



**STANDARD EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT: THEIR
ADEQUACY AND UTILIZATION IN PUBLIC SECONDARY
SCHOOLS**

**JUANITO A. DIAZ, JR.
TEACHER II**

Polangui General Comprehensive High School
juanito.diazjr@deped.gov.ph

ABSTRACT

This study assessed the standard of educational facilities and equipment in public secondary schools, focusing on their adequacy and utilization as a basis for developing a monitoring and evaluation (M&E) tool to improve the delivery of quality education during the School Year 2025–2026. It examined the level of adequacy based on minimum standards, identified significant differences in adequacy and utilization, and evaluated the acceptability of the developed tool. Using a descriptive research design, data were collected through a survey questionnaire from 9 school principals, 9 facility coordinators, 120 teachers, and 10 jurors. Statistical tools such as frequency count, percentage, weighted mean, and t-test were used for data analysis.

The study found that school facilities were very adequate (WM=3.30) and equipment was adequate (WM=3.23), indicating both met minimum standards, with facilities slightly higher; accessibility and usability of facilities were rated highest, while ventilation, lighting, and sanitation were lowest, and for equipment, quantity met standards but specialized subject equipment was limited, consistent with findings that environmental conditions still need improvement for a conducive learning environment (Kohl et al., 2024). There was no

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan
Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista
Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



Available online at <https://www.instabrightgazette.com>

significant difference in the adequacy of facilities and equipment ($F=2.134161 < F_{crit}=5.317655$), suggesting consistent implementation of resource standards in line with DepEd Order No. 036, s. 2022. In terms of utilization, both facilities ($WM=3.83$) and equipment ($WM=3.42$) were optimized, with libraries most utilized and specialized laboratories least used, while equipment scheduling systems were effective but ICT tools were underutilized, supporting the view that resource effectiveness depends on both availability and use (Chibuike, 2025). However, a significant difference was found in utilization ($F=55.31471 > F_{crit}=5.317655$), showing facilities were used more than equipment due to differences in accessibility and integration, consistent with literature on uneven ICT utilization (Yangambi, 2023). In response, a Monitoring and Evaluation Tool was developed with structured checklists and a summary component to assess school resources systematically and support evidence-based management, aligned with DepEd policies, and it was rated highly acceptable ($WM=3.79$), indicating it is clear, relevant, and suitable for implementation to improve continuous monitoring and resource management in schools.

The study concluded that facilities were very adequate while equipment was adequate, with no significant difference in their adequacy, and that resource utilization was generally optimized despite a significant variation between the two. A highly acceptable three-part Monitoring and Evaluation Tool was developed to address these issues. The study further recommended strategic planning and budgeting, equitable resource allocation, continuous teacher training, and regular monitoring to improve the adequacy and utilization of school

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



resources, alongside the refinement and adoption of the monitoring tool for sustained quality improvement.

INTRODUCTION

The quality and adequacy of school facilities and equipment are critical in creating an effective and conducive learning environment in public secondary schools. School facilities include libraries, laboratories, play-grounds, gymnasiums, audio-visual rooms, classrooms, and safety equipment such as closed-circuit television (CCTV) systems and perimeter fencing. Innovations such as solar panels and rainwater collection systems further enhance the sustainability and functionality of school infrastructure (Yangambi, 2023).

In the Philippines, the management of public school facilities is guided by a comprehensive legal framework. DepEd Order No. 036, s. 2022, (Protocols and Guidelines on the Submission, Receipt, and Processing of Requests Related to the School Building Program), mandates the development of a Comprehensive School Facilities Development Plan and regular monitoring. DepEd Order No. 032, s. 2025, (Guide-lines on the Selection of Recipients and Minimum Requirements for the Construction of Inclusive Learning Resource Centers), sets standards for inclusive learning facilities. DepEd Order No. 064, s. 2017, (Establishing the Minimum Performance Standards and Specifications for DepEd School Buildings), together with DepEd Order No. 006, s. 2021, (Re-Establishment of Minimum Performance Standards and Specifications for DepEd School Buildings Using Alternative Construction Materials), ensures safety, comfort, and structural integrity. Additionally, DepEd Order No. 012, s. 2023,

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



(Guidelines on the Implementation of the Basic Education Facilities Fund (BEFF)), and DepEd Order No. 001, s. 2023, (Revised Guidelines on the Infra-structure for Safer and Resilient Schools (ISRS) Project), highlight the importance of improving physical and technological learning environments to support student safety, sanitation, and achievement.

The Basic Education Facilities Fund (BEFF) addresses infrastructure gaps by supporting the construction of new classrooms, rehabilitation of existing structures, and provision of essential facilities such as sanitation systems, furniture, and water supply. While these interventions provide the physical resources necessary for learning, the extent to which they are adequate and properly utilized ultimately determines their effectiveness in supporting teaching and learning. Therefore, this study sought to assess not only whether schools meet minimum standards but also how these resources were deployed to enhance the quality of education. Understanding both the adequacy and utilization of facilities and equipment was essential for ensuring that public secondary schools provide safe, functional, and effective learning environments that foster students' holistic development and academic success.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Research Methodology

This chapter presents the research design, sources of data, respondents of the study, research instrument, validation of the research instrument, ethical considerations, data gathering procedure, and statistical tools.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



Research Design

A research design is a structured plan that guides how a study is conducted, including the methods and procedures for collecting and analyzing data. It ensures that the research problem is addressed systematically and that the results are reliable and valid.

Descriptive research design was employed in this study as it systematically described the status of educational facilities and equipment in public secondary schools, focusing on their adequacy and utilization. According to Creswell and Creswell (2018), descriptive research aimed to accurately and systematically describe a population, situation, or phenomenon without manipulating variables, making it suitable for assessing existing conditions and identifying patterns. In this study, the design allowed for the measurement of the level of adequacy of facilities and equipment against established minimum standards, the examination of variations across selected variables, and the evaluation of the extent of utilization. Furthermore, it provided the empirical basis for developing a monitoring and evaluation tool by identifying gaps and areas needing improvement, and supported the assessment of its acceptability through clear and quantifiable data.

A survey questionnaire was utilized as the primary data-gathering instrument to collect standardized information on the adequacy and utilization of educational facilities and equipment in public secondary schools. According to Dillman, Smyth, and Christian (2014), survey questionnaires allowed researchers to systematically obtain data from a large number of respondents, enabling the quantification of perceptions, practices, and conditions. In this study, the instrument gathered data on the level of adequacy of facilities and equipment based

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



on minimum standards, the differences in adequacy across selected variables, and the extent of utilization. It also provided the necessary data for the development of a monitoring and evaluation tool and for evaluating its acceptability as assessed by jurors, ensuring structured and comparable data for analysis. With this instrument the researcher will be able to decide and come up with authentic and reliable tool in ensuring the adequacy and utilization of public facilities and equipment.

Participants of the Study

The respondents of the study, as shown in Table 1, were selected from public secondary schools in the Schools Division of Albay using purposive sampling. This method was used to include individuals directly involved in school facilities management and utilization.

The study involved 9 public school principals and 9 facility coordinators, who are responsible for planning and monitoring school facilities, and 120 teachers, who served as the primary users and provided insights on the adequacy and functionality of these facilities. In addition, 10 jurors were included to provide expert evaluation and validation based on their knowledge and experiences. These groups ensured that both administrative and user perspectives were represented in the study. Their combined inputs contributed to a more comprehensive and reliable assessment of school facilities.

The respondents were distributed across two districts, with 112 participants from District 1 and 36 from District 2, ensuring that only schools meeting the study's criteria were included. This distribution provided a balanced representation of participants from the selected areas. It also allowed for meaningful comparisons between districts in terms of facility

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



adequacy and utilization. Furthermore, it strengthened the credibility of the findings by reflecting actual conditions across the participating schools.

Research Instrument

A survey questionnaire-checklist is a research instrument that combines structured questions and a list of indicators to collect specific information from respondents. It helps researchers systematically gather, organize, and quantify data about attitudes, behaviors, or conditions for analysis.

The researcher made three survey questionnaire-checklists namely Survey Questionnaire for Standard of Educational Facilities and Equipment: their Adequacy and Utilization in Public Secondary Schools, Monitoring and Evaluation Tool, and Acceptability of Monitoring and Evaluation Tool.

Survey Questionnaire for Standard of Educational Facilities and Equipment: their Adequacy and Utilization in Public Secondary Schools has two parts. Part I assessed the level of adequacy of resources based on minimum standards, specifically focusing on the adequacy of facilities and equipment, using a Four-point rating scale where 4-indicates Very Adequate, 3-Adequate, 2-Inadequate, and 1-Very Inadequate. Part II evaluated the extent of utilization of resources, specifically focusing on the utilization of facilities and equipment, using a Four-point rating scale wherein 4 indicates optimized, 3-Fully Utilized, 2-Partially Utilized, and 1-Underutilized.

Next survey questionnaire-checklist is the Monitoring and Evaluation Tool and it composed of three parts. Monitoring and Evaluation Tool included the Facilities Monitoring

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



Available online at <https://www.instabrightgazette.com>

Checklist, Equipment Monitoring Checklist, and Evaluation Summary Tool, each using a four-point rating scale wherein the Facilities Monitoring Checklist rated 4 as Excellent Condition, 3 as Good Condition, 2 as Fair Condition, and 1 as Poor Condition; the Equipment Monitoring Checklist rated 4 as fully functional, 3 as functional, 2 as partially functional, and 1 as non-functional; and the Evaluation Summary Tool rated 4 as very satisfactory, 3 as satisfactory, 2 as needs improvement, and 1 as poor.

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) tools are made of researcher and it customized for specific studies, designed according to the research objectives and variables, and are flexible and modifiable within the study's context. In contrast, Department of Education (DepEd) M&E tools are standardized, policy-driven, and used nationwide to ensure consistency, accountability, and compliance, making them less adaptable to individual changes.

Third survey questionnaire-checklists is the Acceptability of the Monitoring and Evaluation Tool included clarity, relevance, simplicity, reliability, validity, usability, time efficiency, cultural appropriateness, completeness, and stakeholder acceptability, using a four-point rating scale where 4 indicates highly acceptable, 3 acceptable, 2 less acceptable, and 1 not acceptable. The results were used to determine the overall quality and practicality of the tool. They also served as the basis for refining and improving the instrument to ensure its effectiveness in evaluating school facilities and equipment in order to come up of immediate decisions in monitoring of facilities and procurement of equipment.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



Validation of the Research Instrument

The instrument was further validated through a dry run with the selected 10 Jurors from the public secondary schools with experiences and accessibility to the facilities and equipment and found out that the instrument was practical and usable by them.

The purpose of conducting a dry run is to determine the face validity and the content validity of the instrument. Suggestions given by the respondents for the improvement of the questionnaire to raise its validity for accuracy be considered.

Validation of the Research Instrument

The instrument was further validated through a dry run with the selected 10 Jurors from the public secondary schools with experiences and accessibility to the facilities and equipment and found out that the instrument was practical and usable by them.

The purpose of conducting a dry run is to determine the face validity and the content validity of the instrument. Suggestions given by the respondents for the improvement of the questionnaire to raise its validity for accuracy be considered.

Ethical Considerations

Research ethics were given paramount importance throughout the study, particularly in the collection, interpretation, and reporting of data. The principles of competence, integrity, accountability, confidentiality, respect for respondents' privacy, and beneficence were strictly observed in the conduct of the research. Furthermore, the provisions of the Data Privacy Act of 2012 (Republic Act No. 10173) were complied with to ensure the protection of personal information. All data gathered from the respondents were handled with strict confidentiality,

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



utilized solely for academic purposes, and securely stored to prevent unauthorized access.

Information consent was obtained from all participants prior to data collection, and their participation was voluntary. Anonymity was likewise ensured, and no identifying information was disclosed at any stage of the study.

Data Gathering Procedure

The data-gathering procedure was carried out in three phases, the pre-implementation phase, the implementation phase, and the post-implementation phase. During the pre-implementation phase, preliminary activities were undertaken to ensure the smooth conduct of the study. The researcher secured a recommendation letter signed by the Dean of the Graduate School of Republic Colleges of Guinobatan, Inc. to obtain permission to conduct the research. A formal request for approval was then submitted to the Schools Division Superintendent (SDS) of one of the Division in the Province of Albay, and approval sought from the Public Schools District Supervisors and Public Secondary School Heads. Upon approval, the researcher introduced and explained the purpose of the study to the identified respondents.

During the implementation phase, the actual data collection was conducted. The researcher reproduced copies of the questionnaire based on the number of target respondents and personally administered them with the assistance of the school heads. Clear instructions were provided to ensure accurate responses, and the respondents were given sufficient time to answer all items. The accomplished questionnaires were retrieved immediately after

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



completion to ensure a high retrieval rate and data accuracy. The distribution and retrieval of the questionnaires were summarized in Table 2.

During the post-implementation phase, the collected data were organized, tallied, and subjected to appropriate statistical treatment. The responses were encoded, analyzed, and interpreted using statistical tools such as frequency count, percentage, weighted mean, and t-test. This process facilitated a clear understanding of the findings and supported the formulation of conclusions and recommendations based on the results of the study. Data cleaning and validation were conducted to ensure the accuracy and completeness of the dataset.

Furthermore, the analyzed data were presented in both tabular and narrative forms for better interpretation. Each result was examined in relation to the objectives of the study to maintain consistency and relevance. This approach strengthened the reliability of the findings and minimized possible errors in interpretation. Consequently, the study was able to generate evidence-based conclusions and practical recommendations. It also improved the clarity of data presentation for easier understanding by readers.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

This chapter presents the analysis, interpretation of the gathered data to address the research problems. It was divided into two parts covering the following: (1) the level of adequacy of resources based on minimum standards along facilities and equipment; (2) the significant differences in adequacy among variables; (3) the extent of resource utilization

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



along facilities and equipment; (4) the significant difference in utilization among variables; (5) the development of a monitoring and evaluation tool to address issues in adequacy and utilization for quality education; and (6) the acceptability of the monitoring and evaluation tool as evaluated by jurors.

Level of Adequacy of Resources Based on Minimum Standards Along Facilities

The level of adequacy of school facilities based on minimum standards showed that accessibility and usability of school facilities obtained the highest mean score, interpreted as Very Adequate, indicating that school facilities were generally designed and organized to ensure ease of access and functional use among students, teachers, and administrators, and suggesting that functional accessibility had been prioritized to support efficient instructional.

In contrast, ventilation, lighting, and sanitation obtained the lowest mean score, interpreted as Adequate, which indicated that environmental and health-related conditions were less consistently met compared to other indicators.

It may have been influenced by infrastructure limitations, aging buildings, or inconsistent maintenance practices affecting airflow, lighting, and sanitation systems that affect clients, administration, teachers and the process of learning of every student of the public secondary schools.

The findings of the study support the studies of Morgan and Atienzer 2023, Earthman 2022, and Del Rosario 2025: If facilities exist but lack regular and proper maintenance, it negatively impacts teacher performance and learning outcomes.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



The results suggested that while school facilities were generally adequate in terms of usability and structural functionality, improvements and maintenance for sustenance were still needed in environmental quality standards to further promote a safe, healthy, and conducive learning environment that supported learner well-being and academic performance. In the end, the community or stakeholders, administrator, teachers, clients and students as a whole, will benefit more of this, if it will be given proper attention.

Level of Adequacy of Resources Based on Minimum Standards Along Equipment

As shown in Table 5, the level of adequacy of resources based on minimum standards along equipment obtained an overall weighted mean, and as interpreted as Adequate. This indicated that, in general, school equipment resources met the minimum required standards, although further improvements were still needed to reach a higher level of adequacy.

Among the indicators, quantity of equipment met minimum standards obtained the highest mean score, and interpreted as Very Adequate. This suggested that schools had sufficiently provided the required number of equipment, which reflected compliance with basic allocation standards and a focus on the procurement and distribution of instructional materials. It implied that school management had prioritized the availability of equipment in terms of quantity to support basic instructional needs.

In contrast, availability of equipment for specialized subjects obtained the lowest mean score and as interpreted as Adequate. This indicated that equipment for specialized or technical subjects was less available compared to general instructional equipment.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



This may have been attributed to higher costs of specialized tools, limited budget allocation, or prioritization of general-purpose resources over subject-specific requirements.

Improving these aspects was considered essential, as adequate and well-maintained instructional equipment had been associated with enhanced teaching effectiveness and improved learner outcomes (UNESCO, 2020).

Overall, the findings suggested that while schools had met minimum standards in terms of equipment quantity, challenges still existed in ensuring equitable access, functionality, maintenance, and availability of specialized instructional tools. This implied that resource management had focused more on compliance with quantity requirements rather than optimization of usability, accessibility, and specialization.

Significant Difference in the Level of Adequacy of Resources Based on Minimum Standards Along Facilities and Equipment

An F-test was used to determine whether a significant difference existed between the variables. Since the computed F-value of 2.134 was lower than the critical F-value of 5.32 at 0.05 level of significance with 1 and 8 degrees of freedom, the null hypothesis was accepted, and the alternative hypothesis was rejected. This indicated that there was no significant difference in the level of adequacy of resources based on minimum standards along facilities and equipment.

These findings suggested that public secondary schools had maintained a consistent standard in their resources, which was essential in supporting effective teaching and learning. They further indicated that minor variations, such as slightly lower ratings in equipment

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



accessibility or maintenance, did not significantly affect the overall adequacy of resources, thereby supporting the study's objective of assessing compliance with the required minimum standards for facilities and equipment.

These results were consistent with the findings of Andal (2024), which emphasized that the presence of low-quality facilities and equipment hindered the learning process.

This analysis helps determine which area meets the required standards more effectively and which requires improvement. Additionally, the findings provide useful insights for improving resource planning and enhancing the quality of the learning environment.

Extent of Utilization of the Resources Along Facilities

As shown in Table 7, the extent of utilization of the resources along facilities obtained an overall weighted mean of 3.83, and interpreted as Optimized, indicating that school facilities were highly utilized in instructional activities.

Among the indicators, the library accessed by users, obtained the highest mean score, and interpreted as Optimized. This suggested that the library was the most frequently utilized facility, indicating its strong role in supporting learning activities, information access, and academic engagement. It implied that learning resource areas were consistently used and served as a primary support structure for instructional needs. In contrast, laboratories obtained the lowest mean score and interpreted as Optimized. This may have been attributed to limited access, scheduling constraints, or the specialized nature of activities conducted in these areas.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



The impact of these findings showed that effective utilization enhanced teaching and learning by improving resource use, learner engagement, and academic support, while lower use of specialized facilities limited some experiential learning opportunities, requiring improved implementation strategies.

These findings were consistent with Segismundo (2025), who emphasized that proper and consistent utilization of facilities was as important as their availability.

With the data gathered, it suggests that facility in science laboratories, TLE should be given more attention in providing such facility for it hinders the process of learning of the student in public secondary schools.

Extent of Utilization of the Resources Along Equipment

As shown in Table 8, the extent of utilization of the resources along equipment obtained an overall weighted mean, and interpreted as Optimized, indicating that equipment was generally well-utilized in instructional and learning activities.

Among the indicators, equipment scheduling and borrowing system obtained the highest mean, and interpreted as Optimized, suggesting that proper systems for accessing and managing equipment were consistently followed. In contrast, ICT equipment (computers and projectors) obtained the lowest mean also interpreted as Optimized, indicating comparatively lower use in instructional delivery, possibly due to limited integration or access constraints.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



Overall, the findings showed that equipment was effectively utilized, especially in management systems and learner support. Though limited use of ICT and audio-visual tools indicated a need for better technology integration

These results affirmed that effective utilization, not just availability, enhances instructional quality and learning outcomes (Chibuike, 2025).

It suggests on the data gathered, procurement of more quality ICT equipment, like computers, and projectors for use by the teachers and students.

Significant Difference in the Extent of Utilization of Resources Along Facilities and Equipment

The result indicated that the utilization of facilities and equipment was not equal, suggesting differences in how effectively each resource was used. While both contributed to teaching effectiveness and student performance, the imbalance may have limited overall learning outcomes. This implies the need for a more balanced and strategic approach, with regular assessment and policies to ensure optimal and equitable utilization of both facilities and equipment.

This results was related to the study of Andal(2024) which emphasized the importance the improvement of facilities and proper resource allocation to address congestion issue.

This implies the need for a more balanced and strategic approach, with regular assessment and policies to ensure optimal and equitable utilization of both facilities and equipment.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



Developed Prototype Monitoring and Evaluation Tool

The tool was intended to assist school administrators in identifying priority areas and implementing timely interventions. Through regular monitoring and evaluation, it was expected to enhance the adequacy and utilization of facilities and equipment, thereby improving teaching and learning outcomes.

The prototype monitoring and evaluation tool was developed in response to identified issues in the adequacy and utilization of facilities and equipment in delivering quality education in the Division of Albay. The tool consisted of three components: the Facilities Monitoring Checklist, the Equipment Monitoring Checklist, and the Summary of Evaluation Tool, which collectively captured data on the condition, availability, and use of school resources.

The development of the tool was anchored on findings related to damaged or unsafe facilities and the lack of regular equipment maintenance. Although these issues had lower frequency, they remained critical due to their impact on the safety and effectiveness of the learning environment.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations were drawn.

1. School administrators may prioritize strategic planning and budgeting to ensure that school facilities and equipment complied with the required minimum standards for effective teaching and learning. With the prioritize allocations, procurements of equipment and facilities maintenance may contribute a lot in the process of learning.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



2. Equitable resource allocation was recommended, with priority given to indicators that obtained the lowest levels of adequacy, particularly ventilation, lighting, and sanitation under facilities, and the availability of equipment for specialized subjects under equipment. This may indicate the need to improve environmental conditions and strengthen access to subject-specific instructional resources to achieve balanced adequacy across school facilities and equipment.
3. Teachers were encouraged and provided with training opportunities to maximize the utilization of available facilities and equipment through effective integration into instructional delivery. This suggested the need for continuous professional development focusing on innovative teaching strategies and the effective use of laboratories, ICT tools, and other learning spaces. It may results to more conducive and effective teaching.
4. Capacity-building programs and regular monitoring were recommended to address variations in the extent of utilization across different indicators. It may imply the necessity of sustained training, technical assistance, and systematic supervision to ensure the consistent and effective use of school resources.
5. A comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Tool were recommended to systematically assess, monitor, and improve the adequacy and utilization of school facilities and equipment in support of quality education. It may imply of immediate decision making by the policymakers, supervisors, school administrations, school heads, stakeholders, and teachers.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE

ISSN: 2704-3010

Volume VII, Issue III

April 2026

Available online at <https://www.instabrightgazette.com>



6. It was further recommended that the Monitoring and Evaluation Tool be adopted and continuously refined based on jurors' feedback to ensure its validity, reliability, and relevance in evaluating school facilities and equipment. This may ensure its effectiveness as a sustainable instrument for continuous quality improvement in public secondary schools.



Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



References

A. BOOKS

Agub (2012). Competency-Based Learning Materials Facilitating Learning Sessions, National TVET Trainers Academy, Technical Education and Skills Development Authority, April 2012, 126.

Alferez and Duno (2010). MSA Statistics and Probability, Cainta Publishing House, 2010, 35-41.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2014). Internet, phone, mail, and mixed-mode surveys: The tailored design method (4th ed.). John Wiley & Sons.

B. PERIODICALS/ JOURNALS

Abas, & Marasigan. (2020). Readiness of science laboratory facilities of public junior high schools in Lanao del Sur. Retrieved on April 8, 2026 from <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.10294.52805>

Ambubuyog, et al. (2025). Assessing the quality of school facilities and student engagement in a public school. Retrieved on April 8, 2026 from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/391767509_Assessing_the_Quality_of_School_Facilities_and_Student_Engagement_in_A_Public_School

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez, Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



Andal. (2024). School facilities and academic performance in public high schools in Laguna.

Retrieved on April 8, 2026 from

<https://rsisinternational.org/journals/ijriss/articles/school-expansion-and-performances-of-public-high-schools-in-the-province-of-laguna/>

Andrade, A. E., Padilla, L., & Carrington, S. J. (2024). Educational spaces: The relation between school infrastructure and learning outcomes. *Heliyon*, 10(19), e38361.

Retrieved on April 16, 2026 from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e38361>

Ayodele, et al. (2025). Impact of school facilities on students' academic performance in Nigerian secondary schools. Retrieved on April 8, 2026 from

<https://fnasjournals.com/index.php/FNAS-JMSE/article/view/908>

Barrett, et al. (2020). The impact of classroom design on pupils' learning. Retrieved on April 8, 2026 from

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/272625202_The_impact_of_classroom_design_on_pupils'_learning_Final_results_of_a_holistic_multi-level_analysis

Cabusor, & Antonio. (2025). Availability, accessibility, and teachers' utilization of science laboratory resources in public secondary schools of Ilocos Norte. Retrieved on April 8,

2026 from <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.06.03.33>

Castillo, & Cay. (2024). Utilization of special education fund in selected public schools in Quezon Province. Retrieved on April 8, 2026 from

<https://doi.org/10.53378/ijemds.353115>

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez, Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



Chibuike. (2025). Facility maintenance practices and instructional effectiveness in technical colleges in Nigeria. Retrieved on April 8, 2026 from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/377863380_Preventive_Maintenance_Practices_on_School_Facilities_Implications_for_Effective_Instructional_Delivery_in_Technical_Education_Programmes_in_Colleges_of_Education_in_South-East_Nigeria

Earthman. (2021). School facility conditions and student achievement: A meta-analysis. Retrieved on April 8, 2026 from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/362420423_RESEARCH_ON_SCHOOL_FACILITIES_AND_STUDENT_ACHIEVEMENT

Gelacio, M. J. O., & Comighud, S. M. T. (2020). Utilization of information and communication technology (ICT) resources. *IJRDO Journal of Educational Research*, 5(5), 1–20. Retrieved on April 16, 2026 from <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3865911>

Kohl, et al. (2024). School building environmental conditions and student learning efficiency. Retrieved on April 8, 2026 from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/396403115_Advancing_Energy_Efficiency_in_Educational_Buildings_A_Case_Study_on_Sustainable_Retrofitting_and_Management_Strategies

Limon, M. R. (2016). The effect of the adequacy of school facilities on students' performance and achievement in technology and livelihood education. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, 5(1). Retrieved on April 22, 2026 from <https://ijarped.com/index.php/journal/article/view/274>

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez, Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



Morgan, & Atienzar. (2023). School facilities and teacher satisfaction in public schools of Davao

City. Retrieved on April 8, 2026 from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/376640509_THE_INFLUENCE_OF_SCHOOL_FACILITIES_AND_EFFECTIVENESS_ON_THE_SATISFACTION_OF_TEACHERS_IN_PUBLIC_SCHOOLS

Mylonas, et al. (2020). Smart school infrastructure and digital learning integration. Retrieved on April 8, 2026 from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joitmc.2025.100638>

Navarro. (2024). School infrastructure in the Philippines: Where are we now and where should we be heading? Retrieved on April 8, 2026 from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/383549834_School_Infrastructure_in_the_Philippines_Where_Are_We_Now_and_Where_Should_We_Be_Heading

Philippine Institute for Development Studies. (2024). School infrastructure in the Philippines: Policy gaps and development challenges. Retrieved on April 8, 2026 from <https://pidswebs.pids.gov.ph/CDN/document/pidsrp2406.pdf>

Remirata, & Ramada. (2024). Fiscal management and school resource provision in public schools. Retrieved on April 8, 2026 from <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.803189S>

Segismundo. (2025). Utilization of library facilities in selected secondary schools in Rizal Province. Retrieved on April 8, 2026 from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/400883681_Utilization_of_Library_Resources_in_Selected_Public_Elementary_Schools

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez, Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE

ISSN: 2704-3010

Volume VII, Issue III

April 2026

Available online at <https://www.instabrightgazette.com>



Tamayo. (2024). Status of ICT resources in public schools in Masbate. Retrieved on April 8,

2026

from

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/387141882_STATUS_OF_ICT_RESOURCES_IN_THE_SCHOOLS_BASIS_FOR_UTILIZATION_AND_PROCUREMENT_PLANS

Uline, & Tschannen-Moran. (2020). The walls speak: The interplay of quality facilities, school climate, and student achievement. Retrieved on April 8, 2026 from

<https://doi.org/10.1108/09578230810849817>

William, et al. (2025). Impact of learning resources and school facilities on literacy skills in rural and urban Philippine schools. Retrieved on April 8, 2026 from

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/388217913_Impact_of_Learning_Resources_and_School_Facilities_on_Literacy_Skills_in_Rural_and_Urban_Philippine_Schools

Yangambi, M. (2023). Impact of school infrastructure on students' learning and achievement: Case of three public schools in the Kinshasa-Ngaliema education division. *Creative Education*,

14, 788–809. Retrieved on January 21, 2026 from

<https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2023.144052>

Yangambi. (2023). Effects of school infrastructure on teaching and learning in public schools in the Democratic Republic of Congo. Retrieved on April 8, 2026 from

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/370395131_Impact_of_School_Infrastructures_on_Students_Learning_and_Performance_Case_of_Three_Public_Schools_in_a_Developing_Country

Developing_Country

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



Zairi. (2021). School facility maintenance practices in Malaysian educational institutions.

Retrieved on April 8, 2026 from <https://ir.uitm.edu.my/id/eprint/71533/1/71533.pdf>

C. DEPED ORDERS / ISSUANCES

Department of Education. (2010). DepEd Order No. 88, s. 2010: 2010 secondary education development and improvement project (SEDIP). Department of Education, Philippines.

Department of Education. (2015). DepEd Order No. 8, s. 2015: Policy guidelines on classroom assessment for the K to 12 basic education programs. Department of Education, Philippines.

Department of Education. (2015). DepEd Order No. 40, s. 2015: Guidelines on K to 12 school improvement planning (SIP). Department of Education, Philippines.

Republic of the Philippines. (2022). Department of Education Order No. 036,s. 2022 Protocols and Guidelines on the submission, receipt, and processing of Requests related to the building program and other school Facilities Improvements Projects Retrieved on September 1, 2025 from <https://www.deped.gov.ph/>

DepEd (2023), DepEd Order No. 018, s. 2023 titled Revised Multi-Year Guidelines on the Allocation, Receipt, Utilization, Monitoring, and Reporting of the Basic Education Facilities Funds (BEFF). Retrieved on April 16, 2026 from <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2023/07/21/july-20-2023-do-018-s-2023-revised-multi-year-guidelines-on-the-allocation-receipt-utilization-monitoring-and-reporting-of-the-basic-education-facilities-funds-beff/>

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



D. LEGAL BASES

Republic Act No. 9155. (2001). Governance of basic education act of 2001. Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines.

Republic Act No. 10533. (2013). Enhanced basic education act of 2013. Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines.

Republic Act No. 10173. (2012). Data Privacy Act of 2012. Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines. Retrieved on April 16, 2026 from <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/2012/08/15/republic-act-no-10173/>

E. ELECTRONIC / INTERNET SOURCES

Cambridge University Press. (2025). Equipment. Retrieved on April 20, 2026 from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/equipment>

Cambridge University Press. (2025). Facilities. Retrieved on April 20, 2026 from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/facilities>

Collins Dictionary. (2026). Simplicity. Retrieved on April 20, 2026 from <https://www.collinsdictionary.com>

Dictionary.com. (2026). Clarity. Retrieved on April 20, 2026 from <https://www.dictionary.com>

Drost, E. A. (2011). Reliability and validity in research. *Journal of Science Education*, 10(1), 1–15.

Encyclopedia. (2026). Cultural appropriateness. Retrieved on April 20, 2026 from <https://www.encyclopedia.com>

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez, Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE

ISSN: 2704-3010

Volume VII, Issue III

April 2026

Available online at <https://www.instabrightgazette.com>



Hendricks, A. (2026). Stakeholder's acceptability. Retrieved on April 20, 2026 from <https://simplystakeholders.com/company/>

IGI Global. (2025). Urban school. Retrieved on April 20, 2026 from <https://www.igi-global.com>

Merriam-Webster. (2025). Accessibility. Retrieved on April 20, 2026 from <https://www.merriam-webster.com>

Merriam-Webster. (2025). Condition. Retrieved on April 20, 2026 from <https://www.merriam-webster.com>

Merriam-Webster. (2025). Public secondary school. Retrieved on April 20, 2026 from <https://www.merriam-webster.com>

Merriam-Webster. (2025). Quality. Retrieved on April 20, 2026 from <https://www.merriam-webster.com>

Merriam-Webster. (2025). Usability. Retrieved on April 20, 2026 from <https://www.merriam-webster.com>

Municipality of Polangui. (n.d.). Municipal profile. Retrieved on August 21, 2025, from <https://polangui.gov.ph/municipality-profile/>

Nekvinda, A. (2026). Time efficiency: Meaning and importance. Hubstaff Blog. Retrieved on April 20, 2026 from <https://hubstaff.com/blog/time-efficiency/>

Republic of the Philippines, Department of Environment and Natural Resources. (n.d.). Mandate, mission, and vision. <https://denr.gov.ph>

Republic of the Philippines, Department of Public Works and Highways. (n.d.). Standard design plans of school buildings. <https://www.dpwh.gov.ph>

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez, Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



ScienceDirect. (2025). Rural school. Retrieved on April 20, 2026 from

<https://www.sciencedirect.com>

Turney. (2022). Frequency distribution: Tables, types & examples. Retrieved on September

5, 2025 from <https://www.scribbr.com/statistics/frequency-distributions/>

Vocabulary.com. (2026). Adequacy. Retrieved on April 20, 2026 from

<https://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/adequacy>

Vocabulary.com. (2026). Availability. Retrieved on April 20, 2026 from

<https://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/availability>

Wais. (2025). Weighted mean statistics. Retrieved on September 5, 2025 from

https://uomus.edu.iq/img/lectures21/MUCLecture_2023_101720364.pdf

F. INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION PUBLICATIONS

OECD. (2010). Glossary of key terms in evaluation and results-based management. Retrieved

on April 20, 2026 from <https://www.oecd.org>

OECD (2021), Learning Environments and Student Performance in OECD Countries.

World Bank. (2011). Monitoring and evaluation: Some tools, methods and approaches.

Retrieved on April 20, 2026 from <https://www.worldbank.org>

World Bank (2022), Safe and Resilient School Infrastructure in Developing Countries.

UNESCO. (2014). Education glossary and indicators. Retrieved on April 20, 2026

<https://www.unesco.org>

UNESCO (2020), School Infrastructure and Learning Outcomes.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE

ISSN: 2704-3010

Volume VII, Issue III

April 2026

Available online at <https://www.instabrightgazette.com>

United Nations Sustainable Development Retrieved on April 18, 2026 from <https://sdgs.un.org>



Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza
