical report). National Economic and Development Authority–Calabarzon.
- [12] Lalamonan, E. N., & Comighud, S. M. (2020). Awareness and implementation of solid waste management (SWM) practices. *IJRDO-Journal of Educational Research*, 5(5), 11–43.
- [13] Mamhot, K. (2019). Extent of implementation of disaster risk reduction management and stakeholders’ participation. Foundation University.
- [14] Manabo, C. E. (2023). Risk reduction and disaster preparedness (RRDP) program implementation of the public academic institutions in Carmona, Cavite. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 14(5), 564–576. [https://scimatic.org/show\\_manuscript/2129](https://scimatic.org/show_manuscript/2129)
- [15] Manalo, R. G. M. V., & Manalo, M. V. (2020). Exploring the gap in implementing the Philippine Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Law (RA 10121) in the K–12 senior high school institutions’ curricula. De La Salle University Research Congress 2020. <https://www.dlsu.edu.ph/wp-content/uploads/pdf/conferences/research-congress-proceedings/2020/FNH-07.pdf>
- [16] Mohanty, A., Hussain, M., Mishra, M., Kattel, D. B., & Pal, I. (2019). Exploring community resilience and early warning solution for flash floods, debris flow and landslides in conflict-prone villages of Badakhshan, Afghanistan. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 33, 5–15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2018.07.012>
- [17] Regis, D. (2020). Implementation of the school disaster risk reduction management in public elementary schools in Region VIII. *SABTON: Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 2(1), 48–61. <https://journal.evsu.edu.ph/index.php/sabton-mrj/article/view/312>
- [18] Robielos, R. A. C., Lin, C. J., Senoro, D. B., & Ney, F. P. (2020). Development of vulnerability assessment framework for disaster risk reduction at three levels of geopolitical units in the Philippines. *Sustainability*, 12(21), 8815. <https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/12/21/8815>

- [19] Ryan, B., Johnston, K. A., Taylor, M., & McAndrew, R. (2020). Community engagement for disaster preparedness: A systematic literature review. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 49, 101655. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2020.101655>
- [20] Shah, A. A., Gong, Z., Ali, M., Sun, R., Naqvi, S. A. A., & Arif, M. (2020). Looking through the lens of schools: Children perception, knowledge, and preparedness of flood disaster risk management in Pakistan. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 50, 101907. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2020.101907>
- [21] Tizon, R. T., & Comighud, S. M. T. (2020). Implementation of the public schools' disaster risk reduction management program and level of capabilities to respond. <https://knowledgecenter.ubt-uni.net/conference/2020/ed/1/>
- [22] Toledo, R., Tantoy, O., & Paraiso, R. (2020). Development of disaster risk management and mitigation extension program for school-aged children in the province of Bukidnon. *Asia Pacific Journal of Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 18, 61–75.
- [23] Tolentino, K. (2021). Education in emergency: The school managers' practices on risk reduction and management of disaster. *Journal of Education, Management and Development Studies*, 1(1), 10–23. <https://journals.cspc.edu.ph/index.php/jemds/article/view/5>
- [24] Valencia, M. I., Ali, M., Maryani, E., & Supriatna, N. (2019). Integration of disaster risk reduction in the curriculum of Philippine educational institution. In 3rd Asian Education Symposium (AES 2018) (pp. 463–468). Atlantis Press. <https://www.atlantis-press.com/proceedings/aes-18/55917397>