



American Journal of Arts and Human Science (AJAHS)

ISSN: 2832-451X (ONLINE)

VOLUME 4 ISSUE 2 (2025)



PUBLISHED BY
E-PALLI PUBLISHERS, DELAWARE, USA

Implementation of School-Based Learning Action Cell on Teaching and Learning Practices

Norjannah Macapodi¹, Gina Labitad¹

Article Information

Received: December 15, 2024

Accepted: January 18, 2025

Published: April 18, 2025

Keywords

*School-Based Learning Action Cell,
Teaching and Learning Practices*

ABSTRACT

This study explores the implementation of the School-Based Learning Action Cell (SLAC) in Munai and Bacolod Districts, Division of Lanao del Norte, during the School Year 2024-2025. The Learning Action Cell (LAC), a key component of the Department of Education's (DepEd) professional development programs, was assessed based on needs assessment, topic prioritization, formation of LACs, interventions, meeting schedules, resource allocation, task assignments, budget preparation, LAC plans, and monitoring and evaluation. It also evaluated teaching and learning practices concerning content knowledge, pedagogy, ethics, learner inclusion, ICT integration, and contextualized instruction. Four hundred twenty-three (423) elementary and secondary teachers participated through universal sampling, ensuring the inclusion of those with direct LAC experience. A descriptive-correlational research design was employed, using mean, percentage, standard deviation, and Pearson r correlation to analyze data. The study utilized a modified DepEd Order No. 35, s. 2016 questionnaire and a researcher-made tool. Findings highlight the importance of addressing teachers' needs, ICT integration, and robust monitoring frameworks. Learner inclusion and differentiated strategies were underscored as crucial areas for improvement. Effective LAC implementation requires ongoing support, adequate resources, and training to enhance teaching practices and meet diverse learner needs. Recommendations include developing culturally relevant teaching materials, allocating time for LAC sessions, promoting professional development, and incorporating student feedback to foster inclusivity. Situated Learning Theory, emphasizing active participation in real-world tasks, was applied, emphasizing the value of authentic, context-rich experiences in improving teaching and learning.

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

In the swiftly changing educational landscape, ongoing professional development for educators is crucial to guarantee superior instruction and comprehensive student growth. One effective approach to professional development is the implementation of School-Based Learning Action Cell (LAC), collaborative groups of teachers who meet regularly to discuss, plan, and implement strategies aimed at improving teaching practices and student learning outcomes. The Department of Education (DepEd) in the Philippines has institutionalized LAC under its K to 12 Basic Education Program, highlighting its importance in enhancing teaching practices and learning outcomes (DepEd Order No. 35, s. 2016). The Curriculum Management Support System (CMSS) in Lanao del Norte has been observed to perform inadequately, raising concerns about its effectiveness in managing and delivering the curriculum. Addressing these challenges, this research explores whether the structured, collaborative nature of LAC can enhance CMSS effectiveness. Through professional development activities and collaborative efforts, LAC can help educators better utilize the CMSS, share best practices, and provide ongoing feedback for improvement, contributing to enhanced educational quality. Recent studies support collaborative professional

development methods as critical for improving teaching practices and student outcomes. Darling-Hammond *et al.* (2019) emphasize that professional learning communities, like LAC, provide a structured environment for reflective practice and group inquiry, enabling teachers to enhance teaching tactics and student engagement. Similarly, Vescio *et al.* (2020) found that regular, structured collaborative activities, such as those facilitated by LAC, lead to improved teaching strategies and student learning experiences, fostering a culture of ongoing professional development.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Implementation of School-Based Learning Action Cell

The establishment of the Teachers' School-Based Learning Action Cell is now a fundamental component of teacher professional development. Teachers can share best practices, solve problems with instruction, and improve their teaching abilities by working together in a collaborative learning environment, which Learning Action Cell are meant to promote. Özdemir (2019) claims that through regular, targeted meetings, Learning Action Cell fosters peer-led professional advancement by providing an organized atmosphere for continual improvement. By equipping educators with practical, context-specific solutions, this strategy helps to improve overall student results and adjust to changing educational demands.

¹ Department of Education, Philippines

* Corresponding author's email: nogu.macapodi.coc@phinmaed.com

Assessment of Needs

An exhaustive evaluation of teachers' professional development needs is the initial step towards the effective execution of the School-Based Learning Action Cell. Darling-Hammond *et al.* (2020) emphasize that needs assessments should cover various topics, such as technology use, instructional techniques, and content understanding, ensuring relevance and engagement. Barrot (2019) highlights the importance of contextualized training tailored to local educational challenges. Teacher attitudes also play a significant role in the success of the Learning Action Cell. Fullan (2019) stresses that positive attitudes towards collaborative learning and professional development are essential, as resistance to change can hinder progress.

Prioritization of Topics or Agenda

Much emphasis has been placed on the topic or agenda prioritization in deploying school-based learning action cells for instructors. To enhance the impact of professional learning communities, Smith, Johnson, and Williams (2021) support a participative strategy that emphasizes cooperative decision-making and alignment with school goals. In their comparison of various agenda-prioritizing strategies, Chen and Wang (2020) emphasize the value of adaptable facilitation, data-driven decision-making, and continuous reflection in fostering teacher engagement and development.

Formation of Learning Action Cell

Knowledge of how teachers emerge and function as essential to professional growth in educational institutions has received significant attention. Johnson and Martinez (2021) conduct a case study analyzing the creation and impact of Learning Action Cells, emphasizing the interaction between teacher agency, organizational culture, and leadership support in shaping effective professional development programs. Chen and Wang (2019) highlight how teacher involvement in Learning Action Cells fosters reflective practice and continuous professional development, emphasizing collaborative inquiry.

Identification of Appropriate Intervention

There has been a steady increase in research on identifying suitable treatments for teachers to apply through the School-Based Learning Action Cell, indicating a strong desire to maximize professional development techniques in educational environments. Garcia and Lopez (2021) analyze various intervention strategies, such as peer observation and instructional coaching, and their impact on teacher effectiveness and student learning. Smith and Wang (2020) further explore the types of interventions used, their perceived efficacy, and the contextual factors influencing their implementation, emphasizing the need to tailor interventions to specific teacher and student needs.

Scheduling of Meetings

As there has been an increasing focus on maximizing

collaborative professional development frameworks, studies examining the scheduling of meetings inside teachers' School-Based Learning Action Cell have gained popularity in educational research since 2019. Rodriguez and Garcia (2020) studied how scheduling tactics—such as meeting frequency, duration, and timing—affect teacher attendance and perceived efficacy, highlighting the logistical factors that influence scheduling decisions. Wang and Lee (2019) further explored the variables affecting meeting schedules, including organizational limitations, teacher preferences, and external factors. Their findings emphasize the importance of adaptable, inclusive scheduling and effective communication for promoting teacher participation.

Setting Up Resources

Rodriguez and Garcia (2020) highlight the role of resource allocation in Learning Action Cells, emphasizing its importance for teacher engagement and professional development. They stress the need for accessible and relevant resources to foster collaboration. Lee and Wang (2019) explore factors influencing resource availability, including administrative support and teacher input, and emphasize ongoing assessment.

Assignment of Work

Jones and White (2020) emphasize equitable task distribution and well-defined roles for teacher participation and accountability. Kim and Lee (2019) highlight how team dynamics and leadership influence task assignment, suggesting that collaboration and transparency boost teacher investment.

Preparation of Budget

Recent research has examined how task distribution within school-based Learning Action Cells (LACs) impacts collaborative professional growth. Jones and White (2020) emphasize the importance of equitable job assignments and clear role explanations to maintain teacher engagement and accountability. Their study highlights that aligning tasks with teachers' professional development goals and strengths fosters a positive learning environment. Kim and Lee (2019) explore factors influencing task allocation, such as team dynamics, leadership styles, and institutional policies. They find that transparent and flexible decision-making enhances teachers' investment in their professional development.

Writing of LAC Plan

Recent studies highlight the importance of structured Learning Action Cell (LAC) plans in teachers' professional development. Smith and Hernandez (2019) stress the need for clear goals, action plans, and assessment systems that align with school objectives. Johnson and Lee (2020) emphasize collaboration in plan creation, fostering ownership and accountability. Thompson and Wang (2021) discuss challenges like time constraints and skill discrepancies, recommending professional development and digital tools.

Monitoring and Evaluation

Recent studies emphasize the crucial role of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) in ensuring the effectiveness of School-Based Learning Action Cell (LAC) programs. Davis and Wilson (2020) highlight that systematic M&E practices, including feedback loops and data-driven decisions, enhance teacher engagement and instructional improvement. Lee and Thompson (2019) show that a multimodal M&E approach provides a comprehensive understanding of program effectiveness, stressing the need for school administrators' support.

Teaching and Learning Practices

Enhancing instruction and learning is a basic objective in all educational institutions across the globe. Innovative teaching techniques, data-driven training, and a variety of professional development programs are effective options for this progress. Darling-Hammond *et al.* (2019) point out that job-embedded, collaborative, and long-term professional development programs have a big impact on teaching methods and student accomplishment. Furthermore, it is essential to implement formative assessment procedures and evidence-based teaching methodologies in order to create a dynamic and adaptable learning environment (Schleicher, 2020).

Content Knowledge

Recent studies underscore the essential role of content knowledge in enhancing teaching and learning outcomes. Ball and Forzani (2020) found that teachers with a strong grasp of their subject were more effective at explaining complex concepts and engaging students. Shulman and Grossman (2019) showed that ongoing, subject-specific professional development boosted teachers' confidence and effectiveness. Hill *et al.* (2021) identified key components of content knowledge, such as procedural expertise and conceptual understanding, as critical for creating relevant and engaging learning experiences.

Pedagogical Skills

Recent research underscores the significant role of pedagogical skills in improving both teaching quality and student outcomes. Hattie and Zierer (2019) emphasized the value of strategies such as formative feedback, diverse teaching methods, and lesson plan adjustments in enhancing student engagement and comprehension. Darling-Hammond *et al.* (2020) found that teacher education programs focusing on classroom management, differentiated instruction, and assessment literacy better prepare educators to address diverse student needs, highlighting the importance of blending theoretical knowledge with practical skill development.

Attitudes

Evans and Leonard (2019) found that passionate teachers create more engaging environments, improving student performance. Richardson and Watt (2020) showed that educators with a positive view of professional

development adopt innovative methods, enhancing teaching quality. Klassen *et al.* (2021) found that teachers with higher self-efficacy are more likely to try new techniques, with mentoring and professional development key to fostering self-efficacy. Kennedy and Jones (2019) showed that teachers with a cooperative mindset are more effective in inclusive classrooms.

Assessment Strategies

Black and Wiliam (2019) found that formative assessment techniques, like self-assessment and regular feedback, help students track progress and foster a growth mindset. Brookhart (2020) emphasized that teachers with strong assessment literacy can design more effective tests. Guskey and Jung (2019) highlighted that standards-based grading provides detailed feedback, allowing for targeted interventions.

Professional Ethics

Campbell (2019) emphasized that teachers demonstrating fairness, respect, and responsibility create a positive learning environment. Shapira-Lishchinsky (2020) highlighted the importance of continuous development in ethical decision-making. Sanger and Osguthorpe (2021) found that teachers who model ethical behavior positively influence student growth.

Learner Diversity and Student Inclusion

Florian and Beaton (2019) emphasized adaptive technologies, collaborative learning, and differentiated instruction for inclusive pedagogy, leading to greater engagement and success. Schuelka and Johnstone (2020) found inclusive education policies enhance social skills and empathy. Loreman, Sharma, and Forlin (2020) highlighted ongoing teacher training to improve efficacy and outcomes. These studies highlight the importance of inclusive pedagogy and professional development for student success.

ICT Integration in Instruction

Tondeur *et al.* (2020) emphasize that ICT integration transforms traditional teaching into interactive, student-centered environments through tools like digital simulations and online collaboration platforms, boosting student engagement. They highlight the importance of professional development programs for equipping educators with ICT skills. Smetana and Bell (2021) found that technology-enhanced environments improve critical thinking, problem-solving, and digital literacy.

Contextualization of Learning Materials

Contextualized learning resources significantly improve students' academic performance by making learning more relevant. Johnson *et al.* (2020) found that aligning materials with students' prior knowledge and cultural backgrounds enhances understanding and retention, while Wong and Wong (2021) revealed that incorporating real-world contexts boosts motivation, engagement, and critical thinking.

Statement of the Problem

The study aimed to determine the level of the Implementation of School-Based Learning Action Cell on teaching and learning among teachers in Munai and Bacolod Districts, Division of Lanao del Norte, for the School Year 2024-2025. The result of the study would be the basis for a school development plan.

Specifically, the study sought to answer the following questions:

1. To what level is the implementation of school-based Learning action cell as perceived by the respondents as to assessment of needs, prioritization of topics or agenda, formation of learning action cell, identification of appropriate intervention, scheduling of meetings, setting up resources, assignment of work, preparation of budget, writing of LAC plan and monitoring and evaluation?

2. To what level is the teaching and learning practices of the respondents considering content knowledge, pedagogical skills, attitudes, assessment strategies, professional ethics, learner diversity and student inclusion, ICT integration in instruction, and contextualization of learning materials?

3. Is there a significant relationship between the respondents' perceived implementation of the School-Based Learning Action Cell and their teaching and learning practices?

4. Based on the findings of the study, what school development plan on School-Based Learning Action Cell can be designed?

Theoretical Framework

This study is grounded in Lev Vygotsky's Social Constructivist Theory, which emphasizes learning through interaction and collaboration. Social constructivism supports cooperative learning, scaffolding, and the Zone of Proximal Development, where experienced individuals guide others to enhance understanding. The Learning Action Cell (LAC) aligns with these principles by promoting collaborative professional development. Saleem (2023) highlights how LAC fosters critical thinking through discussion, while Vescio *et al.* (2020) stress that LAC provides a space for reflective practice and problem-solving.

Conceptual Framework

Based on DepEd Order No. 35, series of 2016, the Teachers' School-Based Learning Action Cell (SLAC) focuses on professional development to enhance teaching and learning. It assesses teachers' needs in areas like content knowledge, pedagogical skills, and professional ethics. SLAC sessions prioritize ICT integration, contextualized learning materials, and learner diversity. Regular meetings, resource allocation, and task delegation ensure systematic development. Monitoring and evaluation assess SLAC's impact, leading to continuous improvement. Through SLAC, teachers refine teaching strategies, enhance

assessment methods, and foster inclusivity, improving education quality and teaching effectiveness.

Scope and Limitations

This study aimed to assess the teachers' execution of the School-Based Learning Action Cell and their pedagogical practices in the Munai and Bacolod Districts during the academic year 2024-2025. The independent variables were confined to the execution of the School-Based Learning Action Cell concerning needs assessment, topic prioritization, learning action cell formation, appropriate intervention identification, meeting scheduling, resource allocation, work assignment, budget preparation, LAC Plan composition, and monitoring and evaluation. The dependent variables were restricted to teaching and learning practices, including content knowledge, pedagogical skills, attitudes, assessment strategies, professional ethics, learner diversity, student inclusion, ICT integration in instruction, and contextualization of learning materials.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Research Design

The study used a descriptive-correlation research design to explore the implementation of School-Based Learning Action Cell (SLAC) among teachers. This design was chosen to systematically describe the current status of SLAC, its processes, and its perceived effectiveness from teachers' perspectives. The research employed a survey targeting a representative sample of teachers from various schools to capture a broad range of experiences and perceptions regarding SLAC implementation. This approach identified patterns, themes, and correlations, considering recent changes in educational policies from 2019 onwards. The findings are aligned with studies by Darling-Hammond *et al.* (2020) and Loucks-Horsley *et al.* (2019), which emphasize the importance of collaborative professional development models like SLACs in fostering ongoing improvement in teaching practices and educational outcomes.

Research Setting

The study was conducted in the municipalities of Munai and Bacolod in Lanao del Norte, Philippines, highlighting contrasting contexts for implementing School-Based Learning Action Cell (SLAC). Munai, a predominantly rural area with a Maranao population, faces challenges typical of rural settings, such as limited resources and infrastructure, while Bacolod, a more urbanized coastal municipality, benefits from better access to educational resources and advanced methodologies.

Research Respondents

The respondents of the study were the four hundred twenty-three (423) teachers for elementary and secondary schools in Munai and Bacolod Districts for SY 2024-2025. Table A below shows the respondents of the study.

Table 1: Distribution of Respondent

District/School	Respondents	District/School	Respondents
Munai: Bacayawan PS	4	Bacolod: Binuni Demologan NHS	29
Balabacon PS	3	Alegria ES	4
Balintad PS	4	Babalaya ES	7
Cadayonan ES	5	Bacolod CIS	44
Cadulawan ES	5	Binuni Demologan NHS	1
Lindongan PS	3	Binuni ES	17
Lingcoan PS	3	Demarao ES	7
Lininding ES	8	Esperanza ES	14
Madaya PS	1	Felisa Santos Sr. MES	6
Maganding PS	1	Kahayag IS	14
Matampay PS	5	Liangan East ES	15
Munai CIS	16	Liangan NHS	40
Munai NHS	27	Manan Asi Lawan ES	6
Panggao ES	10	Minaulon ES	8
Pendulonan IS	22	Pagayawan IS	19
Punong PS	5	Rufino Santos Sr. MES	10
Ramain IS	13	Rupagan ES	9
Sundig A Munai PS	4		
Tambo ES	20		
Tamparan ES	9		
Taporog ES	5		
	173		250
Total			423

Research Instrument

The research instrument had two parts. Part I focused on the execution of the School-Based Learning Action Cell (LAC) based on DepEd Order No. 35, s. 2016, covering needs assessment, topic prioritization, LAC formation, intervention identification, and monitoring. Part II is a researcher made tool.

Statistical Treatment of Data

Descriptive statistics were employed to outline the fundamental attributes of the data in the study, offering concise descriptions of both the sample and the measurements. These statistics form the cornerstone for nearly all quantitative data analyses, complemented by straightforward graphical examination. The respondents were categorized using frequency and percentage among different factors. The mean served as a measure of the

central tendency for responses, particularly in relation to research writing process skills, while the standard deviation was used to assess data distribution. The Pearson-r coefficient was employed to assess the significance of the association between the implementation of the School-Based Learning Action Cell and the processes of teaching and learning.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Problem 1. To What Level is the Implementation of School-Based Learning Action Cell as Perceived by the Respondents as to Assessment of Needs, Prioritization of Topics or Agenda, Formation of Learning Action Cell, Identification of Appropriate Intervention, Scheduling of Meetings, Setting up Resources, Assignment of Work, Preparation of Budget, Writing of LAC Plan and Monitoring and Evaluation?

Table 2: Distribution of the Level of Implementation of School-Based Learning Action Cell in terms of Assessment of Needs

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
The assessment needs should be identified with reference to the professional teacher standards set for one’s career stage.	3.42	0.79	At all Times
The assessment needs should be captured through different forms like self – assessment tools, classroom observation results, critical reflections, surveys, research – based teacher development needs, students’ assessment results and other forms.	3.02	0.73	Most of the Time

The student learning outcomes should be the basis on the analysis of student performance data such as test scores, grades, assessments to identify gaps in knowledge and skills.	3.57	0.84	At all Times
The curriculum alignment should be the basis for evaluation of how well the current curriculum meets educational standards and student needs.	3.65	0.89	At all Times
The teacher’s feedback should collect insights into student difficulties, curriculum challenges and instructional methods.	3.35	0.79	At all Times
There should be a gathering of student opinions on learning experiences, challenges and areas where they feel additional support is needed should be seriously considered.	3.40	0.76	At all Times
The observation of classroom dynamics should identify instructional practices that are effective or need improvement for students’ performance.	3.63	0.84	At all Times
In reviewing and evaluating past teacher training and professional development activities should determine their impact and identify the ongoing needs.	2.89	0.58	Most of the Time
There should be an assessment of the availability and adequacy of learning materials, technology, and other resources necessary for effective teaching and learning for both teachers and students.	2.16	0.51	Sometimes
The evaluation of parental engagement and support in student achievement across all subject areas should be supported by a development plan.	2.99	0.62	Most of the Time
Overall	3.21	0.74	Most of the Time

Legend:

3.26-4.00 *At all Times / Very High*

2.51-3.25 *Most of the Time / High*

1.76-2.50 *Sometimes / Low*

1.00-1.75 *Never/ Very Low*

Table 2 presents the distribution of respondents’ level of implementation of School-Based Learning Action Cell in terms of assessment of needs with an overall mean of 3.21(SD = 0.74), described as Most of the Time and interpreted as High. It means that teachers consistently participate in assessing the needs related to their professional development and the teaching-learning process. This implies that the assessment of needs is high and is being prioritized as an integral part of the Learning Action Cell sessions, allowing teachers to identify areas that require attention and improvement. Darvin (2021) emphasizes that the implementation of the School-Based Learning Action Cell, grounded in a thorough assessment of teachers’ needs, is vital for effective professional development..

The indicator “The curriculum alignment should be the basis for evaluation of how well the current curriculum meets educational standards and student needs” received

the highest mean of 3.65 (SD = 0.89), described as Very High. This indicates that teachers consistently prioritize curriculum alignment in the assessment of needs during Learning Action Cell sessions. According to Darvin (2021), the implementation of the School-Based Learning Action Cell grounded in a thorough assessment of teachers’ needs is essential for effective professional development. Darvin’s study highlights that SLAC, when tailored to the specific challenges faced by teachers, significantly improves engagement levels and facilitates the application of new knowledge in the classroom. The indicator “There should be an assessment of the availability and adequacy of learning materials, technology, and other resources necessary for effective teaching and learning for both teachers and students” received the lowest mean of 2.16 (SD = 0.51), described as Low. This suggests that teachers do not regularly assess resource availability during Learning Action Cell sessions, potentially hindering effective instructional practices and resource allocation. Santos and Cruz (2021) emphasize that evaluating resource availability is vital for implementing diverse instructional strategies and addressing gaps, particularly in under-resourced areas.

Table 3: Distribution of the Level of Implementation of School-Based Learning Action Cell in terms of Prioritization of Topics or Agenda

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
Each member of the activity will agree on which needs to be prioritized for their sessions.	2.26	0.53	Sometimes
The prioritization of topics or agenda should be based on urgency, time required, interest, or other criteria agreed upon by group members.	3.15	0.65	Most of the Time
It should focus on areas that align with the curriculum standards and objectives.	2.56	0.59	Most of the Time
The identified topics should support teachers’ continuous professional development and address areas where teachers have expressed a need for improvement.	2.12	0.51	Sometimes

The use data from formative and summative assessments should pinpoint areas where students are struggling and prioritize those least mastered skills or topics.	3.17	0.75	Most of the Time
There should have an inclusion of emerging trends, innovative teaching strategies, and new educational technologies that can enhance teaching and learning should be included.	3.22	0.76	Most of the Time
It should address any recent changes in educational policies, standards or guidelines that teachers need to be aware of and implement.	3.18	0.74	Most of the Time
It should consider feedback from students, parents and other stakeholders to prioritize topics that have a direct impact on learning.	3.67	0.89	At all Times
The identified areas should benefit from collaborative planning, sharing of best practices, and peer support.	2.89	0.62	Most of the Time
Ensures that necessary resources such as time, materials, and technology are available for effectively addressing the prioritized topics in the LAC plan.	3.02	0.67	Most of the Time
Overall	2.92	0.67	Most of the Time

Legend:

3.26-4.00 *At all Times / Very High*

2.51-3.25 *Most of the Time / High*

1.76-2.50 *Sometimes / Low*

1.00-1.75 *Never/ Very Low*

Table 3 presents the distribution of respondents' level of implementation of the School-Based Learning Action Cell in terms of prioritization of topics or agenda with an overall mean of 2.92 (SD = 0.67), described as Most of the Time and interpreted as High. It means that teachers generally prioritize topics and agendas during Learning Action Cell sessions.

It implies that teachers recognize the importance of structuring their Learning Action Cell sessions around prioritized topics. According to Bautista and Garcia (2021), prioritizing topics within the School-Based Learning Action Cell is essential for ensuring that the most relevant and pressing issues are addressed in professional development sessions. In line with this, the indicator It should consider feedback from students, parents and other stakeholders to prioritize topics that have a direct impact on the learning, got the highest mean of 3.67

(SD = 0.89), described as At all Times and interpreted as Very High. It means that teachers consistently value the input of students, parents, and other stakeholders when determining the topics or agenda for Learning Action Cell sessions. According to Lim and Hernandez (2021), incorporating feedback from students, parents, and other stakeholders is crucial for prioritizing topics that directly impact learning in educational development initiatives, such as the School-Based Learning Action Cell. On the other hand, the indicator The identified topics should support teachers' continuous professional development and address areas where teachers have expressed a need for improvement, got the lowest mean of 2.12 (SD = 0.51), described as Sometimes and interpreted as Low. It means that topics in Learning Action Cell sessions do not always align with teachers' expressed needs for professional growth and improvement. Villanueva and Santos (2021) emphasize that aligning topics with teachers' CPD needs boosts engagement and motivation, fostering professional growth and effective strategy application.

Table 4: Distribution of the Level of Implementation of School-Based Learning Action Cell in terms of Formation of Learning Action Cell

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
The formation of Learning Action Cell should be based on the prioritized need and depending on the number of teachers in every school or cluster of schools.	3.02	0.66	Most of the Time
It should compose of five to 15 members.	2.56	0.54	Most of the Time
The teachers should convene in groups that are strategically decided.	2.01	0.67	Sometimes
The LAC should be formed based on the key stages, grade levels, learning areas, or programs offered in the school.	3.65	0.87	At all Times
Multigrade schools should be clustered in different ways by the district or division supervisors based on the objectives of the LACs to be conducted.	2.99	0.64	Most of the Time
Each LAC should include a leader, a facilitator, a documenter, and members or participants.	3.68	0.76	At all Times
The external resource persons should be invited when necessary though the preference is for the LAC resource persons to be from among the LAC members.	3.60	0.83	At all Times
It should have a well-defined purpose and specific objectives that align with the school's overall educational goals and teachers' professional development needs.	3.69	0.88	At all Times

It should include a diverse group of teachers from different grade levels, subject areas and experience levels.	3.72	0.92	At all Times
The members should commit to the LAC's goals by actively engaging in activities, including regular attendance, participation, discussions, and sharing insights and experiences.	3.01	0.73	Most of the Time
Overall	3.19	0.75	Most of the Time

Legend:

3.26-4.00 *At all Times / Very High*

2.51-3.25 *Most of the Time / High*

1.76-2.50 *Sometimes / Low*

1.00-1.75 *Never/ Very Low*

Table 4 presents the distribution of respondents' level of implementation of School-Based Learning Action Cell in terms of formation of Learning Action Cell with an overall mean of 3.19 (SD = 0.75), described as Most of the Time and interpreted as High. It means that teachers generally form Learning Action Cell regularly. It indicates that teachers acknowledge the importance of forming Learning Action Cell. Ramirez and Flores (2021) emphasize that the Learning Action Cell's formation is vital for the success of School-Based Learning Action Cell initiatives. The indicator It should include a diverse group of teachers from different grade levels, subject areas, and experience levels, got the highest mean of 3.72 (SD = 0.92), described as At all Times and interpreted as Very High. It means that teachers recognize and consistently value diversity within the formation of the Learning

Action Cell. It suggests that there is a strong commitment to inclusiveness in the formation, with teachers and school leaders ensuring that each session includes a broad representation of the teaching community. Martinez and Cruz (2021) found that a diverse group of teachers in the Learning Action Cell, with members from different grade levels, subject areas, and experiences, enhances collaboration. The indicator The teachers should convene in groups that are strategically decided got the lowest mean of 2.01 (SD = 0.67), described as Sometimes and interpreted as Low. It means that the practice of forming strategically decided groups within the Learning Action Cell is not consistently implemented. It suggests that while strategic grouping is recognized as beneficial, it is not yet a strong priority in Learning Action Cell implementation. Thompson and Reyes (2021) found that strategically organizing teachers into groups for professional development, such as the Learning Action Cell, enhances collaboration and learning outcomes by addressing specific needs.

Table 5: Distribution of the Level of Implementation of School-Based Learning Action Cell in terms of Identification of Appropriate Intervention

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
The members of the LAC should agree on exploring interventions to address the identified need.	3.63	0.87	At all Times
The interventions may include learning materials, instructional materials, equipment, facilities, teaching strategies, teaching modalities, programs, and other resources.	3.81	0.95	At all Times
The monitoring should ensure that participants are actively engaged, asking questions, and contributing to discussions to maintain interest and understanding among LAC members.	3.56	0.79	At all Times
The performance analysis on assessments, quizzes, or tasks should identify areas where participants consistently struggle, enabling tailored interventions to address specific weaknesses.	3.61	0.84	At all Times
The feedback on session content, delivery, and overall experience should be collected and analyzed to determine necessary interventions.	3.62	0.85	At all Times
Noted changes in behavior, such as increased frustration, distraction, or withdrawal, should indicate the need for intervention to address underlying issues.	3.43	0.87	At all Times
Progress should be tracked over time through formative assessments and observations to identify participants who are not meeting learning milestones and require targeted support.	3.60	0.83	At all Times
Attendance and participation rates should be analyzed to identify disengagement or difficulties, indicating the need for interventions to re-engage participants.	3.18	0.77	Most of the Time
Insights from peers and colleagues on individual or group performance and behavior should be gathered to provide additional perspectives on necessary interventions.	3.71	0.93	At all Times
Overall	3.51	0.83	At all Times

Legend:

3.26-4.00 *At all Times / Very High*

2.51-3.25 *Most of the Time / High*

1.76-2.50 *Sometimes / Low*

1.00-1.75 *Never/ Very Low*

Table 5 presents the distribution of respondents' level of implementation of School-Based Learning Action Cell in terms of identification of appropriate intervention with an overall mean of 3.51 (SD = 0.83), described as *At all Times* and interpreted as *Very High*. It means that teachers consistently engage in identifying and selecting suitable interventions as part of their activities. According to Hernandez and Cruz (2021), the identification of appropriate interventions within the School-Based Learning Action Cell is crucial for addressing specific teaching challenges effectively. The indicator *The interventions may include learning materials, instructional materials, equipment, facilities, teaching strategies, teaching modalities, programs, and other resources*, got the highest mean of 3.81 (SD = 0.95), described as *At all Times* and interpreted as *Very High*.

It means that teachers are highly consistent in utilizing a broad range of interventions, such as learning materials, equipment, teaching strategies, and programs, within their sessions. According to Ramos and Cruz (2021), effective interventions in the School-Based Learning Action Cell often include learning materials, instructional aids, equipment, and teaching strategies tailored to address specific educational challenges. On the other hand, the indicator *Participants should be encouraged to self-assess and reflect on their learning experiences, identifying areas where they need more support or different approaches*, got the lowest mean of 2.99 (SD = 0.61), described as *Most of the Time* and interpreted as *High*. It means that while teachers generally engage in self-assessment and reflection within Learning Action Cell sessions, this practice may not be as consistently emphasized as other aspects of intervention identification. According to Tan and Rivera (2021), encouraging teachers to reflect on their learning experiences in sessions like the School-Based Learning Action Cell promotes self-awareness and professional growth, enabling teachers to pinpoint areas for further support.

Table 6: Distribution of the Level of Implementation of School-Based Learning Action Cell in terms of Scheduling of Meetings

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
The LAC members should decide on the schedule, length and frequency of meetings.	3.01	0.69	Most of the Time
The LAC sessions should be conducted at least once a month.	3.27	0.73	At all Times
Meetings should be scheduled at times when all or most participants are available to ensure maximum attendance.	3.19	0.68	Most of the Time
A regular meeting schedule, whether weekly, bi-weekly, or monthly, should be established to maintain consistent engagement without overwhelming participants.	2.17	0.51	Most of the Time
It should prepare and distribute a clear topic or agenda before the scheduled meeting outlining the topic to be discussed, objectives and any preparatory work required from the participants.	3.26	0.69	At all Times
Sufficient time should be allocated for each agenda item, including discussions, activities, and follow-ups, to ensure a balanced and productive meeting.	3.62	0.72	At all Times
It should adjust the schedule based on the participants' feedback and changing needs, allowing for flexibility in timing and frequency of meetings.	2.98	0.59	Most of the Time
Participants should be provided with advance notice or memos about meeting dates to allow for adequate preparation and scheduling adjustments.	3.46	0.87	At all Times
Convenient and comfortable locations should be chosen for in-person meetings, or robust virtual platforms should be ensured for online meetings, with clear instructions for accessing these spaces.	3.23	0.82	Most of the Time
Time should be scheduled for follow-up actions, and meeting minutes or summaries should be documented and promptly shared with all participants.	3.76	0.93	At all Times
Overall	3.20	0.72	Most of the Time

Legend:

3.26-4.00 *At all Times / Very High*

2.51-3.25 *Most of the Time / High*

1.76-2.50 *Sometimes / Low*

1.00-1.75 *Never/ Very Low*

Table 6 presents the distribution of respondents' level of implementation of School-Based Learning Action Cell in terms of scheduling of meetings with an overall mean

of 3.20 (SD = 0.72), described as *Most of the Time* and interpreted as *High*. It means that Learning Action Cell meetings are scheduled regularly but may not always be prioritized or adhered to with full consistency. According to Ramos and Delos Santos (2020), scheduling regular meetings for the School-Based Learning Action Cell is crucial for maintaining continuity and engagement

among teachers. The indicator Time should be scheduled for follow-up actions, and meeting minutes or summaries should be documented and promptly shared with all participants got the highest mean of 3.76 (SD = 0.93), described as At all Times and interpreted as Very High. It means that teachers prioritize the organization and continuity of Learning Action Cell sessions by consistently documenting meeting minutes and follow-up actions. According to Delgado and Rivera (2021), scheduling time for follow-up actions and sharing documented summaries from School-Based Learning Action Cell meetings enhances the continuity and impact of professional

learning. The indicator A regular meeting schedule, whether weekly, bi-weekly, or monthly, should be established to maintain consistent engagement without overwhelming participants, got the lowest mean of 2.17 (SD = 0.51), described as Most of the Time and interpreted as High. It means that while there is an attempt to establish a regular meeting schedule for Learning Action Cell, it may not be as consistently followed or prioritized as other aspects of the implementation. According to Santos and Rivera (2021), establishing a regular meeting schedule in the School-Based Learning Action Cell is crucial for maintaining teachers' engagement without overburdening them.

Table 7: Distribution of the Level of Implementation of School-Based Learning Action Cell in terms of Setting up Resources

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
Resources such as supplies, worksheets, videos, equipment, budget, food, venues should be identified and provided for the effective conduct of LAC sessions.	3.57	0.77	At all Times
The LAC leader or school head leads should identify the needed resources to ensure their availability and sustainability.	3.78	0.86	At all Times
The school should conduct thorough needs assessment to determine the specific resources required based on the goals and objectives of the activity.	3.18	0.74	Most of the Time
The school should ensure that all necessary resources such as training materials, digital tools and reference documents are readily available and accessible to all participants.	3.79	0.89	At all Times
The school should select high – quality. Up to date, and relevant resources that align with the educational standards and the specific focus of the LAC activity.	3.01	0.68	Most of the Time
Appropriate technology such as projectors, laptops, and interactive whiteboards should be incorporated to facilitate presentations, discussions, and collaborative work.	3.75	0.87	At all Times
The heads of schools should organize resources in a logical and user-friendly manner making it easy for the participants to locate and use them during the LAC sessions.	3.17	0.76	Most of the Time
The school should allocate resources equitably among the participants ensuring that everyone has the necessary materials and tools to engage fully in the LAC activities.	3.81	0.92	At all Times
The school should provide supplementary materials such as guides, manuals and how - documents, to assist the participants in using the resources effectively.	3.76	0.87	At all Times
The space should be properly arranged to support collaborative work, ensuring that seating arrangements, lighting, and internet connectivity are conducive to group activities.	3.15	0.78	Most of the Time
Overall	3.50	0.81	At all Times

Legend:

3.26-4.00 At all Times / Very High

2.51-3.25 Most of the Time / High

1.76-2.50 Sometimes / Low

1.00-1.75 Never/ Very Low

Table 7 presents the distribution of respondents' level of implementation of school-based learning action cell in terms of setting up resources with an overall mean of 3.50(SD = 0.81), described as At all Times and interpreted as Very High. It means that teachers consistently prioritize the establishment of resources necessary for effective teaching and learning within the context of the Learning Action Cell. It implies that teachers' consistent prioritization of resource setup suggests a dedication

to fostering engaging and effective learning experiences driven by their professional development and practical insights. Mendoza and Cruz (2020) assert that establishing resources for the School-Based Learning Action Cell is essential for improving the efficacy and sustainability of professional development efforts. The indicator The school should allocate resources equitably among the participants ensuring that everyone has the necessary materials and tools to engage fully in the LAC activities, got the highest mean of 3.81 (SD = 0.92), described as At all Times and interpreted as Very High. It means there is a strong consensus among teachers regarding the importance of equitable resource allocation in the

Learning Action Cell. According to Torres and Mendoza (2020), equitable resource allocation in the School-Based Learning Action Cell ensures all teachers can fully engage in professional development by providing necessary materials and tools, fostering an inclusive environment that promotes equal opportunity for learning and growth. The indicator The school should select high – quality, Up to date, and relevant resources that align with the educational standards and the specific focus of the LAC activity, got the lowest mean of 3.01 (SD = 0.68),

described as Most of the Time and interpreted as High. It means that there may be challenges in the process of resource selection, such as budget constraints, lack of access to current materials, or insufficient training on how to evaluate the quality and relevance of resources. Bautista and Ramirez (2020) emphasize that providing high-quality, up-to-date, and relevant resources aligned with educational standards enhances the effectiveness of the School-Based Learning Action Cell.

Table 8: Distribution of the Level of Implementation of School-Based Learning Action Cell in terms of Assignment of Work

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
Each member of the LAC activity should be given a specific role to perform during the discussion.	3.33	0.71	At all Times
Roles should rotate during each LAC session to allow members to experience different responsibilities and develop a diverse skill set.	3.41	0.73	At all Times
Each participant should have a clearly defined role within the learning action cell activity.	3.12	0.78	Most of the Time
Tasks should be assigned based on the skills, expertise, and strengths of each participant to maximize efficiency and effectiveness.	3.67	0.92	At all Times
It should ensure each participant’s tasks align with the overall objectives and goals of the LAC activity.	3.23	0.74	Most of the Time
Tasks should be distributed evenly to avoid overburdening any single participant, ensuring a fair workload for all.	2.99	0.62	Most of the Time
Effective time management should be implemented to ensure all activities are completed on schedule.	3.15	0.77	Most of the Time
Work assignments should promote collaboration and teamwork, fostering a cooperative learning environment.	3.43	0.75	At all Times
The resource allocation should ensure the participants have access to the necessary resources and support needed to complete the assigned tasks.	3.21	0.74	Most of the Time
A feedback mechanism should be established with regular check-ins and feedback loops, allowing participants to report progress, address challenges, and receive guidance.	2.89	0.63	Most of the Time
Overall	3.24	0.74	Most of the Time

Legend:

3.26-4.00 *At all Times / Very High*

2.51-3.25 *Most of the Time / High*

1.76-2.50 *Sometimes / Low*

1.00-1.75 *Never/ Very Low*

Table 8 presents the distribution of respondents’ level of implementation of School-Based Learning Action Cell in terms of assignment of work with an overall mean of 3.24 (SD = 0.74), described as Most of the Time and interpreted as High. It means that the assignment of work within the Learning Action Cell framework is generally occurring. This indicates that while teachers often find tasks assigned during Learning Action Cell meetings manageable and relevant, there may still be inconsistencies in how effectively these assignments are structured and communicated. According to Santos and Mercado (2020), the effective implementation of the School-Based Learning Action Cell depends on the strategic assignment of work among participants to ensure smooth operation and meaningful engagement.

The indicator Tasks should be assigned based on the skills, expertise, and strengths of each participant to maximize efficiency and effectiveness, got the highest mean of 3.67 (SD = 0.92), described as At all Times and interpreted as Very High. It means that there is a strong emphasis on recognizing and utilizing the individual strengths of teachers within the Learning Action Cell. This implies that teachers feel their specific skills and expertise are acknowledged when tasks are assigned, which is essential for fostering a productive and collaborative environment. According to Rivera and Santos (2020), assigning tasks within the School-Based Learning Action Cell based on teachers’ unique skills, expertise, and strengths leads to more efficient and effective collaboration. The indicator A feedback mechanism should be established with regular check-ins and feedback loops, allowing participants to report progress, address challenges, and receive guidance got the lowest mean of 2.89 (SD = 0.63), described as Most of the Time and interpreted

as High. It means that while there is some recognition of the importance of feedback mechanisms within the Learning Action Cell, there is still room for improvement in their implementation. This implies that teachers feel feedback is not consistently or adequately integrated into

the work assignment process. According to Castillo and Hernandez (2020), establishing a feedback mechanism with regular check-ins and feedback loops is crucial in School-Based Learning Action Cell to monitor progress and address ongoing challenges.

Table 9: Distribution of the Level of Implementation of School-Based Learning Action Cell in terms of Preparation of Budget

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
The budget should be sourced from school maintenance and operating expenses, as well as external grants, and must comply with existing accounting rules and regulations.	3.65	0.83	At all Times
The budget should reflect the specific objectives and goals of the LAC activity to ensure alignment with educational priorities and expected learner outcomes.	3.23	0.74	Most of the Time
Budget allocations should consider the needs of participants, including materials, resources, and any support required for effective participation.	3.68	0.85	At all Times
A facilitator's fee should be included for inviting external experts to facilitate the LAC sessions.	3.47	0.69	At all Times
The costs for training materials, handouts, digital resources and any other educational tools needed for LAC activity should be included in the budget preparation.	3.67	0.84	At all Times
The budget should include rental costs for the venue when it is held outside the school.	3.60	0.77	At all Times
There should have an allocation for meals and refreshments for the participants.	3.46	0.78	At all Times
A budget should be allocated for participant travel expenses, including transportation allowances or reimbursements if applicable.	3.16	0.73	Most of the Time
A budget should be allocated for technology equipment such as projectors and audiovisual aids, especially if the activity involves presentations or group work.	3.03	0.69	Most of the Time
A budget should be allocated for administrative costs, including miscellaneous expenses such as printing and other logistical support required to organize the LAC activity.	3.56	0.82	At all Times
Overall	3.45	0.77	At all Times

Legend:

3.26-4.00 *At all Times / Very High*

2.51-3.25 *Most of the Time / High*

1.76-2.50 *Sometimes / Low*

1.00-1.75 *Never/ Very Low*

Table 9 presents the distribution of respondents' level of implementation of school-based learning action cell in terms of preparation of budget with an overall mean of 3.45 (SD = 0.77), described as At all Times and interpreted as Very High. It means that this high preparation of budget, indicates a strong commitment to financial planning. According to Villanueva and Ramos (2020), the preparation of a dedicated budget for School-Based Learning Action Cells is essential to support effective implementation, ensuring access to resources, materials, and logistical support that enhance the learning experience, address practical needs, and contribute to higher teacher participation and engagement. The indicator Budget allocations should consider the needs of participants, including materials, resources, and any support required for effective participation, got the highest mean of 3.68 (SD = 0.85), described as At all Times and interpreted as Very High. It means that schools

are prioritizing comprehensive budget planning by actively considering the specific needs of teachers involved in the Learning Action Cell. According to Santos and Delos Reyes (2020), effective budget allocations for School-Based Learning Action Cells should prioritize the needs of participants by ensuring access to essential materials, resources, and support services. The indicator A budget should be allocated for technology equipment such as projectors and audiovisual aids, especially if the activity involves presentations or group work, got the lowest mean of 3.03 (SD = 0.69), described as Most of the Time and interpreted as High. It means that while technology resources are generally acknowledged as important, they may not always be prioritized in the budget for Learning Action Cell activities. This implies a possible gap in ensuring that essential technological tools are consistently available, which may limit the quality of interactive or presentation-based sessions. Kim and Lee (2019) determine crucial components that influence work allocation, including team dynamics, leadership styles, and institutional regulations, by examining data from observational studies and interviews conducted in several schools.

Table 10: Distribution of the Level of Implementation of School-Based Learning Action Cell in terms of Writing of LAC Plan

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
The LAC plan should be written and documented following the template and start with the process on planning, implementation and evaluation.	3.56	0.82	At all Times
The plan should integrate or link with the School Improvement Plan or Annual Implementation Plan.	2.95	0.66	Most of the Time
The LAC plan should include a variety of activities, such as lectures, practicums, orientations, coaching, workshops, and the development and use of instructional materials, followed by collaborative discussions on next steps.	3.01	0.69	Most of the Time
The final activity of the LAC session should involve individual and group action planning in order to implement agreed activities in the classroom.	3.19	0.76	Most of the Time
The LAC members should implement the proposed strategies or activities in their classrooms, schools, or communities as appropriate and evaluate their effectiveness.	2.89	0.54	Most of the Time
The LAC members should be prepared to report back on the success of the activities in future LAC sessions.	2.78	0.51	Most of the Time
The LAC facilitators and leaders should monitor the activities and assess their impact on improving learner outcomes at school.	3.52	0.82	At all Times
The school Heads or principals should support the LACs by doing class observations and encourage teachers to continually improve instruction so that student learning will also improve.	3.78	0.92	At all Times
The action steps in LAC should be detailed, actionable steps to achieve each learning goal.	3.72	0.86	At all Times
Regular reflection and adjustments should be made based on progress reviews	3.59	0.66	At all Times
Overall	3.30	0.72	At all Times

Legend:

3.26-4.00 *At all Times / Very High*

2.51-3.25 *Most of the Time / High*

1.76-2.50 *Sometimes / Low*

1.00-1.75 *Never/ Very Low*

Table 10 presents the distribution of respondents' level of implementation of School-Based Learning Action Cell in terms of writing of LAC plan with an overall mean of 3.30 (SD = 0.72), described as At all Times and interpreted as Very High. This means that the respondents have high regard for the writing of the LAC plan. It suggests that teachers place importance on the foundational steps of these activities by ensuring a written plan is in place, which may contribute to more effective and goal-oriented sessions. According to Mendoza and De Guzman (2021), the development of a Learning Action Cell plan is critical in structuring school-based professional development activities to address teachers' needs effectively, as a well-written plan serves as a roadmap that guides teachers through each session's objectives, resources, and outcomes, increasing the likelihood of meaningful professional growth and aligning with both individual and institutional goals. The indicator The school Heads or principals should support the LACs by doing class observations and encourage teachers to continually improve instruction so that student learning will also improve, got the

highest mean of 3.78 (SD = 0.92), described as At all Times and interpreted as Very High. It means that there is consistent support from school heads or principals, actively involved in observing and providing feedback on teaching practices within the sessions. According to Flores and Ramos (2020), school heads and principals play an essential role in supporting the Learning Action Cell by conducting classroom observations and providing constructive feedback to teachers, fostering a culture of continuous improvement that enhances teaching strategies and positively impacts student outcomes. The indicator The LAC members should be prepared to report back on the success of the activities in future LAC sessions, got the lowest mean of 2.78 (SD = 0.51), described as Most of the Time and interpreted as High. It means that while LAC members occasionally report back on the outcomes of their activities, this practice is not yet fully embedded as a routine aspect of the learning action cell sessions. According to Santos and Villareal (2020), ongoing feedback and reporting mechanisms in the Learning Action Cell are critical for measuring the impact of professional development activities, as they foster accountability and continuous improvement, enabling teachers to reflect on the effectiveness of their actions, discuss areas for refinement, and explore solutions to obstacles, while

Table 11: Distribution of the Level of Implementation of School-Based Learning Action Cell in terms of Monitoring and Evaluation

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
The monitoring and feedback should be ongoing throughout the LAC planning and implementation phases.	3.35	0.86	At all Times
The evaluators should focus on how the LAC enhances teacher quality and improves student outcomes.	3.56	0.95	At all Times
The monitoring and evaluation should assess teacher quality, student performance, and the effectiveness of strategies.	3.01	0.55	Most of the Time
Progress monitoring should provide information on whether activities meet standards in terms of quality, quantity, and timing, contributing to the attainment of LAC goals.	3.02	0.56	Most of the Time
The feedback mechanism should guide the LAC in making decisions and adjustments during implementation.	3.33	0.83	At all Times
Monitoring should focus on policy-stipulated components such as content, pedagogy, instructional strategies, assessment skills, and understanding of learners.	3.55	0.91	At all Times
LAC progress monitoring should follow the agreed-upon protocols for the implementation phase.	3.00	0.57	Most of the Time
The members of the LAC should collaboratively develop a variety of methods and tools for progress monitoring.	3.05	0.59	Most of the Time
Each member should be assessed in their daily activities for effective learning outcomes.	2.37	0.51	Sometimes
The LAC implementation should be monitored for sustainability purposes.	3.21	0.62	Most of the Time
Overall	3.15	0.70	Most of the Time

Legend:

3.26-4.00 *At all Times / Very High*

2.51-3.25 *Most of the Time / High*

1.76-2.50 *Sometimes / Low*

1.00-1.75 *Never/ Very Low*

Table 11 presents the distribution of respondents' level of Implementation of School-Based Learning Action Cell in terms of monitoring and evaluation with an overall mean of 3.15 (SD = 0.70), described as Most of the Time and interpreted as High. It means that while teachers are implementing monitoring and evaluation practices in the LAC regularly, there is room for improvement to make these practices more consistent. According to Reyes and Tan (2020), monitoring and evaluation play a pivotal role in the effectiveness of the School-Based Learning Action Cell, as a structured approach helps identify strengths and areas for improvement, fosters accountability, and allows teachers to adjust practices based on data and feedback, strengthening professional growth and student outcomes. The indicator The evaluators should focus on how the LAC enhances teacher quality and improves student outcomes got the highest mean of 3.56 (SD = 0.95), described as At all Times and interpreted as Very High. It means that teachers prioritize monitoring and evaluation

practices that directly assess improvements in teaching quality and student outcomes. It suggests that teachers recognize the importance of purposeful evaluation and are committed to ensuring that these evaluations have a meaningful impact. According to Villanueva and Santos (2020), evaluators of the Learning Action Cell should prioritize assessing how these initiatives enhance teacher quality and ultimately improve student outcomes, with a focus on evaluating pedagogical changes and student performance improvements. The indicator Each member should be assessed in their daily activities for effective learning outcomes, got the lowest mean of 2.37 (SD = 0.51), described as Sometimes and interpreted as Low. It means that teachers do not frequently incorporate individual assessments into their daily Learning Action Cell activities, potentially due to the challenge of balancing frequent evaluations with instructional responsibilities. According to Ramirez and Santos (2021), assessing teachers in their daily activities is essential for achieving effective learning outcomes by identifying strengths and areas for improvement, ensuring alignment with educational standards, and promoting reflective practices that enhance student learning.

Table 12: Summary of the Implementation of School-Based Learning Action Cell

Variables	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Assessment of Needs	3.21	0.74	High
Prioritization of Topics or Agenda	2.92	0.67	High

Formation of Learning Action Cell	3.19	0.75	High
Identification of Appropriate Intervention	3.51	0.83	Very High
Scheduling of Meetings	3.20	0.72	High
Setting Up Resources	3.50	0.81	Very High
Assignment of Work	3.24	0.74	High
Preparation of Budget	3.45	0.77	Very High
Writing of LAC Plan	3.30	0.72	Very High
Monitoring and Evaluation	3.15	0.70	High
Overall	3.27	0.75	Very High

Legend:

3.26-4.00 Strongly Agree / Very High

3.25 Agree / High

1.76-2.50 Disagree / Low

1.00-1.75 Strongly Disagree / Very Low

Table 12 presents the summary of the implementation of School-Based Learning Action Cell with an overall mean of 3.27 (SD = 0.75), interpreted as Very High. It means that the School-Based Learning Action Cell is highly valued and integrated within the school's professional development practices. It implies that teachers find it to be effective and relevant to their professional needs, encouraging their frequent participation and active involvement. According to de Guzman and Castro (2020), the implementation of School-Based Learning Action Cell is crucial in fostering teacher development and collaborative learning, as it provides a structured environment for reflection, discussion, and sharing best practices, which enhances teaching and learning.

The variable Identification of Appropriate Intervention, got the highest mean of 3.51 (SD = 0.83), interpreted as Very High. It means that teachers place a high priority on selecting appropriate interventions to address specific educational needs, highlighting the Learning Action Cell's focus on practical, result-driven solutions. It suggests that it provides a supportive environment where teachers can collaborate to identify and develop interventions tailored

2.51-

to the unique needs of their students. According to Alcaraz and Santos (2020), identifying appropriate interventions is crucial for enhancing teaching effectiveness and student learning outcomes. The variable Prioritization of Topics or Agenda got the lowest mean of 2.92 (SD = 0.67), interpreted as High.

It means that while teachers acknowledge the importance of setting priorities for Learning Action Cell sessions, this practice might not always be implemented to its fullest potential. It suggests that teachers may benefit from clearer guidelines or support in establishing priorities for the sessions to enhance relevance and productivity. According to Dizon and Villanueva (2020), prioritizing topics in educational settings is crucial for maximizing the effectiveness of professional development, as teachers' involvement in selecting topics increases engagement and ensures alignment with their immediate needs and challenges.

Problem 2. To What Level is the Teaching and Learning of School-Based Learning Action Cell Implementation Considering Content Knowledge, Pedagogical Skills, Attitudes, Assessment Strategies, Professional Ethics, Learner Diversity and Student Inclusion, ICT Integration in Instruction and Contextualization of Learning Materials?

Table 13: Distribution of the Level of Teaching and Learning of School-Based Learning Action Cell Implementation Based on Content Knowledge

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
As a teacher...			
I demonstrate a deep understanding of the subject matter and its relevance to learners' needs and interests.	3.34	0.71	Strongly Agree
I ensure that their instructional strategies align with the curriculum standards and learning objectives.	3.58	0.86	Strongly Agree
I adapt content to meet the diverse needs, strengths, and interests of learners, including those with disabilities, giftedness, and indigenous backgrounds.	3.60	0.89	Strongly Agree
I effectively use technology to enhance content delivery, engagement, and learner interaction.	2.99	0.62	Agree
I proficiently use Mother Tongue, Filipino, and English to facilitate teaching and learning, promoting linguistic diversity and cultural sensitivity.	2.25	0.49	Disagree
I possess knowledge of cognitive-based criteria, such as diagnostic evaluation data, process evaluation information, and product evaluation data, to inform instruction.	2.56	0.57	Agree

I apply performance-based criteria, such as instructional strategies and techniques, to effectively teach content and skills.	3.02	0.51	Agree
I organize content in a logical and coherent manner, using advance organizers and scaffolding to facilitate learner understanding.	3.11	0.69	Agree
I regularly solicit and respond to learner feedback to refine their instructional strategies and improve learner engagement.	3.33	0.71	Strongly Agree
I utilize differentiated instruction to meet the diverse needs of learners, including varying learning styles and paces.	3.02	0.66	Agree
Overall	3.08	0.67	

Legend:

3.26-4.00 Strongly Agree / Very High

2.51-3.25 Agree / High

1.76-2.50 Disagree / Low

1.00-1.75 Strongly Disagree / Very Low

Table 12 presents the distribution of respondents' level of teaching and learning of School-Based Learning Action Cell implementation based on content knowledge with an overall mean of 3.08 (SD = 0.67), described as Agree and interpreted as High. It means that teachers generally feel positive about the adequacy of their content knowledge concerning the implementation. It indicates that although teachers possess a good degree of content knowledge, there exist chances for professional growth to augment their expertise. According to Magsino and Sarmiento (2020), the implementation of the School-Based Learning Action Cell significantly enhances teachers' content knowledge, which in turn impacts their teaching effectiveness by providing a structured environment. The indicator As a teacher, I adapt content to meet the diverse needs, strengths, and interests of learners, including those with disabilities, giftedness, and

indigenous backgrounds, got the highest mean of 3.60 (SD = 0.89), described as Strongly Agree and interpreted as Very High. It means that teachers are actively engaged in inclusive practices that recognize and address the varied learning needs within their classrooms. It suggests that there is a growing awareness among educators about the importance of differentiated instruction. According to Gunter *et al.* (2020), adapting content to address the diverse needs, strengths, and interests of learners is essential for effective teaching, particularly in inclusive classrooms. The indicator As a teacher, I proficiently use Mother Tongue, Filipino, and English to facilitate teaching and learning, promoting linguistic diversity and cultural sensitivity, got the lowest mean of 2.25 (SD = 0.49), described as Disagree and interpreted as Low. It means there is a notable gap in teachers' ability or willingness to use multiple languages effectively in the classroom. According to Bunar (2020), the proficient use of multiple languages, including Mother Tongue, Filipino, and English, is essential for effective teaching, as it promotes comprehension and cultural sensitivity.

Table 14: Distribution of the Level of Teaching and Learning of School-Based Learning Action Cell Implementation Based on Pedagogical Skills

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
As a teacher...			
I actively engage in teaching and involve students in learning activities.	3.44	0.82	Strongly Agree
I establish supportive learning environment with clear behavioral expectations.	3.40	0.79	Strongly Agree
I foster student autonomy, perseverance, and collaborative skills among my students.	3.39	0.78	Strongly Agree
I ensure coherence between the learning goals, instructional activities, and evaluations.	3.09	0.69	Agree
I encourage an open, participatory classroom environment where students feel comfortable asking questions.	3.22	0.73	Agree
I use and utilize diagnostic, formative, and summative assessment results to identify learning gaps and inform instructional decisions.	3.51	0.87	Strongly Agree
I employ a variety of research-based teaching methods, such as guided practice, corrective feedback, and independent practice, to promote learner mastery.	3.49	0.86	Strongly Agree
I organize content logically, use advance organizers, and scaffold instruction to facilitate learner understanding.	3.10	0.73	Agree
I employ strategies to stimulate learner interest, involvement, and active participation in the learning process.	3.23	0.77	Agree
I use differentiated instructional approaches to address the diverse learning styles, paces, and abilities of all learners.	3.54	0.83	Strongly Agree
Overall	3.34	0.79	Strongly Agree

and interpreted as Very High. It means that teachers possess a positive attitude toward the implementation of school-based learning action cell activities. According to Saha and Dutta (2021), teachers' attitudes towards the implementation of School-Based Learning Action Cell play a crucial role in the success of collaborative professional development initiatives, emphasizing that positive attitudes can significantly enhance teacher engagement. The indicator As a teacher, I use receptive feedback and constructive criticism help improve teaching practices, got the highest mean of 3.54 (SD = 0.89), described as Strongly Agree and interpreted as Very High. It means that teachers recognize the value of feedback in their professional development. This implies that educators are open to receiving input from peers and supervisors, viewing it as a critical component of their growth and effectiveness in the classroom. It suggests that

a culture of constructive criticism is prevalent within the school environment. According to Wu and Zhang (2020), the use of receptive feedback and constructive criticism is essential in fostering reflective teaching practices, as teachers who actively seek and utilize feedback. The indicator As a teacher, I perceive research as important and relevant to their teaching practices, which fosters a positive attitude towards it, got the lowest mean of 3.00 (SD = 0.66), described as Agree and interpreted as High. It means that while teachers generally acknowledge the value of research in informing their teaching practices, there may still be a gap in fully integrating research findings into their daily instructional strategies. According to Sweeney and Wang (2020), teachers' perceptions of research as important and relevant to their teaching practices play a significant role in fostering a positive attitude towards educational research.

Table 16: Distribution of the Level of Teaching and Learning of School-Based Learning Action Cell Implementation Based on Assessment Strategies

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
As a teacher...			
I use assessment to inform instruction and improve learning outcomes by setting goals and targets for learners and themselves.	3.28	0.72	Strongly Agree
I take a holistic view of learners, considering academic, behavioral, social, and emotional aspects of learning, and involve learners, parents, and peers in the assessment process.	3.33	0.79	Strongly Agree
I use formative assessment regularly to monitor learner progress and adjust instruction to meet learner needs.	3.71	0.92	Strongly Agree
I use summative assessments to evaluate learner achievement and provide feedback for improvement.	3.45	0.82	Strongly Agree
I involve learners with self-assessment, setting their own targets, and developing meta-cognitive skills and strategies.	3.68	0.89	Strongly Agree
I involve in peer assessment, providing feedback to each other and developing critical thinking and communication skills.	3.17	0.71	Agree
I provide constructive feedback to learners, focusing on specific strengths and areas for improvement.	3.62	0.83	Strongly Agree
I continuously reflect on and improve their assessment practices to better support learner growth and achievement.	3.18	0.72	Agree
I consider contextual factors such as learner background, socio-economic status, and cultural context when designing and implementing assessments.	2.99	0.56	Agree
I consider assessments which are designed to engage learners and promote active participation, with opportunities for learners to contribute to assessment planning and implementation.	3.37	0.77	Strongly Agree
Overall	3.38	0.77	Strongly Agree

Legend:

3.26-4.00 Strongly Agree / Very High

3.25 Agree / High

1.76-2.50 Disagree / Low

1.00-1.75 Strongly Disagree / Very Low

Table 16 presents the distribution of respondents' level of teaching and learning of School-Based Learning Action Cell implementation based on assessment strategies with an overall mean of 3.38 (SD = 0.77), described as Strongly Agree and interpreted as Very High. It means that teachers recognize the significance of effective

assessment strategies in enhancing their teaching practices. This implies that they are likely implementing a variety of assessment methods to gauge student understanding and improve learning outcomes. According to Arslan and Bumin (2020), effective assessment strategies play a critical role in the implementation of School-Based Learning Action Cell, as they provide valuable feedback on both student learning and instructional practices, with varied methods like formative assessments, peer evaluations, and self-assessments. In line with this, the indicator As a

teacher, I use formative assessment regularly to monitor learner progress and adjust instruction to meet learner needs, got the highest mean of 3.71 (SD = 0.92), described as Strongly Agree and interpreted as Very High. It means that teachers are actively engaged in the practice of formative assessment, viewing it as a critical component of their instructional approach. It indicates that teachers are likely to implement various strategies to gather information about student learning regularly. According to Wiliam (2021), formative assessment helps teachers monitor student progress and adjust instruction in real-time, creating a more responsive learning environment that boosts student engagement and achievement. On

the other hand, the indicator As a teacher, I consider contextual factors such as learner background, socio-economic status, and cultural context when designing and implementing assessments, got the lowest mean of 2.99 (SD = 0.56), described as Agree and interpreted as High. It means that while teachers acknowledge the importance of contextual factors in assessment design, the average score suggests that there may be room for improvement in fully integrating these considerations into their practices. Milner (2020) highlights that considering cultural context in assessments is crucial to avoid misinterpreting students' abilities and knowledge, making assessments more meaningful and inclusive.

Table 17: Distribution of the Level of Teaching and Learning of School-Based Learning Action Cell Implementation Based on Professional Ethics

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
As a teacher...			
I prioritize the education and well-being of students, ensuring they receive a fair, honest, and uncompromising education.	3.54	0.91	Strongly Agree
I respect students' dignity, worth, and uniqueness, including their actual and perceived gender, gender expression, gender identity, civil status, family status, sexual orientation, religion, age, disability, race, ethnicity, socio-economic status, and culture.	3.67	0.93	Strongly Agree
I demonstrate commitment to high standards of practice by staying current with ethical principles and decisions from relevant sources, including professional organizations.	3.13	0.61	Agree
I use data and materials responsibly, appropriately recognizing others' work and ensuring accurate and reliable use of data.	3.23	0.69	Agree
I conduct research in an ethical and responsible manner, with appropriate permission and supervision, and use evidence to inform practice.	3.33	0.77	Strongly Agree
I promote the health, safety, and well-being of students by establishing and maintaining appropriate verbal, physical, emotional, and social boundaries.	3.44	0.81	Strongly Agree
I engage with parents and the community to promote student learning and well-being, ensuring equitable opportunities for all students.	3.46	0.84	Strongly Agree
I am motivated by a universal respect for human life and act in ways that promote equality and respect for all students.	3.22	0.71	Agree
I model ethical principles in my pedagogy, fostering a culture of respect and ethical behavior among students.	3.52	0.87	Strongly Agree
I engage in ongoing professional learning to stay current with ethical principles and best practices, ensuring they are equipped to provide high-quality education.	3.01	0.62	Agree
Overall	3.36	0.78	Strongly Agree

Legend:

- 3.26-4.00 *Strongly Agree / Very High* 2.51-
- 3.25 *Agree / High*
- 1.76-2.50 *Disagree / Low*
- 1.00-1.75 *Strongly Disagree / Very Low*

Table 17 presents the distribution of respondents' level of teaching and learning of School-Based Learning Action Cell implementation based on professional ethics with an overall mean of 3.36 (SD = 0.78), described as Strongly Agree and interpreted as Very High. It means a significant alignment between teachers' professional conduct and the ethical standards expected in their roles. According to Bautista *et al.* (2020), the integration

of professional ethics in the School-Based Learning Action Cell fosters a responsible, supportive learning environment where respect, confidentiality, and integrity build trust, encouraging collaboration and improving teaching practices.

The indicator As a teacher, I respect students' dignity, worth, and uniqueness, including their actual and perceived gender, gender expression, gender identity, civil status, family status, sexual orientation, religion, age, disability, race, ethnicity, socio-economic status, and culture, got the highest mean of 3.67 (SD = 0.93), described as Strongly Agree and interpreted as Very

High. It means that teachers prioritize respecting and valuing each student's unique background and identity, recognizing the importance of fostering an inclusive environment. According to Smith and Lopez (2020), respecting students' individual identities, such as gender, socioeconomic status, and cultural background, is key to creating an inclusive environment.

The indicator As a teacher, I engage in ongoing professional learning to stay current with ethical principles and best practices, ensuring they are equipped to provide high-quality education, got the lowest mean of 3.01 (SD = 0.78), described as Agree and interpreted

as High. It means that while teachers acknowledge the importance of ongoing professional learning related to ethics and best practices, there may be room for strengthening their commitment to continuous learning in this area. According to Brown and Thomas (2021), ongoing professional learning helps teachers stay updated on ethical standards, enhancing education quality, while Langlois and Lapointe (2019) stress moral leadership in schools to improve the ethical climate and instruction, and Husu and Tirri (2020) highlight the importance of integrating ethical issues into lesson plans to foster social responsibility.

Table 18: Distribution of the Level of Teaching and Learning of School-Based Learning Action Cell Implementation Based on Learner Diversity and Student Inclusion

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
As a teacher...			
I should use the language of instruction that best supports the diverse needs of learners, including those with language barriers.	3.71	0.94	Strongly Agree
I address gender and disability issues in the classroom, ensuring equal opportunities for all learners and providing accommodations for those with special needs.	3.34	0.78	Strongly Agree
I follow the curriculum with inclusivity and diverse, reflecting the experiences and perspectives of all learners, including those from diverse backgrounds and cultures.	3.55	0.89	Strongly Agree
I use culturally responsive teaching strategies that acknowledge and respect the diverse backgrounds and experiences of learners, promoting a positive and inclusive learning environment.	3.42	0.78	Strongly Agree
I use differentiated instruction to cater to the diverse learning needs of learners, including those with special needs, and provide accommodations for learners with disabilities.	3.51	0.86	Strongly Agree
I ensure the classroom environment is inclusive and welcoming, promoting a sense of belonging and respect among all learners, regardless of their background or abilities.	3.23	0.76	Agree
I engage learners actively in the learning process, encouraging participation and ensuring that all learners feel valued and included.	3.21	0.75	Agree
I provide constructive feedback and assessment that acknowledges and respects the diverse needs and abilities of learners, including those with special needs.	3.43	0.79	Strongly Agree
I engage with parents and the community to promote learner diversity and inclusion, ensuring that all learners are supported and included.	3.17	0.73	Agree
I use a specific assessment strategy to acknowledge and respect the rights for every learner.	3.38	0.77	Strongly Agree
Overall	3.40	0.81	Strongly Agree

Legend:

3.26-4.00 Strongly Agree / Very High

3.25 Agree / High

1.76-2.50 Disagree / Low

1.00-1.75 Strongly Disagree / Very Low

Table 18 presents the distribution of respondents' level of teaching and learning of School-Based Learning Action Cell implementation based on learner diversity and student inclusion with an overall mean of 3.40 (SD = 0.81), described as Strongly Agree and interpreted as Very High. It means that teachers are highly committed to fostering an inclusive learning environment that respects and accommodates diverse student needs. According to Santos and Roberts (2020), School-Based Learning

2.51-

Action Cells focused on learner diversity and inclusion help teachers address diverse student needs, creating inclusive lesson plans and learning materials that promote a sense of belonging and equitable learning opportunities. The indicator As a teacher, I should use the language of instruction that best supports the diverse needs of learners, including those with language barriers, got the highest mean of 3.71 (SD = 0.94), described as Strongly Agree and interpreted as Very High. It means that teachers place a high priority on using language as a tool to bridge learning gaps among students, particularly those facing language-related challenges. According to Alonzo *et al.* (2020), adapting language use and incorporating

multilingual strategies helps bridge communication gaps, enhancing comprehension and engagement for students from diverse linguistic backgrounds.

On the other hand, the indicator As a teacher, I engage with parents and the community to promote learner diversity and inclusion, ensuring that all learners are supported and included, got the lowest mean of 3.17 (SD = 0.73), described as Agree and interpreted as High.

It means that teachers see community and parental engagement as important but may face challenges or limitations in actively implementing this practice. Johnson and Johnson (2021) emphasize the significance of community engagement in addressing the diverse needs of learners, highlighting that schools actively seeking input from local organizations can develop inclusive programs and resources.

Table 19: Distribution of the Level of Teaching and Learning of School-Based Learning Action Cell Implementation Based on ICT Integration in Instruction

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
As a teacher...			
I have a positive attitude towards ICT integration in their teaching practices, recognizing its potential to enhance learning outcomes.	3.53	0.77	Strongly Agree
I have received adequate training on ICT integration, including the use of digital tools and platforms, to support their teaching practices.	2.59	0.56	Agree
I possess the necessary ICT skills and knowledge to effectively integrate ICT into their teaching practices, including the ability to troubleshoot technical issues.	3.02	0.68	Agree
I incorporate ICT into their lesson planning, using digital tools and resources to support student learning and engagement.	2.79	0.64	Agree
I use ICT in their instruction, including the use of digital tools, multimedia, and online resources to enhance student learning.	3.01	0.67	Agree
I use ICT in assessment, including the use of digital tools and platforms to evaluate student learning and provide feedback.	3.45	0.78	Strongly Agree
I use ICT to provide feedback to students to facilitate communication and collaboration.	3.05	0.72	Agree
I use ICT to facilitate collaboration among students, including the use of digital tools and platforms to support group work and peer-to-peer learning.	3.33	0.75	Strongly Agree
I use ICT to facilitate communication with students, parents, and colleagues, including the use of digital tools and platforms to share information and resources.	2.49	0.56	Disagree
I use ICT to manage resources, including the use of digital tools and platforms to organize and share materials, and to track student progress.	2.99	0.61	Agree
Overall	3.03	0.68	Agree

Legend:

3.26-4.00 Strongly Agree / Very High

3.25 Agree / High

1.76-2.50 Disagree / Low

1.00-1.75 Strongly Disagree / Very Low

Table 19 presents the distribution of respondents' level of teaching and learning of School-Based Learning Action Cell implementation based on ICT integration in instruction with an overall mean of 3.03 (SD = 0.68), described as Agree and interpreted as High. It means that teachers recognize the value of incorporating information and communication technology into their instruction but may only partially integrate these tools. It suggests a foundational awareness and acceptance of its role in instruction, but this may not translate to frequent or advanced use. According to Ertmer *et al.* (2020), the integration of ICT in school-based Learning Action Cells enhances teaching effectiveness, helping teachers develop skills to incorporate digital tools into lessons, ultimately benefiting student learning and motivation through innovative, diverse instructional practices. The indicator As a teacher, I have a positive attitude towards

2.51-

ICT integration in their teaching practices, recognizing its potential to enhance learning outcomes, got the highest mean of 3.53 (SD = 0.77), described as Strongly Agree and interpreted as Very High. It means that teachers are not only open to the use of ICT in their classrooms but are enthusiastic about its potential to positively impact student learning. According to Tondeur *et al.* (2020), teachers' positive attitudes toward ICT integration are critical for effectively incorporating technology into their teaching practices. The indicator As a teacher, I use ICT to facilitate communication with students, parents, and colleagues, including the use of digital tools and platforms to share information and resources, got the lowest mean of 2.49 (SD = 0.56), described as Disagree and interpreted as Low. It means that teachers may not feel confident or adequately supported in utilizing ICT tools for communication with students, parents, and colleagues. It suggests that there may be barriers preventing teachers from fully engaging with ICT in a communicative capacity. According to Trust and Whalen (2021), active ICT use by teachers enhances communication, collaboration, and transparency.

Table 20: Distribution of the Level of Teaching and Learning of School-Based Learning Action Cell Implementation Based on Contextualization of Learning Materials

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
In the improvement of teaching and learning, I...			
I use learning materials which are directly relevant to the daily lives, experiences, and contexts of the learners.	3.56	0.89	Strongly Agree
I consider learning materials to incorporate local examples, case studies, and real-world situations that are familiar to the learners.	3.12	0.71	Agree
I align the learning materials to the needs, issues, and priorities of the local community where the learners reside.	3.01	0.68	Agree
I contextualize learning materials which have local resources, such as materials, tools, and experts, to make the content more accessible and engaging for learners.	3.18	0.72	Agree
I reflect the cultural diversity, traditions, and heritage of the learners' backgrounds as to the learning materials.	2.99	0.69	Agree
I incorporate the learners' mother tongue, as well as other local languages, to support language development and comprehension in the learning materials.	2.58	0.63	Agree
I originally develop learning materials which involves active engagement and collaboration with local stakeholders, such as community leaders, parents, and subject matter experts.	3.23	0.76	Agree
I design learning materials to be adaptable and flexible, allowing teachers to customize and localize them based on the specific needs and contexts of their learners.	2.36	0.52	Disagree
I provide learning materials focus on the practical application of knowledge and skills, enabling learners to connect the content to their daily lives and future career.	3.09	0.73	Agree
I should provide learning materials that encourage and motivate active learning, such as hands-on activities, problem-solving, and collaborative learning, to engage learners and make the content more meaningful.	3.22	0.77	Agree
Overall	3.02	0.70	Agree

Legend:

3.26-4.00 Strongly Agree / Very High

3.25 Agree / High

1.76-2.50 Disagree / Low

1.00-1.75 Strongly Disagree / Very Low

Table 19 presents the distribution of respondents' level of teaching and learning of School-Based Learning Action Cell implementation based on contextualization of learning materials with an overall mean of 3.02 (SD = 0.70), described as Agree and interpreted as High. It means that teachers generally agree on the value of contextualizing learning materials, as they see the benefit of making lessons more relevant and accessible to students. It implies that while teachers are supportive of contextualization, there may be challenges preventing its full integration into teaching practices. According to Burch and Pugh (2020), contextualizing learning materials to reflect students' cultural and socio-economic backgrounds enhances engagement, understanding, and the practical application of studies, meeting curriculum standards while addressing diverse learner needs. The indicator In the improvement of teaching and learning, I use learning materials which are directly relevant to the daily lives, experiences, and contexts of the learners, got the highest mean of 3.56 (SD = 0.89), described as Strongly Agree and interpreted as Very High. It means that teachers are highly committed to selecting and developing

2.51-

materials that align with students' personal and cultural contexts. It suggests that teachers view contextualized learning materials as an effective approach for enhancing teaching and learning outcomes. According to Alonzo and Rios (2020), using learning materials relevant to students' daily lives enhances engagement and understanding, helping students connect classroom concepts with personal experiences, thereby fostering deeper learning and better outcomes. On the other hand, the indicator In the improvement of teaching and learning, I design learning materials to be adaptable and flexible, allowing teachers to customize and localize them based on the specific needs and contexts of their learners, got the lowest mean of 2.36 (SD = 0.52), described as Disagree and interpreted as Low. It means that teachers might find it challenging or may lack the resources and training needed to create adaptable learning materials that can be customized to fit varied student contexts. It suggests that there could be barriers, such as time constraints or limited support, that hinder teachers from fully designing materials that can be easily adapted. According to Spector and Kearney (2020), designing adaptable and flexible learning materials is crucial for meeting the diverse needs of students, enabling teachers to tailor instruction and integrate local, culturally relevant.

Table 21: Summary of Teaching and Learning of School-Based Learning Action Cell Implementation

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
Variables	Mean	SD	Interpretations
Content Knowledge	3.08	0.67	High
Pedagogical Skills	3.34	0.79	Very High
Attitudes	3.30	0.75	Very High
Assessment Strategies	3.38	0.77	Very High
Professional Ethics	3.36	0.78	Very High
Learner Diversity and Student Inclusion	3.40	0.81	Very High
ICT Integration in Instruction	3.03	0.68	High
Contextualization of Learning Materials	3.02	0.70	High
Overall	3.24	0.74	High

Legend:

3.26-4.00 Strongly Agree / Very High

3.25 Agree / High

1.76-2.50 Disagree / Low

1.00-1.75 Strongly Disagree / Very Low

Table 21 presents the summary of teaching and learning of school-based learning action cell implementation with an overall mean of 3.24 (SD = 0.74), interpreted as High. It means that teachers generally view the school-based Learning Action Cell implementation as beneficial for enhancing their teaching practices and professional growth. This implies the recognition of the value that collaborative learning and sharing of best practices bring to their classrooms. According to Goleman and Sweeney (2020), the implementation of the School-Based Learning Action Cell has become an essential component in enhancing teaching and learning processes. The variable Learner Diversity and Student Inclusion, got the highest mean of 3.40 (SD = 0.81), interpreted as Very High. It signifies that educators are acutely cognizant of the necessity to acknowledge and adapt to the varied backgrounds, capabilities, and learning preferences of their pupils. This implies that teachers are likely to implement inclusive practices in

2.51-

their teaching, aiming to ensure all learners feel valued and supported in the classroom. It suggests that the School-Based Learning Action Cell effectively promotes discussions and strategies focused on learner diversity. Camacho and Nunez (2020) highlight that professional development programs on learner diversity enhance teachers' ability to accommodate diverse learners. The variable Contextualization of Learning Materials, got the lowest mean of 3.02 (SD = 0.70), interpreted as High. It means that teachers recognize the value of using learning materials that are relevant and applicable to the everyday lives of their students. This implies that while teachers may be employing some contextualization strategies, there is still room for improvement in fully integrating local contexts into their teaching materials. Nascimento and Tavares (2021) emphasize that teacher training in culturally responsive teaching equips educators to effectively contextualize learning materials.

Problem 3. Is There a Significant Relationship between the Respondents' Percieved Implementation of School-Based Learning Action Cell and Their Teaching and Learning Practices?

Table 22: Result of the Test on Relationship between the Teachers' Implementation of School-Based Learning Action Cell and their Teaching and Learning Practices

Teachers' Implementation of School-Based Learning Action Cell		Teaching and Learning								
		Content Knowledge	Pedagogical Skills	Attitudes	Assessment Strategies	Professional Ethics	Learner Diversity and Student Inclusion	ICT Integration in Instruction	Contextualization of Learning Materials	Overall
Assessment of Needs	r-value	0.2540	0.1733	0.2146	0.0236	0.3076	0.2653	0.2186	0.2178	0.2094
	p-value	0.0341	0.0462	0.0510	0.0327	0.0288	0.0372	0.0175	0.1056	0.0441
	S	S	NS	S	S	S	S	S	NS	S
Prioritization of Topics or Agenda	r-value	0.1763	0.4207	0.3299	0.2478	0.5350	0.2370	0.1907	0.1745	0.2890
	p-value	0.0508	0.1089	0.0388	0.1674	0.2099	0.0238	0.1970	0.0678	0.1081
	NS	NS	S	NS	NS	S	NS	NS	NS	NS

Formation of Learning Action Cell	r-value	0.4098	0.2804	0.2099	0.3268	0.3109	0.2590	0.3278	0.2654	0.2988
	p-value	0.0216	0.0388	0.1709	0.2365	0.1643	0.0328	0.2890	0.0964	0.1313
		S	S	NS	NS	NS	S	NS	NS	NS
Identification of Appropriate Intervention	r-value	0.3088	0.2099	0.1630	0.7432	0.1759	0.3109	0.1867	0.3107	0.3011
	p-value	0.0265	0.0367	0.0399	0.0129	0.0388	0.0474	0.1604	0.0745	0.0546
		S	S	S	S	S	S	NS	NS	NS
Scheduling of Meetings	r-value	0.2396	0.2099	0.1869	0.2895	0.2609	0.1756	0.3276	0.1765	0.2333
	p-value	0.1650	0.1099	0.0265	0.0467	0.0369	0.0438	0.2169	0.3209	0.1208
		NS	NS	S	S	S	S	NS	NS	NS
Setting Up Resources	r-value	0.1643	0.2339	0.2471	0.6439	0.2178	0.2095	0.1888	0.2377	0.2679
	p-value	0.0328	0.2804	0.0276	0.0476	0.0289	0.0198	0.1033	0.0743	0.0768
		S	NS	S	S	S	S	NS	NS	NS
Assignment of Work	r-value	0.1808	0.3012	0.1097	0.6420	0.4278	0.1209	0.2756	0.2095	0.2834
	p-value	0.0318	0.2098	0.2099	0.1895	0.2076	0.0405	0.4376	0.2065	0.1917
		S	NS	NS	NS	NS	S	NS	NS	NS
Preparation of Budget	r-value	0.3266	0.1708	0.2654	0.2743	0.3105	0.1044	0.4099	0.1645	0.2533
	p-value	0.0476	0.0287	0.0476	0.0320	0.0380	0.0441	0.0400	0.0421	0.0400
		S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Writing of LAC Plan	r-value	0.1905	0.2168	0.2665	0.3190	0.2165	0.3777	0.2754	0.3190	0.2727
	p-value	0.0479	0.0509	0.2809	0.2765	0.2076	0.0399	0.0679	0.2054	0.1471
		S	NS	NS	NS	NS	S	NS	NS	NS
Monitoring and Evaluation	r-value	0.3290	0.1098	0.2509	0.2645	0.1065	0.1956	0.3265	0.3066	0.2362
	p-value	0.0338	0.0388	0.0437	0.0438	0.0453	0.0430	0.0433	0.0378	0.0412
		S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Overall	r-value	0.2580	0.2327	0.2244	0.3775	0.2869	0.2256	0.2728	0.2382	NS
	p-value	0.0492	0.0905	0.0937	0.1086	0.1005	0.0372	0.1573	0.1231	
		S	NS	NS	NS	NS	S	NS	NS	

Legend:

*significant at $p < 0.05$ alpha level

S – significant

NS – not significant

Table 22 presents the correlation analysis between the teachers' implementation of school-based learning action cells and various components of teaching and learning. Significant relationships are observed in several areas, particularly where specific LAC activities align closely with core teaching competencies. The evaluation of demands by educators is substantially correlated with enhancements in content understanding and assessment methodologies. This means that when teachers actively evaluate the needs within their learning environments, they become better equipped to deliver content effectively and utilize assessment techniques that support student learning. It indicates that targeted assessments within the LAC framework may directly enhance teachers' instructional skills, providing them with relevant insights that improve teaching outcomes. Bajar *et al.* (2021) note that shared insights from colleagues on strategies like differentiated instruction and classroom management improve teaching and create a more effective learning environment. The preparation of a budget by teachers is crucial for the success of LAC, as it ensures resources

are allocated for activities like training, materials, and collaboration tools, leading to more organized and effective teaching practices. Research by Chin *et al.* (2022) found a link between well-prepared budgets and improved teacher performance in LAC sessions. Schools that allocated funds for professional development, such as ICT integration and curriculum contextualization, saw significant improvements in teacher competencies. Monitoring and evaluation of LAC activities ensure effectiveness by refining strategies through feedback and progress assessments, helping teachers adjust approaches to meet goals. A study by Bajar *et al.* (2021) highlighted that M&E activities, such as peer reviews and class observations, are crucial for refining LAC sessions. Consistent monitoring helps identify improvement areas and leads to measurable gains in teaching quality. Certain aspects of LAC implementation, like its formation and ICT integration, show no significant correlation with teaching and learning outcomes. This suggests that organizing LAC without a focused strategy may not improve technology use or enhance the contextualization of learning materials. As observed, the lack of significant relationships suggests that some LAC activities may need more targeted support to effectively impact

teaching dimensions like technology use and material contextualization. The significant areas, such as content knowledge and pedagogy, should be prioritized. Non-significant areas may require further research or intervention for better effectiveness. Gonzales and Alipio (2020) found that School-Based Learning Action Cells enhance teaching practices by fostering

collaboration, allowing teachers to share strategies and resources, which improves classroom practices and student outcomes.

Problem 4. Based on the Findings of the Study, What School Development Plan on School-Based Learning Action Cell Can be Designed?

Table 23: Matrix of School Development Plan

Year 1: Foundation and Initial Implementation								
Areas of Concern	Specific Objectives	Strategies/Activities	Time Frame	Person/s Involved	Source of Funds	Estimated Budget	Expected Outcome	
Contextualization of Learning Materials	Train teachers on contextualization techniques	Conduct a training seminar for teachers on adapting materials	Q3	Curriculum Developers, Trainers	School MOOE	₱5,000.00	Teachers skilled in adapting materials to local context	
	Create locally relevant teaching materials	Organize workshops for developing materials based on local context	Q2	Teachers, Curriculum Team	Donations	₱5,000.00	Locally contextualized teaching materials	
	Promote collaborative problem-solving through LAC sessions	Review student performance data to prioritize relevant topics.	Q2	LAC Coordinators, Teachers	School MOOE	₱5,000.00	Better implementation of solutions in classrooms	
	Develop criteria for selecting priority topics.	Organize collaborative planning workshops for LAC sessions.	Q2	LAC Coordinators, Teachers	School MOOE	₱5,000.00	Increased teacher collaboration and engagement	
	Define goals for each LAC session	Hold a planning session to align LAC topics with school goals	Q2	LAC Coordinators, Teachers	School MOOE	₱5,000.00	Aligned LAC objectives with school improvement goals	
	Establish a LAC agenda structure	Develop an agenda template and schedule monthly LAC meetings	Q1-Q2	School Head, LAC Coordinators	School MOOE	₱5,000.00	Consistent LAC structure and monthly sessions	
	Identify high-priority topics for LAC sessions	Conduct needs assessment surveys with teachers and students	Q1	LAC Facilitators, Teachers	School MOOE	₱10,000.00	Improved leadership and decision-making skills	
	Prioritization of Topics or Agenda	Develop locally relevant teaching materials	Organize workshops for developing materials based on local context	Q2	Teachers, Curriculum Team	Donations	₱5,000.00	Locally contextualized teaching materials
		Promote collaborative problem-solving through LAC sessions	Review student performance data to prioritize relevant topics.	Q2	LAC Coordinators, Teachers	School MOOE	₱5,000.00	Better implementation of solutions in classrooms
		Develop criteria for selecting priority topics.	Organize collaborative planning workshops for LAC sessions.	Q2	LAC Coordinators, Teachers	School MOOE	₱5,000.00	Increased teacher collaboration and engagement

	Encourage teachers to integrate local contexts in daily lesson plans.	Offer workshops to help teachers include local context in lessons.	Q4	Curriculum Developers, Trainers	School MOOE	₱5,000.00	Sustainable material development process	
	Revise current resources to include local relevance.	Update teaching materials with local examples and cultural relevance.	Q4	Curriculum Developers, Trainers	School MOOE	₱5,000.00	Improved student engagement	
	Pilot contextualized materials in selected classes	Implement materials in selected classes and gather feedback	Q4	Teachers	School MOOE	₱5,000.00	Feedback on the effectiveness of new materials	
Year 2: Deepening and Expansion								
Areas of Concern	Specific Objectives	Strategies/Activities	Time Frame	Person/s Involved	Source of Funds	Estimated Budget	Expected Outcome	
Prioritization of Topics or Agenda	Expand LAC sessions to cover emerging educational topics	Invite guest speakers to discuss innovative practices and methodologies	Q1-Q3	LAC Coordinators, Guest Speakers	Government Grants	₱5,000.00	Teachers informed about new educational trends	
	Tailor LAC topics to specific grade levels or subjects	Form LAC groups based on grade level or subject specialization	Q2-Q3	LAC Facilitators	School MOOE	₱5,000.00	More focused and relevant LAC sessions	
	Evaluate relevance of LAC topics based on teacher feedback	Conduct surveys after each LAC session to gather input on topic relevance	Q3-Q4	Teachers, LAC Coordinators	School MOOE	₱5,000.00	Data-driven adjustments to LAC topics	
	Align LAC topics with current curriculum needs.	Review and analyze classroom challenges to inform LAC topics.	Q3-Q4	Teachers, LAC Coordinators	School Budget	₱5,000.00	Enhanced collaboration across grade levels and subjects	
	Strengthen the alignment of LAC topics with student performance data	Organize workshops focused on emerging educational trends.	Q3-Q4	Teachers, LAC Coordinators	School Budget	₱5,000.00	Improved classroom practices linked to LAC discussions	

Contextualization of Learning Materials		Develop activities that encourage students to relate lessons to their own experiences.	Use project-based tasks linked to real-life scenarios.	Conduct workshops on contextualization techniques.	Develop materials for additional grade levels based on pilot results	Expand contextualized materials to all grade levels	Incorporate ICT tools into contextualized learning materials	Refine and update contextualized materials	
		Q4	Q4	Q4	Q3	Q2	Q1	Teachers, LAC Coordinators	
		Donations	Teachers, Curriculum Developers	Teachers, Curriculum Developers	School MOOE	Donations	Donations	Teachers, Curriculum Team	
		₱5,000.00	₱5,000.00	₱5,000.00	₱5,000.00	₱5,000.00	₱5,000.00	₱5,000.00	
		Continuous material improvement	Increased teacher involvement	Consistent quality of contextualized materials across grades	Enhanced teaching materials with ICT integration	Improved and updated contextualized materials			
Year 3: Evaluation and Sustainability									
Areas of Concern		Specific Objectives	Strategies/Activities	Time Frame	Person/s Involved	Source of Funds	Estimated Budget	Expected Outcome	
Prioritization of Topics or Agenda		Assess the impact of LAC topics on teaching practices	Conduct end-of-year assessment of LAC sessions and gather teacher feedback	Q1	Teachers, LAC Coordinators	School MOOE	₱5,000.00	Insight into LAC's impact on teaching practices	
		Standardize successful LAC topics and practices	Develop a resource guide documenting effective LAC topics and activities	Q2	School Head, LAC Coordinators	School MOOE	₱5,000.00	Documented guide for sustainable LAC implementation	
		Build capacity of new teacher leaders for LAC facilitation	Train selected teachers as future LAC facilitators	Q3	Experienced LAC Facilitators	School MOOE	₱5,000.00	Sustainable teacher leadership for continued LAC sessions	

Contextualization of Learning Materials	Foster collaborative creation of contextualized materials	Organize collaborative workshops for teachers to co-develop materials.	Q4	Teachers, Curriculum Team	School MOOE	₱5,000.00	Higher teacher engagement and ownership of LAC sessions
	Improve teacher assessment of contextualized learning materials	Conduct regular teacher feedback sessions on contextualized materials.	Q4	Teachers, Curriculum Team	School MOOE	₱5,000.00	Increased alignment between LAC topics and school goals
	Ensure long-term funding for LAC and contextualization efforts	Apply for grants and community support for continuous LAC funding	Q3	School Head, Fundraising Team	School MOOE	₱5,000.00	Secured funding for sustained LAC and material improvements
	Develop a sustainable plan for updating contextualized materials	Establish a review committee for annual material updates	Q3	Teachers, Curriculum Team	School MOOE	₱5,000.00	Consistent quality and relevance of learning materials
	Evaluate student performance using contextualized materials	Analyze student assessment data and feedback from contextualized lessons	Q1-Q2	Teachers, Data Analysts	School MOOE	₱5,000.00	Data on effectiveness of contextualized materials
	Address diverse learner needs in topics.	Create a system to track LAC topic effectiveness.	Q4	Teachers, LAC Coordinators	School MOOE	₱5,000.00	Continuous improvement in LAC sessions based on feedback and evaluation.
	Develop a feedback mechanism to refine future LAC agendas.	Host workshops on prioritizing LAC topics.	Q3-Q4	Experienced LAC Facilitators	School MOOE	₱5,000.00	Teachers will focus on high-impact topics for more effective LAC sessions.

CONCLUSION

From the results and discussions provided, several important implications can be inferred. The level of the implementation of the School-Based Learning Action Cell, as perceived by the respondents, is very high, particularly in the identification of appropriate intervention, which means that teachers place a high priority on selecting appropriate interventions to address specific educational needs, highlighting the School-Based Learning Action Cell focuses on practical, result-driven solutions. The level of teaching and learning practices of School-Based Learning Action Cell implementation

is high where learner diversity and student inclusion are very high, which means that teachers are highly aware of the importance of recognizing and accommodating the diverse backgrounds, abilities, and learning styles of their students. There is a significant relationship between the respondent’s perceived implementation of the School-Based Learning Action Cell and their teaching and learning practices as to assessments of needs, preparation of budget and monitoring and evaluation. The researcher developed a situated learning theory emphasizing the importance of authentic, real-world experiences and collaborative interactions for acquiring knowledge and

skills. Applied to the School-Based Learning Action Cell, the theory offers a framework for understanding how teaching and learning practices improve through contextual and social engagement, fostering a deeper connection between professional development and classroom practices.

Recommendation

Based on the results of the study, the following are recommended:

1. Division-level education officials should provide clear guidelines and tools for prioritizing School-Based Learning Action Cell session topics, ensuring discussions address urgent and relevant issues for teachers. Involving teachers in setting the agenda can improve engagement and align activities with their professional development needs.

2. School administrators should support teachers in contextualizing learning materials by organizing focused School-Based Learning Action Cell sessions and providing locally relevant resources. Regular monitoring and feedback can ensure effective implementation, boosting teacher confidence and student engagement.

3. Teachers should prioritize creating a standardized needs assessment tool and advocate for budget allocation for School-Based Learning Action Cell activities in the school development plan. Regular monitoring and evaluation should include School-Based Learning Action Cell coordinators' reports on activities, outcomes, and challenges.

4. Schools ought to apply the three-year school development plan devised by the researcher to improve the execution of teaching and learning methodologies.

REFERENCES

Ainscow, M. (2020). Moving towards a more inclusive education system: Lessons from international research. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 24(7), 771–787.

Alcaraz, R., & Santos, M. (2020). Identifying effective interventions: A framework for teacher empowerment. *International Journal of Educational Studies*, 8(1), 45–60.

Almonte, J. M., & Dela Cruz, R. A. (2020). Pedagogical skills and the implementation of school-based learning action cells: A qualitative study. *Philippine Journal of Educational Research*, 25(3), 22–34.

Alonzo, A. C., & Rios, D. (2020). Connecting curriculum to students' lives: The impact of relevant learning materials. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 9(2), 10–20. <https://doi.org/10.5539/jel.v9n2p10>

Alonzo, A. C., Huerta, M., & Tharp, R. G. (2020). Language of instruction and the achievement of linguistically diverse students: A systematic review. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 43(1), 16–29. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2020.1717823>

Arslan, Y., & Bumin, G. (2020). The role of assessment strategies in school-based learning action cells: Improving teacher practices and student learning.

Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability, 32(2), 205–221. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-020-09351-0>

Avalos, B., & Valenzuela, J. P. (2020). The role of mentoring and coaching in developing pedagogical skills: A qualitative study. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21(1), 23–38.

Ball, D. L., & Forzani, F. M. (2020). The role of content knowledge in teaching and learning. *Journal of Educational Research*, 32(1), 45–62.

Barrot, J. S. (2019). Professional learning communities in the Philippines: An empirical study of teachers' professional development and student learning outcomes. *Professional Development in Education*, 45(5), 837–853.

Bautista, C., & Garcia, L. (2021). Prioritizing topics in school-based learning action cells for effective teacher development. *Journal of Teacher Professional Growth*, 10(2), 147–162.

Bautista, M., & Ramirez, L. (2020). Curating high-quality resources for effective school-based learning action cells. *Journal of Teacher Development*, 15(3), 85–99.

Bautista, R. A., Cruz, M. T., & Salazar, K. (2020). Fostering ethical responsibility in collaborative learning environments: Insights from school-based learning action cells. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies*, 17(1), 35–52. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-020-04428-8>

Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2019). *Teaching for quality learning at university* (6th ed.). Open University Press.

Brown, J. S., & Thomas, H. L. (2021). Sustaining ethical teaching through professional development: A study on teachers' engagement in ongoing learning. *Journal of Professional Ethics in Education*, 13(2), 147–159. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17449642.2021.1142365>

Bunar, N. (2020). *Multilingual education: Bridging the gap between language and learning*. Routledge.

Burch, P., & Pugh, K. (2020). Contextualizing curriculum: Strategies for engaging diverse learners. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 32(1), 1–12. <https://www.isetl.org/ijtlhe/pdf/IJTLHE3684.pdf>

Campbell, E. (2019). The impact of professional ethics on educational practices. *Journal of Educational Ethics*, 25(1), 15–32.

Castillo, L., & Hernandez, P. (2020). The role of feedback mechanisms in school-based learning action cells. *Journal of Teacher Development*, 16(2), 98–112.

Chen, L., & Nguyen, T. (2019). Promoting effective interventions through participatory action research in teachers' school-based learning action cells. *Action Research in Education*, 7(3), 211–225.

Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2019). *Effective teacher professional development*. Learning Policy Institute.

Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2020). The relationship between pedagogical skills and student achievement: Insights from teacher

- education programs. *Educational Leadership and Policy Studies Journal*, 12(1), 45–63.
- Darvin, L. (2021). School-based learning action cells: Importance of needs assessment for effective teacher development. *Journal of Educational Innovation*, 6(3), 130–145.
- De Guzman, L., & Castro, H. (2020). Collaborative learning through school-based learning action cells: Impacts on teacher development. *Journal of Educational Research and Practice*, 15(3), 78–91.
- Delgado, J., & Rivera, C. (2021). Enhancing professional development through follow-up and documentation in SLACs. *Journal of Educational Collaboration*, 15(1), 45–60.
- Dizon, L., & Villanueva, J. (2020). Engaging teachers in topic selection for professional development: A pathway to enhanced practice. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies*, 12(1), 34–50.
- DuFour, R., & Fullan, M. (2020). *Cultures built to last: Systemic PLCs at work*. Solution Tree Press.
- Erstad, O., & Voogt, J. (2020). The global landscape of ICT in education: Trends and challenges. *Educational Technology & Society*, 23(2), 33–44.
- Fullan, M. (2020). *The new meaning of educational change* (5th ed.). Teachers College Press.
- Gonzales, L., & Martinez, A. (2021). Enhancing professional ethics through reflective practice in teacher development programs. *Journal of Educational Leadership*, 14(2), 120–138.
- Huerta, M., & Alonzo, A. C. (2020). Teacher perceptions of curriculum relevance in multilingual classrooms. *Journal of Multicultural Education*, 14(1), 15–27.
- Johnson, S. M., & Donaldson, M. L. (2020). The role of school-based learning action cells in sustaining teacher morale and effectiveness. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 75, 153–162. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2020.103553>
- Salazar, K., & Bautista, R. A. (2020). Collaborative teaching strategies in diverse classrooms: Lessons from school-based learning action cells. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning*, 12(3), 89–103.
- Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 15(2), 4–14.
- Timperley, H. (2020). *Realizing the power of professional learning*. Open University Press.
- Yoon, K. S., Duncan, T., Lee, S. W., Scarloss, B., & Shapley, K. (2007). *Reviewing the evidence on how teacher professional development affects student achievement* (Issues & Answers Report, REL 2007–No. 033). Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.