

World Journal on Education and Humanities Research

Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International

Vol. 1, Issue 3, pp. 27-36

Received, May2022; Revised July 2022;

Accepted July2022

DOI: <https://doi.10.5281/zenodo.6982438>

PROGRESSIVE EXPANSION OF THE LIMITED FACE TO FACE INSTRUCTION

Verna Orit*, Daphne Olimba, Diana Mae Dihayco, Arselene Pardillo, Charlet May Petalco, Herbert Sandoval, Jr., Jessa Christie Casquejo, Dufny Jane Apurado, Edgar Tibay, Pedrito Ocha, Ma. Adela Bergamo

Corresponding Author: Vernaorit@gmail.com

Abstract: This study assessed the school readiness on the implementation of the limited-face-to-face in the identified schools in the division of Lapu-Lapu. The researchers used the descriptive research method to gather information about the respondents' demographic profile. The data obtained were analyzed using percentage weighted mean, significant difference for the extent of implementation with 0.05 level of significance. Based on the findings it can be noted that teachers and administrators have different perception on the status on the implementation of the limited face to face. The finding of the study is crucial in understanding the teachers and administrators' point of view due to their presence and active participation in the limited face to face. Thus, the findings of this study propose an action plan that address the challenges in limited face to face in order to maximize the potential benefits of the said intervention program.

Keywords: Limited-face-to-face, Safety Protocols, Administration and Supervision, Progressive Expansion

1. Introduction

The most important challenge for the global education system in the last century was posed at the end of 2019 by the outbreak of the new coronavirus pandemic. No less than 1.6 billion people involved in the education system in over 190 countries and covering all continents of the world have suffered from the closure of schools, the entire shutdown process happening by May 2020 (UN, 2020). The main ally to protect all those involved in the education system also offering the possibility of an alternative didactic process turned out to be technology. It was the answer coming from some generalized and dominant public policies that wanted to be resilient and ready to offer an alternative to face-to-face learning.

During the COVID-19 pandemic, e-learning has turned into an important alternative for reforming the entire traditional education system. Both teachers and students have had to change their behaviors, their teaching/learning style, assessment methods, and

so forth (Suson et al., 2020; Gherhes et al., 2021). This reform has brought about several benefits, but has caused tensions and frustrations among both the beneficiaries of the teaching act and the educational actors. E-learning has shown that it is necessary to model the behaviors of all parties involved. In order to streamline the educational process, especially the one carried out in the university environment, creative and constructive interventions are required. These would solve specific problems and could lead to ensuring the sustainability of education.

Most of the studies carried out in the field focus on the advantages and disadvantages of e-learning vs. face-to-face learning (Naveed et al., 2017; Tagoe, 2012). Naved et al. (2017) argue that, unlike face-to-face learning, e-learning has its advantages, such as flexibility, no need to travel to school, and a low cost, requiring only an Internet connection. However, this does not mean that e-learning does not have its shortcomings, such as inequities in accessing technology or learning computer skills, or even a lack of physical space for this teaching/learning process (Beaunoyer et al., 2020; Suson, 2019). E-learning is dependent on technology, the Internet, and various devices that not all potential beneficiaries can access (Sadeghi, 2019). Students' experience of quality learning is not only related to the teachers' skills and abilities to capture attention during the e-learning process but also to their own training, characteristics, and digital skills (Haznedar et al., 2021).

Moreover, in e-learning, physical space should foster involvement in interpersonal relationships, thus encouraging didactic communication (Lowentha & Snelson, 2017). In addition, some studies show that e-learning does not have the same impact as face-to-face learning (Galy et al., 2011). It seems that online students may lose their focus and miss deadlines for different tasks. Over time, both teachers and students may experience various negative effects from e-learning, such as sight problems (due to long periods in front of the screen) or back pain, and, at the same time, they may feel the lack of activities in open spaces (Nazarlou, 2013).

In the Philippines, the government's Department of Education has come up with guidelines to implement online and modular distance learning delivery of instruction. This is to safeguard students from being infected by the disease. However, plans to conduct the pilot implementation of limited face-to-face delivery in low-risk areas of COVID-19 transmission for January 2021 have been approved by the president but later recalled due to the threat of the new strain of COVID-19.

Predicaments are raised whether the country is ready to open its schools for students to go for face-to-face learning despite having been one of the longest and strictest lockdowns in the world. School reopening for face-to-face interactions must be carefully planned to ensure the safety of students as well as teachers and school staff in a staged fashion especially in following physical distancing. Planning and execution of school health protocols during this pandemic must be supported by the truthful data being given by various institutions (Sarmiento et al., 2021).

In line with the pilot implementation of limited face-to-face classes in select low-risk areas in the country, the Department of Education (DepEd) and the Department of Health (DOH) have identified mechanisms to ensure safety of participating learners, teaching and non-teaching staff, and their families. The pilot implementation will be done among a maximum of 120 schools across the country, recognizing the need to safely reopen schools and that schools cannot operate in silos, DepEd and DOH worked hand-in-hand. This study assessed the readiness of the school in providing safety environment for the learners in the pilot testing of face to face.

2. Purpose of the Study

This study assessed the progressive on the implementation of the limited-face-to-face in the identified schools in the division of Lapu-Lapu for the School Year 2021-2022 as basis for a safe and healthy environment guide. Moreover, it addressed the status of the implementation of the limited face to face instructions as to the following aspects: preparation for school reopening, school traffic management, communication strategy, contingency plan and school-community coordination. The significant difference between respondents' perceptions on the level of implementation of limited face to face instructions was also treated.

3. Research Methodology

The researchers used the descriptive research method to gather information about the school readiness in implementing the limited face to face together with sets of questionnaires as data gathering instruments. The data gathered were treated by the aid of statistical software utilizing 0.05 level of significance. The results served as bases for promoting action that promote safe and healthy environment in times of extended covid-19 pandemic. The research started on the orientation of the respondents on current study. The researcher used the INPUT-PROCESS-OUTPUT approach. Figure 2 shows the flow of the study. The input included the teacher's and administrators' profile in terms of age and gender, civil status, educational attainment, length of service, and number of relevant training and seminars attended. It also addresses the following main problem; preparation for school reopening, school traffic management, communication strategy, contingency plan, school-community coordination, it also includes the significant mean difference of the group respondents. The process included the dissemination of questionnaires, data gathering, data consolidation, presentation, data analysis, and data presentation using appropriate statistical computation.

The respondents of the study were the teachers and their administrator at the identified school in the identified schools. The respondents were chosen from a target population; hence, purposive sampling was utilized in this study. The main questionnaire of this study will be adapted from the guidelines on the progressive expansion of face-to-face classes based on the DepEd order no. 017, s. 2022. These guidelines seek to provide guidance to schools on the mechanisms and standards of the F2F classes and ensure their effective, efficient, and safe implementation. This is anchored on the same shared responsibility principle which was introduced and adopted during the pilot implementation.

4. Results and Discussions

Table 1 presents the data in terms of Preparations for School Reopening. Data shows that the statement refers to the school involve the community in the school reopening process to shape the perceptions of risks and effectively respond to the health crises through localized efforts got the highest weighted mean of 4.00 which verbally described as agree, while the statements refer to, the school adjust class programs according to their Alternative Work Arrangements (AWA) and conduct an orientation of teaching personnel on possible changes in their AWA, the school s monitor and update the COVID-19 vaccination status of the learners through DepEd Learners Information System (LIS) and the school involve the various levels of community

governance - customary community leaders in the case of IP and Muslim communities; the barangay, municipal, and provincial leaders - in the school reopening process to shape the perceptions of risks and effectively respond to the health crises through localized efforts. Continuing dialogue with the immediate community where the school is located is crucial since managing day-to-day risks and concerns will primarily be with the immediate community got the lowest weighted mean of 3.33 which verbally described as agree

Table 1. Preparations for School Reopening

Preparations for School Reopening	Teachers		Administrator	
	Mean	VD	Mean	VD
The school involve the community in the school reopening process to shape the perceptions of risks and effectively respond to the health crises through localized efforts.	4.00	A	3.75	A
The school adjust class programs according to their Alternative Work Arrangements (AWA) and conduct an orientation of teaching personnel on possible changes in their AWA.	3.33	A	3.15	A
The school s monitor and update the COVID-19 vaccination status of the learners through DepEd Learners Information System (LIS)	3.33	A	3.55	A
The school conduct simulation activities among school personnel regarding protocols and routines to replicate and discuss possible scenarios during the actual conduct of face-to-face classes	3.67	A	3.55	A
The school involve the various levels of community governance - customary community leaders in the case of IP and Muslim communities; the barangay, municipal, and provincial leaders - in the school reopening process to shape the perceptions of risks and effectively respond to the health crises through localized efforts. Continuing dialogue with the immediate community where the school is located is crucial since managing day-to-day risks and concerns will primarily be with the immediate community.	3.33	A	3.40	A
Grand Mean	3.52	A	3.54	A

While administrators on the other hand, the school involve the community in the school reopening process to shape the perceptions of risks and effectively respond to the health crises through localized efforts got the highest weighted mean of 3.75 which verbally described as agree, while the statement refers to the school adjust class programs according to their Alternative Work Arrangements (AWA) and conduct an orientation of teaching personnel on possible changes in their AWA got the lowest weighted mean of 3.15 which verbally described as agree.

Table 2 presents the data in terms of School Traffic Management. Data shows that the statements refer to school map at the front gate indicating the location of the classrooms (this may also be used as a guide for points of exit/ evacuation during emergencies) and designated waiting area for parents/ guardians/ chaperones with strict observation of physical distancing at all times. Limit to one person allowed to fetch per learner got the highest weighted mean of 3.67 which verbally described as agree, while the statement refers to, the school establish safe entrance, exit, crowd management

measures, and contact tracing procedures for all those entering school premises (learners, teachers, parents/ guardians, school personnel, etc.) Likewise, drop-off and pick-up points shall be clearly identified and marked got the lowest weighted mean of 3.40 which verbally described as agree.

Table 2. School Traffic Management

School Traffic Management	Teachers		Administrator	
	Mean	VD	Mean	VD
The school establish safe entrance, exit, crowd management measures, and contact tracing procedures for all those entering school premises.	3.40	A	3.55	A
School map at the front gate indicating the location of the classrooms (this may also be used as a guide for points of exit/ evacuation during emergencies)	3.67	A	3.55	A
Instructions for entrance and exit (for the school gate and classrooms)	3.60	A	3.55	A
Designated waiting area for parents/ guardians/ chaperones with strict observation of physical distancing at all times.	3.67	A	3.55	A
Hallway ground markings for walking direction guide	3.63	A	3.40	A
Grand Mean	3.52	A	3.54	A

While administrators on the other hand, the school establish safe entrance, exit, crowd management measures, and contact tracing procedures for all those entering school premises (learners, teachers, parents/ guardians, school personnel, etc.) Likewise, drop-off and pick-up points shall be clearly identified and marked, School map at the front gate indicating the location of the classrooms (this may also be used as a guide for points of exit/ evacuation during emergencies), instructions for entrance and exit (for the school gate and classrooms) and designated waiting area for parents/ guardians/ chaperones with strict observation of physical distancing at all times. Limit to one person allowed to fetch per learner got the highest weighted mean of 3.55 which verbally described as agree, while the statement refers to hallway ground markings for walking direction guide got the lowest weighted mean of 3.40 which verbally described as strongly agree.

Table 3. Communication Strategy

Communication Strategy	Teachers		Administrator	
	Mean	VD	Mean	VD
The school set up a proactive COVID-19 local hotline/helpdesk that connects to and coordinates with hospitals/LGUs	4.00	A	3.75	A
Advisers maintain a database of contact information for parents/guardians of children in their class advisory	3.43	MA	3.15	MA
The school establish feedback mechanisms for parents, guardians, and communicate members	3.20	MA	3.55	A
For communication collaterals (e.g., posters, signboards, brochures), schools can use PAS-developed Face to Face Classes graphics and templates by accessing https://bit.ly/LimitedF2FCommsResources .	3.67	A	3.55	MA
Grand Mean	3.58	A	3.50	A

Table 3 presents the data in terms of Communication Strategy. Data shows that the statement refers to the school set up a proactive COVID-19 local hotline/helpdesk that connects to and coordinates with hospitals/LGUs got the highest weighted mean of 4.00 which verbally described as agree, while the statement refers to, the school establish feedback mechanisms for parents, guardians, and communicate members on issues relative to the implementation of face-to-face classes got the lowest weighted mean of 3.20 which verbally described as moderately agree. While administrators on the other hand, the school set up a proactive COVID-19 local hotline/helpdesk that connects to and coordinates with hospitals/LGUs got the highest weighted mean of 3.75 which verbally described as agree, while the statement refers to Advisers maintain a database of contact information for parents/guardians of children in their class advisory, including phone numbers and addresses, subject to compliance with RA No. 10173 or the Data Privacy Act got the lowest weighted mean of 3.15 which verbally described as moderately agree.

Table 4. Contingency Plan

Contingency Plan	Teachers		Administrator	
	Mean	VD	Mean	VD
The school follow a decision model and prepare a contingency plan for closing and reopening the school in case of COVID-19 resurgence. Separate guidelines will be issued as support for the preparation of the Schools Contingency Plan.	3.33	MA	3.45	A
The contingency plan also includes the strategies for the continuity of learning while face to face classes are suspended until the local authorities have determined the safe resumption of face-to-face classes.	3.00	MA	3.20	MA
The protocols contained in the contingency plan shall be aligned to the existing guidelines issued by concerned government agencies	3.67	A	3.40	A
The contingency plan includes the following: school suspension, distance learning modalities during suspension, and strategies for the reopening of schools after the suspensions.	3.60	A	3.15	MA
Grand Mean	3.4	A	3.3	A

Table 4 presents the data in terms of Contingency Plan. Data shows that the statement refers to the protocols contained in the contingency plan shall be aligned to the existing guidelines issued by concerned government agencies got the highest weighted mean of 3.67 which verbally described as agree, while the statement refers to, the contingency plan also includes the strategies for the continuity of learning while face to face classes are suspended until the local authorities have determined the safe resumption of face-to-face classes got the lowest weighted mean of 3.00 which verbally described as moderately agree. While administrators on the other hand, the school follow a decision model and prepare a contingency plan for closing and reopening the school in case of COVID-19 resurgence. Separate guidelines will be issued as support for the preparation of the Schools Contingency Plan got the highest weighted mean of 3.45 which verbally described as agree, while the statement refers to the contingency plan includes the following: school suspension, distance learning modalities during suspension, and

strategies for the reopening of schools after the suspensions got the lowest weighted mean of 3.15 which verbally described as moderately agree.

Table 5. School- Community Coordination

School- Community Coordination	Teachers		Administrator	
	Mean	VD	Mean	VD
The school establish coordination mechanisms with the Barangay Health Emergency Response Team (BHERT) of the local Government Unit (LGU) in ensuring health protocols are observed properly.	3.60	MA	3.80	A
The school operationalize the Preventive Alert System in Schools (PASS) (Enclosure No. 4 to DepEd Memorandum No. O15, s. 2020).	3.42	A	3.30	A
The school ensure that a health personnel or designated "clinic teacher" is physically present at the school clinic during school days.	3.00	MA	3.40	A
The school orient parents/guardians about health and safety protocols in school and at home (e.g., pick-up and drop-off, minimum health and safety requirements, reinforcing health and safety protocols at home)	4.00	A	3.45	A
The school establish home-school coordination on reporting the health status of learners.	3.40	MA	3.40	A

Table 5 presents the data in terms of School- Community Coordination. Data shows that the statement refers to the school orient parents/guardians about health and safety protocols in school and at home (e.g., pick-up and drop-off, minimum health and safety requirements, reinforcing health and safety protocols at home) got the highest weighted mean of 4.00 which verbally described as agree, while the statement refers to, the school ensure that a health personnel or designated "clinic teacher" is physically present at the school clinic during school days got the lowest weighted mean of 3.00 which verbally described as moderately agree. While administrators on the other hand, the school establish coordination mechanisms with the Barangay Health Emergency Response Team (BHERT) of the local Government Unit (LGU) in ensuring health protocols are observed properly got the highest weighted mean of 3.80 which verbally described as agree, while the statement refers to the school operationalize the Preventive Alert System in Schools (PASS) (Enclosure No. 4 to DepEd Memorandum No. O15, s. 2020). The teacher shall ensure that health inspection is routinely conducted during the conduct of the face-to-face classes got the lowest weighted mean of 3.30 which verbally described as agree.

Table 6. Test of significant difference

Constructs	Mean	P value	Remarks	Decision
Preparation of School Reopening	Teacher= 3.53 administrators= 3.48	0.764725	significant	Reject
School Traffic Management	Teacher= 3.59 administrators= 3.52	0.246603	significant	Reject
Communication Strategy	Teacher= 3.575 Students= 3.5	0.73607	significant	Reject
Contingency Plan	Teacher= 3.4 Students= 3.3	0.5859	significant	Reject
School-community Coordination	Teacher= 3.505 Students=3.4875	0.943332	significant	Reject

Table 6 shows the significant difference on the teacher perception on the status of the limited face to face. Data shows that all aspects of limited face to face have a higher value compare to the P-value. Finding shows that all constructs were significant, thus the null hypothesis was rejected. Hence, there is a significant difference on the respondent's perception.

5. Conclusion

Based on the findings it can be noted that teachers and administrators have different perception on the status on the implementation of the limited face to face. The finding of the study is crucial in understanding the teachers and administrators' point of view due to their presence and active participation in the limited face to face. Thus, the findings of this study propose an action plan that address the challenges in limited face to face in order to maximize the potential benefits of the said intervention program.

References

- Arbeit 4.0 (2015), Megatrends digitaler Arbeit – 25 Thesen, Ergebnisse eines Projekts von Shareground und der Universität St. Gallen, Retrieved May 16, 2016 from <https://www.telekom.com/static/-/285820/1/150902-Studie-St.-Gallen-si>
- Alemi, Mino. 2016. General Impacts of Integrating Advanced and Modern Technologies on Teaching English as a Foreign Language. *International Journal on Integrating Technology in Education* 5: 13–26.
- Anggraeni, Candradewi Wahyu. 2018. Promoting Education 4.0 in English for Survival Class: What are the Challenges? *Metathesis-Journal of English Language, Literature, and Teaching* 2: 12–24.
- Beaunoyer, E.; Dupéré, S.; Guitton, M.J. COVID-19 and digital inequalities: Reciprocal impacts and mitigation strategies. *Comput. Hum. Behav.* 2020, 111, 106424.
- Diwan, P. (2017). Is Education 4.0 an imperative for success of 4th Industrial Revolution? Accessed from <https://medium.com/@pdiwan/is-education-4-0-an-imperative-for-success-of-4th-industrial-revolution-50c31451e8a4>
- Dunwill, E. (2016). 4 changes that will shape the classroom of the future: Making education fully technological. Accessed from <https://elearningindustry.com/4-changes-will-shape-classroom-of-the-future-making-education-fully-technological>.
- OECD. (2020). Strengthening online learning when schools are closed: The role of families and teachers in supporting students during the COVID-19 crisis.
- Policy Brief Education during Covid-19 and Beyond.UN Report August 2020. Available online: https://www.un.org/development/desa/dspd/wp-content/uploads/sites/22/2020/08/sg_policy_brief_covid-19_and_education_august_2020.pdf (accessed on 15 March 2021).
- Eom, S. B., & Ashill, N. (2016). The determinants of students' perceived learning outcomes and satisfaction in university online education: An update. *Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education*, 14(2), 185-215.
- Galy, E.; Downey, C.; Johnson, J. The effect of using e-learning tools in online and campus-based classrooms on student performance. *J. Inf. Technol. Educ.* 2011, 10, 209–230.

- Gherheș, V., Stoian, C. E., Fărcașiu, M. A., & Stanici, M. (2021). E-learning vs. face-to-face learning: Analyzing students' preferences and behaviors. *Sustainability*, 13(8), 4381.
- Kaptelinin, V., Kuutti, K. & Bannon, L. (1995). Activity theory: basic concepts and applications: a summary of the tutorial given at the east west HCI95 conference. In Brad Blumenthal, Juri Gornostaev & Claus Unger, (Eds.). *Human-computer interaction* (pp. 189-201). Berlin/Heidelberg: Springer. (Lecture notes in computer science, 1015/1995).
- Lowenthal, P.R.; Snelson, C. In search of a better understanding of social presence: An investigation into how researchers define social presence. *Distance Educ.* 2017, 38, 141–159.
- Maryam, F.K., & Halili S.H., (2015). Podcast acceptance to enhance learning science vocabulary among Iranian elementary students. *The Online Journal of Distance Education and e-Learning*, 3 (4), 51-60.
- Sadeghi, M.A. Shift from classroom to distance learning: Advantages and limitations. *Int. J. Res. Engl. Educ.* 2019, 4, 80–88.
- Sailer, M., & Homner, L. (2020). The gamification of learning: A meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review*, 32(1), 77-112.
- Sarmiento, P. J. D., Sarmiento, C. L. T., & Tolentino, R. L. B. (2021). Face-to-face classes during COVID-19: a call for deliberate and well-planned school health protocols in the Philippine context. *Journal of Public Health*, 43(2), e305-e306.
- Suson, R. L. (2019). Appropriating digital citizenship in the context of basic education. *International Journal of Education, Learning and Development*, 7(4), 44-66.
- Suson, R., Baratbate, C., Anooos, W., Ermac, E., Aranas, A. C., Malabago, N., ... & Capuyan, D. (2020). Differentiated Instruction for Basic Reading Comprehension in Philippine Settings. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 8(9), 3814-3824.
- Tagoe, M. Students' perceptions on incorporating e-learning into teaching and learning at the University of Ghana. *Int. J. Educ. Dev. Using Inf. Commun. Technology*

Copyright (c) 2022. Author (s). This is an open term of Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). To view a copy of this license, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>