Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

# The Status Of Child Protection Policy And Organizational Performance Of The Public Secondary Schools In Isabela: Bases For A Comprehensive Training Program

Daisy P. Camba [1], Nerissa P Batoon, PhD [1]
1 – Isabela State University-Echague
daisy.camba001@deped.gov.ph

Publication Date: May 18, 2026 DOI: **10.5281/zenodo.20268925**

**Abstract**

This study examined the implementation of the Child Protection Policy (CPP) and its relationship with organizational performance in public secondary schools in Isabela, Philippines. It aimed to assess the level of CPP implementation across key domains and determine its association with School-Based Management (SBM) performance.

A descriptive–correlational design was employed involving 300 respondents from 20 purposively selected schools, including implementers, learners, and community representatives. Data were gathered using the validated Child Protection Policy Implementation Assessment Questionnaire (CPP-IMaQ). Statistical tools included frequency, percentage, mean, standard deviation, analysis of variance (ANOVA), and Pearson's correlation coefficient.

Findings revealed that implementers and community representatives rated CPP implementation as excellently evident, particularly in intervention programs, restorative practices, and monitoring mechanisms, while learners rated these as fairly evident, indicating lower awareness and engagement. Significant differences in implementation were observed when grouped by school size, years of service, and educational attainment ($p < .05$). Larger schools demonstrated stronger implementation in referral systems, parent education, and external linkages. In terms of organizational performance, only a limited number of schools reached the advanced SBM level, reflecting uneven institutional development. Moreover, selected learner-centered interventions, restorative practices, and participatory monitoring indicators showed significant positive correlations with SBM performance ($p < .05$).

The study concludes that while CPP structures are generally established, enhancing learner engagement, stakeholder participation, and monitoring systems is essential to improve policy effectiveness and organizational performance. These findings provide empirical inputs for targeted training and policy enhancement initiatives in public secondary schools.

**Keywords:** *Child Protection Policy, restorative practices, intervention programs, school-based management, organizational performance, school governance*

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

## 1. Introduction

### *Background and rationale*

The COVID-19 pandemic significantly disrupted educational systems worldwide, reshaping the context in which schools address student welfare, behavior, and safety. In the Philippines, prolonged school closures and the shift to remote learning heightened concerns related to learners' mental health, exposure to abuse, and limited access to reporting and support mechanisms. Reports indicated increasing cases of psychological distress, including suicide and attempted suicide among learners, underscoring the urgency of strengthening school-based protection systems.

In response, the Department of Education (DepEd) reinforced initiatives such as school mental health programs, referral systems, and inter-agency collaborations. Central to these efforts is the Child Protection Policy (CPP), which aims to ensure a safe and secure learning environment through intervention programs, restorative practices, and monitoring mechanisms. However, the effectiveness of CPP implementation remains uneven, with gaps in awareness, reporting, and stakeholder engagement.

The pandemic further exposed structural limitations of traditional child protection approaches, which relied heavily on face-to-face interactions and school-based monitoring. The transition to a post-pandemic "new normal," characterized by blended learning environments and increased digital exposure, necessitates a shift toward more adaptive, inclusive, and technology-responsive protection systems. Despite these changes, there is limited empirical evidence on how schools are implementing CPP within this evolving context and how such implementation relates to organizational performance.

This study addresses this gap by examining the status of CPP implementation in public secondary schools in Isabela, focusing on intervention programs, restorative practices, and monitoring systems. It further analyzes differences in implementation across selected school and respondent profiles and determines the relationship between CPP implementation and School-Based Management (SBM) performance. The findings aim to provide evidence-based inputs for strengthening child protection mechanisms and enhancing organizational performance in the post-pandemic educational landscape.

### *Review of related literature*

Child protection is a fundamental human right recognized in global frameworks. The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC, 1989) mandates the protection of children from all forms of abuse, neglect, and exploitation, particularly under Article 19. Complementing this, the World Health Organization (2020) identifies violence against children as a major public health concern affecting development and education, while UNICEF's Child-Friendly Schools Framework emphasizes safe, inclusive, and protective learning environments. These frameworks establish that child protection is a shared responsibility across institutions, particularly schools.

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

Despite these global commitments, studies reveal persistent challenges in implementation. Al-Qaysi (2018) found variations in school personnel attitudes toward policy adoption, while Heiman and Gupta (2020) emphasized the gap between policy and practice. Mustikasari and Rostyaningsih (2020) and Munger and Markstrom (2019) identified weak implementation and limited awareness as key issues. Sinanan (2011) highlighted barriers to reporting, including fear of consequences and lack of knowledge. In the post-pandemic context, Stoilova, Livingstone, and Khazbak (2021) reported increased online risks such as cyberbullying, underscoring the need for adaptive child protection mechanisms.

In the Philippines, these global principles are translated into national legal and policy frameworks. The 1987 Philippine Constitution affirms the State's duty to protect children, while Republic Act 7610 provides the legal basis for addressing child abuse, exploitation, and discrimination. Within the education sector, child protection is institutionalized through DepEd Order No. 40, s. 2012, which outlines procedures for prevention, reporting, investigation, and intervention. This is supported by DepEd Order No. 55, s. 2013 (Anti-Bullying Act implementation), DepEd Order No. 18, s. 2015 (Children-at-Risk and Children in Conflict with the Law), and DepEd Order No. 003, s. 2021, which strengthens child protection structures such as the Child Protection Unit (CPU) and Child Rights in Education Desk (CREDe). Other relevant policies include DepEd Order No. 57, s. 2017 (Protection of Children in Armed Conflict) and DepEd Order No. 32, s. 2017 (Gender-Responsive Basic Education).

At the division level, the Schools Division of Isabela developed the Child Protection Against Bullying (CPAB) Manual, later revised as Version 2.0 (2022) to address gaps in reporting, policy interpretation, and case management. The updated manual integrates multiple DepEd policies and adopts restorative justice principles and positive discipline approaches. It provides structured procedures for prevention, reporting, investigation, and intervention, along with standardized tools for documentation, referral, and monitoring.

At the school level, child protection is operationalized through the School-Based Management (SBM) framework, as strengthened from DepEd Order No. 83, s. 2012 to DepEd Order No. 007, s. 2024. Child protection is embedded across SBM domains, particularly in learning environment, governance, leadership, and stakeholder engagement. Supporting mechanisms include DepEd Order No. 44, s. 2015 (School Improvement Plan and School Report Card), DepEd Order No. 45, s. 2015 (SBM Grants), and DepEd Order No. 009, s. 2021 (Quality Management System), which collectively enhance planning, resource allocation, and continuous improvement.

Empirical studies in the Philippine context show that while policies are established, implementation varies. Baronia (2020) and Bayucca (2020) reported general awareness among teachers but noted inconsistencies in practice. Estremera (2018) and Segundo and Guia (2019) emphasized the need for capacity-building and stronger institutional support, while Roche (2017) and Roche and Flynn (2021) highlighted the

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

role of social and structural factors in shaping implementation. Additionally, Andaya et al. (2025) found that coordination and experience influence the effectiveness of referral systems.

Implementation of child protection policies is commonly examined across three key areas: intervention programs, restorative practices, and monitoring and evaluation. Studies indicate that while these components are essential, challenges persist in sustaining effective monitoring systems, ensuring stakeholder participation, and strengthening program delivery.

Furthermore, child protection is closely linked to school performance. International and local studies suggest that safe learning environments improve student engagement, behavior, and academic outcomes. Research by Segundo and Guia (2019) and Roche (2017) demonstrates that effective implementation contributes to improved school climate and organizational performance, while Roorda et al. (2011) highlights the positive relationship between supportive environments and academic success.

Despite these findings, there remains limited empirical evidence examining the direct relationship between Child Protection Policy implementation and school organizational performance at the division level. This gap provides the basis for the present study, which seeks to investigate this relationship in the context of public secondary schools in Isabela.

***Statement of the problem***

This study investigated the implementation of the Child Protection Policy (CPP) and its relationship with the organizational performance of public secondary schools in Isabela. Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the profile of the respondents and schools in terms of school size, gender, years of service, educational attainment, and reported child protection cases (abuse, bullying, children at risk, and children in conflict with the law)?

2. What minor and major offenses are commonly committed by learners?

3. What is the level of CPP implementation in terms of intervention programs, restorative practices, and monitoring and evaluation, as perceived by implementers, learners, and community representatives?

4. Do perceptions of CPP implementation significantly differ among stakeholder groups?

5. Are there significant differences in CPP implementation when schools are grouped according to selected profile variables?

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

6. What is the level of school performance based on School-Based Management (SBM)?

7. Is there a significant relationship between CPP implementation and school performance?

***Objectives of the study***

This study aimed to examine the implementation of the Child Protection Policy (CPP) in public secondary schools in Isabela and its relationship with organizational performance. Specifically, it sought to:

1. describe the profile of schools and respondents in terms of school size, gender, years of service, educational attainment, and reported cases related to child protection (e.g., abuse, bullying, children at risk, and children in conflict with the law);

2. identify the common minor and major offenses committed by learners;

3. assess the level of CPP implementation across key domains, including intervention programs, restorative practices, and monitoring and evaluation, as perceived by implementers, learners, and community representatives;

4. determine differences in perceptions of CPP implementation among stakeholder groups and across selected school and respondent profiles;

5. evaluate school performance based on School-Based Management (SBM) levels; and

6. examine the relationship between CPP implementation and school organizational performance.

***Research hypotheses***

1. There is no significant difference in the perception of the three groups of respondents (implementers, beneficiaries, and community representatives) on the implementation status of the Child Protection Policy in public secondary schools in Isabela.

2. There is no significant difference on the implementation of the Child Protection Policy in the public secondary schools in Isabela when grouped according to their profile.

3. There is no significant relationship between the implementation of the Child Protection Policy and the School-Based Management (SBM) performance of public secondary schools in Isabela.

**2. Materials and Methods**

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

*Research Design:*

A descriptive–correlational research design, specifically employing a descriptive-evaluative approach, was utilized to assess the implementation of the Child Protection Policy (CPP) and its relationship with school organizational performance. The study involved a purposive sample of 300 respondents drawn from 20 public secondary schools in Isabela, representing three stakeholder groups: implementers (school heads, teachers, and guidance personnel), beneficiaries (student leaders), and community representatives (parents and barangay officials). Schools were selected based on the Department of Education's classification of school size to ensure representation of varied organizational contexts. Data were gathered using a validated, researcher-developed Likert-scale questionnaire, the Child Protection Policy Implementation Assessment Questionnaire (CPP-IMaQ), which was based on the CPAB Manual Version 2.0 and measured three key domains: intervention programs, restorative practices, and monitoring and evaluation. The instrument demonstrated high reliability, with Cronbach's alpha coefficients ranging from 0.80 to 0.95. Prior to data collection, necessary permissions were secured from the appropriate authorities. The questionnaires were then administered to selected respondents, alongside the collection of relevant school profile and case data. Completed instruments were retrieved, checked for completeness, and systematically encoded in preparation for statistical analysis.

***Participants:***

The study involved a **total of 300 respondents** selected through purposive sampling from **20 public secondary schools in the Schools Division of Isabela**. The participants were composed of three stakeholder groups involved in the implementation of the Child Protection Policy (CPP): **100 implementers** (school heads, teachers, and guidance personnel), **100 beneficiaries** (student leaders), and **100 community representatives** (parents and barangay officials). The respondents were drawn from schools categorized according to the Department of Education's classification of school size to ensure representation of diverse organizational contexts and implementation conditions. This composition allowed for a balanced comparison of perspectives from key actors directly engaged in child protection policy implementation and school governance.

***Instruments***

The study utilized a validated researcher-developed Likert-scale questionnaire known as the Child Protection Policy Implementation Assessment Questionnaire (CPP-IMaQ), which was based on the Child Protection Against Bullying (CPAB) Manual Version 2.0 of the Schools Division of Isabela. The instrument was designed to measure the implementation of the Child Protection Policy (CPP) in three main domains: intervention programs, restorative practices and positive discipline, and monitoring and evaluation. It also included a section on respondents' profile and school-related child protection data such as cases of bullying, abuse, children at risk, children in conflict with the law, and other learner offenses.

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

The questionnaire employed a 4-point Likert scale ranging from Never Evident to Excellently Evident/Observed, with corresponding descriptors to measure the extent of CPP implementation across the identified domains. The instrument underwent expert validation by five education and legal experts from the Division Office of Isabela, and revisions were incorporated based on their recommendations. It was further subjected to pilot testing in selected schools, and reliability analysis using Cronbach's alpha yielded coefficients ranging from 0.80 to 0.95, indicating acceptable to excellent internal consistency across all *constructs*.

***Procedure:***

Prior to data collection, the researcher secured the necessary permissions from the Schools Division Office of Isabela and the heads of the selected public secondary schools. Ethical protocols were strictly observed, including the administration of informed consent to all adult participants and parental consent with child assent for student respondents. The purpose of the study, voluntary participation, and assurance of confidentiality were clearly communicated.

Data collection commenced with the distribution of the Child Protection Policy Implementation Assessment Questionnaire (CPP-IMaQ) to the identified respondents from the 20 selected schools. The instrument was administered to the three stakeholder groups—implementers, beneficiaries, and community representatives—following the approved sampling plan. In addition, relevant school profile data and documented records on child protection cases (such as bullying incidents, abuse cases, children at risk, and children in conflict with the law) were gathered from school records and guidance offices.

After retrieval, all completed questionnaires were checked for completeness, consistency, and accuracy. The data were then encoded, organized, and prepared for statistical treatment. Descriptive and inferential analyses were subsequently conducted to determine the level of CPP implementation, differences across groups, and its relationship with school organizational performance.

***Data Analysis:***

All collected data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Descriptive statistics such as frequency and percentage were used to summarize the profile of respondents and the distribution of learner-related cases (e.g., bullying incidents, abuse cases, children at risk, and children in conflict with the law). The level of implementation of the Child Protection Policy (CPP) in terms of intervention programs, restorative practices, and monitoring and evaluation was described using the mean and standard deviation.

To determine significant differences in the perception of CPP implementation among the three groups of respondents (implementers, beneficiaries, and community representatives), Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was employed. Furthermore, to examine differences in CPP implementation when grouped according to selected profile

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

variables such as school size, years in service, and educational attainment, ANOVA was also used. Finally, Pearson's correlation coefficient (r) was applied to determine the relationship between the level of CPP implementation and school organizational performance as measured by School-Based Management (SBM) indicators. All statistical tests were evaluated at a 0.05 level of significance.

### *3. Results*

**Table 2 Implementer Respondents Profile**

| Profile | Frequency (n = 100) | Percent (100.0) |
|---|---|---|
| **School Size** | | |
| Medium | 15 | 15.0 |
| Large | 45 | 45.0 |
| Very Large | 40 | 40.0 |
| **Gender** | | |
| Male | 20 | 20.0 |
| Female | 80 | 80.0 |
| **Years in the Service** | | |
| 0-5 years | 13 | 13.0 |
| 6-10 years | 22 | 22.0 |
| 11-20 years | 42 | 42.0 |
| More than 20 years | 23 | 23.0 |
| **Highest Educational Attainment** | | |
| Bachelor's Degree | 5 | 5.0 |
| With Masters Units | 33 | 33.0 |
| Masters' Degree | 28 | 28.0 |
| With Doctorate Units | 13 | 13.0 |
| Doctorate Degree | 21 | 21.0 |

The profile of the respondents shows that majority or 45% of the Implementer Respondents are from Large school category followed by 40% from Very Large school category which indicates that the study is largely situated in highly populated school environments, where the complexity of managing child protection cases can be greater due to higher student-teacher ratios and increased exposure to diverse learner needs.

This table also reflects that the respondents is dominated by the female gender with a population 80.0% compared to the 20% male gender. This reflects a common gender distribution in the teaching profession over the years. While this aligns with national trends, this data suggests that schools in the Division of Isabela are shaped largely by female educators, which could influence approaches to intervention and care.

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

As shown in the data, majority of respondents or 42% had been in the service for 11-20 years while 23% comprises faculty with more than 20 years in service, indicating a workforce with substantial professional experience. The longer years in service by the Implementer respondents suggest a greater familiarity and knowledge with school policies for having a repeated exposure to child protection concerns, but it cannot guarantee effective implementation especially when there are mostly guidance designates instead of full-time guidance counselors with continuous training and updated policy awareness. Likewise, school heads and teacher advisers have a lot of tasks that requires their focus and time, which may affect the functionality of the CPC (Child Protection Committee).

The presence of respondents with advanced academic qualifications, including Master's units comprising 33% followed by the respondents with Masters' Degree of 28.0% and Doctoral degrees of 21.0% and 13% with Doctorate units implies a high level of professional preparation. Faculty and personnel having advance educational qualification is an advantage to school management and expected to have contributed positively to policy understanding and implementation of various programs. It could also be understood that DepEd personnel's promotion depends on the academic qualification, not necessarily educational degrees that are aligned with the implementation of child protection like MS Psychology or MA Guidance and Counselling or any other required by the provisions of Guidance counselor's appointment in a school. Despite that these findings are consistent with previous studies (Bayucca, 2020; Estremera, 2018; Segundo & Guia, 2019), which emphasize that teacher experience and qualifications influence policy implementation, but must also be supported by continuous training and institutional mechanisms. Therefore, the effectiveness of child protection practices depends not only on academic credentials but also on practical training, institutional support, and consistent monitoring mechanisms. These findings suggest that while the respondents possess strong qualifications and experience, the large school context may present challenges in consistently implementing child protection policies, highlighting the need for strengthened systems, continuous capacity-building, and contextualized interventions.

**Table 3 RECORDED CHILD PROTECTION CASES**

| **Number of Cases of Child Abuse** | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Nature of Abuse** | **Number of Cases** | **Rank** |
| 1. Physical | 53 | 2 |
| 2. Sexual | 32 | 3 |
| 3.Verbal/psychological | 74 | 1 |
| **Number of Cases of Bullying Incident** | | |
| **Nature of Bullying** | **Number of Cases** | **Rank** |
| 1. Physical | 110 | 1 |
| 2. Social | 94 | 3 |
| 3. Gender-based | 31 | 4 |
| 4. Cyber-bullying | 99 | 2 |
| 5. Retaliation | 94 | 3 |

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

| **Number of Children at Risks** | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Children At Risks Index** | **Number of Cases** | **Rank** |
| 1. Victim of abuse/violence (sexual, physical, psychological, mental, economic, and other forms) | 41 | 2 |
| 2. Victim of neglect | 16 | 3 |
| 3. Coming from a dysfunctional family or without parent or guardian | 84 | 1 |
| 4. Being a member of a gang | 5 | 4 |
| 5. Living in a community with high level of criminality | 1 | 5 |
| 6. Committed a status offence | 5 | 4 |
| 7. Prostituted children | 0 | - |
| 8. Mendicant | 0 | - |
| 9. Solvent/rugby/ weed user and others | 0 | - |
| **School Report on Child in Conflict with the Law** | | |
| **Violation/Case** | **Number of Cases** | **Rank** |
| Drug Use | 1 | 3 |
| Robbery/Thief | 5 | 1 |
| Rape | 3 | 2 |

The number of Child Protection cases shown in Table 3 reflects that Verbal or psychological abuse ranks highest with 74 cases, followed by physical abuse with 53 cases, while sexual abuse has the lowest reported incidence with only 32 cases. This is consistent with Munger & Markstrom (2019), who found that school personnel often under-report physical abuse due to documentation requirements but even more frequently miss psychological abuse because it leaves no physical evidence.

The World Health Organization (2020) classifies psychological violence as a major public health problem affecting approximately one-third of adolescents globally, yet it remains the most under-addressed form of child maltreatment in school settings. Psychological abuse - manifesting as constant belittling, humiliation, verbal threats, and emotional neglect - causes long-term damage to self-esteem, academic engagement, and mental health, yet it receives far less attention than physical abuse as it has a higher number.

Physical violence has been reported very high in the CPC report since the pandemic. The lowest reported 32 cases of sexual abuse does not reflect the data of national statistics and the fact that 404 young students took their own lives and 2,147 attempted suicides during Academic Year 2021–2022 alone (Inquirer, 2023). Having the sexual abuse as lowest in reported number strongly suggest under-reporting rather than low incidence.

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

Sinanan (2011) documented that school personnel fear legal ramifications, family backlash, and deterioration of school-family relationships, leading to systematic non-reporting of severe abuse cases. The indicators in SBM criteria for Leaning environment (SBM APAT Indicator 10, Annex A) indicating Zero child abuse incidence can influence under reporting by school heads as it effect the schools' SBM rating.

On bullying, Physical bullying ranks highest with 110 cases, followed closely by cyberbullying with 99 cases, while social bullying and retaliation each have 94 cases, and gender-based bullying has 31 cases. The near-equivalence of physical bullying of 110 and cyberbullying with 99 cases reflects the post-pandemic digital shift documented by Stoilova, Livingstone & Khazbak (2021), who found that COVID-19 lockdowns increased children's online vulnerability while school policies lagged behind in addressing digital risks. This finding directly supports the

Post-Pandemic Paradigm Shift argued in this study that child protection must now look closely to hybrid risks in both physical and digital environments. This suggests that teacher training programs, CPC protocols, and parent education campaigns must all be updated to include cyberbullying detection, digital evidence preservation, and online safety education. The presence of social bullying and retaliation having 94 cases each at nearly the same frequency as physical bullying indicates that relational aggression, exclusion, rumor-spreading, friendship manipulation is just as common as physical violence but often goes unnoticed because it leaves no marks.

As Cedeño (2024) pointed that CPP effectiveness depends on translation into student experience. If teachers are not trained to identify relational aggression, students suffering from social exclusion will continue to feel unsafe despite the existence of an anti-bullying policy.

Similarly, the persistence of bullying cases shows that Learning Environment Indicator 9 requiring a zero bullying incidence must be met to gain the "Always Manifested" with the highest numerical score to this indicator. This finding also reveals conflicting policy expectations within the School Based Management (SBM) framework and Child Protection Policy implementation.

While SBM indicators emphasize "zero bullying incidence" as measure of school performance, the Child Protection Policy (CPP) and the Child Protection Against Bullying (CPAB) Manual require the documentation and reporting of all cases, including first offenses of bullying, including all early manifestations of bullying as being taught to learners. This creates a situation where schools are expected both to record all incidents for protection and intervention purposes, while simultaneously being assessed based on the absence of such cases.

Meanwhile, the high incidence of abuse cases indicates that the goal of zero child abuse incidence under Learning Environment Indicator 10 is not achieved, while the

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

dominance of psychological abuse highlights gaps in Curriculum and Teaching Indicators 4 and 5, particularly in addressing absenteeism and disengagement can be linked to abuse.

This conflicting expectation may influence school practices, as school heads and personnel may become cautious in formally recording or reporting incidents of child abuse or even Child at Risks (CAR) of child abuse including those linked to economic abuse to avoid affecting performance indicators in SBM. Some cases may be managed informally through counseling or internal interventions without full documentation, which may contribute to under-reporting, especially in sensitive cases such as sexual abuse incidents especially when family refutations can be dragged as well as scores in SBM is likewise affected. DepEd Order no. 83, s.2012 in the Implementing Guidelines for SBM(School-Based Management) which was used to widely institutionalized in schools was noted from reports that implementation is often compliance-driven rather than practice-driven. It was observed that many schools have established required structures such as SIPs (School Improvement Plans), SRCs (School Report Cards), and have undergone SBM assessments; however, as observed, submitted reports were frequently treated as documentary requirements rather than as tools for meaningful planning and continuous improvement.

Under the Child Protection Policy of DepEd, Children at Risk are those who are vulnerable to harm due to adverse personal, family, or environmental conditions. This concept reflects a proactive approach to child protection, where schools are expected to identify and support learners before harm escalates into formally reported abuse or bullying cases. The data showing that the 84 CAR(Child At Risks) cases were coming from a dysfunctional family or without a parent/guardian followed by 41 cases of victims of Abuse or violence suggest a significant number of learners were exposed to unstable or challenging home environments, which contributed to an increased susceptibility to emotional distress, absenteeism, behavioral issues, and eventual involvement in bullying or abuse, either as victims or perpetrators. This reinforces the importance of early identification mechanisms within schools, particularly in relation to absenteeism and disengagement, as reflected in SBM Curriculum and Teaching Indicators 4 and 5.

Moreover, the prevalence of dysfunctional family backgrounds may also be viewed in the context of evolving family structures and emerging value systems in the 21st century. Changes such as parental separation, labor migration, economic pressures, and shifting social norms have altered traditional family support systems, potentially weakening the protective environment that families are expected to provide. While these changes do not inherently lead to dysfunction, they may increase the vulnerability of children when adequate support systems are lacking. The large number of learners from dysfunctional families further underscores the need to strengthen SBM's Governance and Accountability Indicators 24, 25, and 26, particularly in ensuring functional School Governing Councils (SGC), active Parent-Teacher Associations (PTA), and effective stakeholder collaboration to address family-related risks. This finding is likewise consistent with Roche (2017), who found that family breakdown is the single strongest predictor of child vulnerability in the Philippines, where extended family structures

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

traditionally provided protection but have weakened due to labor migration, urbanization, and poverty. The implication is that schools cannot address child protection in isolation. CPCs must develop strong referral linkages with DSWD, LGUs, and barangay child protection committees to provide family support services such as counseling, financial assistance, parenting education which can address root causes rather than just the symptoms.

The only 16 reported neglect cases compared to the 84 dysfunctional family cases also suggests under-documentation. Neglect which predicts chronic absenteeism, hunger, poor hygiene, lack of medical care is often the most difficult form of maltreatment to detect in school settings because its symptoms is usually attributed to poverty rather than neglectful parenting. Schools or child protection frontliners need clear protocols distinguishing poverty from neglect and training for teachers on how to document and report each appropriately.

Meanwhile, the low number of CICL cases reflects possible weaknesses in Leadership factor as required from Indicator 22, particularly in innovating responsive and well-documented frontline services for sensitive cases and strong partnership with stakeholders.

On Children in Conflict with the Law (CICL), Theft or robbery ranks highest with 5 cases, followed by rape with 3 cases and drug use with 1 case. The very low numbers (total 9 cases across 20 schools in years) can reflect under-reporting rather than low incidence. Sinanan (2011) documented that school personnel fear legal dealings and family ties influence the under reporting of CICL incidents to authorities. Additionally, RA 9344 (Juvenile Justice and Welfare Act) mandates diversion programs for CICL, which may occur within schools without formal documentation, creating a gap between actual incidents and reported cases. This result show that handling CICL cases could have been done with the CPC, through guidance counseling and parent conferences but without proper documentation. Because CICL cases requires strong partnership with DSWD and CWD-PNP, families may have made agreements among parties for settlements.

Taken together, Table 3 had notable concerns. First, non-physical forms of harm dominate - psychological abuse with 74 cases, social bullying with 94 cases, cyberbullying with 99 cases, and retaliation with 94 cases. Yet these forms of harm is not included in teacher training programs (GAD of LAC) suggesting that CPC protocols are least equipped to handle. Second, family dysfunction is the root driver of child vulnerability as reflected by 84 CAR cases, meaning that school-based interventions alone will never be sufficient without strong coordination with DSWD, LGUs, and barangay child protection committees. Third, under-reporting is likely occurring for sexual abuse with 32 cases, neglect with16 cases, and CICL incidents with only 9 cases, indicating that the problem is not low incidence but low documentation due to fear of legal consequences, lack of detection training, and absence of confidential reporting pathways. The practical implication for the Schools Division of Isabela to mandate

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

annual training for all teachers on detecting psychological abuse indicators such as withdrawal, sudden academic decline, fearfulness, self-harm and relational aggression in peer interactions. Another is the CPCs to establish formal "Memoranda of Understanding" with DSWD and barangay child protection committees for coordinated family support services, recognizing that dysfunctional family backgrounds are the primary driver of CAR status. Third, the Division Office through CPC should create confidential, protected reporting mechanisms for sexual abuse and CICL incidents, including anonymous reporting options and witness protection policies, to address the fear of legal discomforts and financial requirements as documented by Sinanan (2011). Fourth, cyberbullying protocols must be developed and disseminated to all schools, including digital evidence preservation (including those that are posted through learner's fb reels and the like), coordination with PNP cybercrime units, and parent education on monitoring children's online activity. Without proper action among schools, invisible but damaging forms such as psychological abuse, social bullying, cyberbullying, and family dysfunction will remain to be under-reported until bigger damage will be evident to the victims.

**Table 4 Minor Offenses Commonly Committed by Learners in Public Secondary Schools in Isabela**

| Minor Offenses | Number of Cases | Rank |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Discourtesy | 92 | 6 |
| 2. Dishonesty | 88 | 7 |
| 3. Cutting of classes/loitering | 353 | 3 |
| 4. Absenteeism | 678 | 1 |
| 5. Unauthorized use of school ID | 636 | 2 |
| 6. Bringing of deadly/dangerous weapons inside school premise, | 50 | 9 |
| 7. Cheating on exams, quizzes and/or tests | 58 | 8 |
| 8. Unauthorized use of electronic devices while attending classes | 225 | 4 |
| 9. Unauthorized collection of monies, and/or properties of learners | 21 | 10 |
| 10. Bullying | 166 | 5 |

The data in Table 4 shown from the data records of the Guidance Counselors/Designates that 678 cases of absenteeism ranks first among minor offenses, followed by 636 cases of unauthorized use of school ID, and 353 cases of cutting classes/loitering. Other frequently reported offenses including unauthorized use of electronic devices with 225 cases and bullying with 166 cases, while discourtesy of 92 cases, dishonesty with 88 cases, and bringing of dangerous weapons with 50 cases are less frequent. These findings indicate that the most common learner offenses are attendance-related and behavior management which can be connected to family-based root cause. The high incidence of absenteeism and class cutting suggests not merely issues of compliance, but underlying disengagement and vulnerability among learners,

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

which may be linked to family-related concerns, lack of supervision by their parents, or exposure to risks or peer pressure outside home or outside the school environment.

From a child protection perspective, these behavior related concerns early warning indicators of Children at Risk (CAR). Chronic absenteeism, in particular, is often associated with neglect, emotional distress, or unsafe home conditions. If left unaddressed, these minor offenses may escalate into more serious concerns such as bullying, abuse, involvement in delinquent activities, or even school dropout, as reflected in Learning Environment Indicator 11 of School-Based Management (SBM).

Viewed through the SBM lens, these findings point to gaps in Learning Environment Indicator 11, which emphasize learner engagement and attendance leading to Zero dropped out rates or reduction of drop outs. The persistence of absenteeism and related behaviors suggests that existing instructional practices and learner support systems may not be sufficiently responsive to the needs and realities of learners, particularly those at risk as SBM indicators for Curriculum and Teaching number 4 and 5 where contextualize learning materials and remediation activities to address learning gaps when learners become vulnerable to absenteeism and escaping. These findings imply that schools need to strengthen monitoring systems for attendance and learner engagement, as well as implement early intervention strategies for at-risk students. The findings support Segundo and Guia (2019), who reported that schools with only moderate implementation of child protection measures continue to experience behavioral issues among learners.

Similarly, Roche (2017) emphasized that social and environmental factors, including family and community conditions, significantly influence children's behavior and involvement in school-related offenses.

The community based, non-punitive approach as recommended int CPAB manual to deal with minor offenses can be shifted to a restorative and intervention-based approach. While positive sanctions may be necessary for repeated minor offenses, relying solely on non-punitive or community-based resolutions may not be sufficient, particularly when minor offenses are recurring or indicative of deeper issues. Instead, these cases should be elevated to restorative secondary level interventions, where learners are provided access to more structured and professional support such as referral to licensed guidance counselors, behavioral management specialists, or licensed psychologists who are better equipped to assess underlying causes such as family dysfunction, economic hardship.

**Table 5 Major Offenses Commonly Committed by Learners in the Public Secondary Schools in Isabela**

| Major Offenses | Number of Cases | Rank |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Habitual commission of minor offense | 56 | 2 |
| 2. Notorious bully, | 39 | 5 |
| 3. Disobedience/Disrespectful to teacher or | 36 | 6 |

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| school personnel, | | |
| 4. Consumption of/ bringing of intoxicating beverages, | 45 | 3 |
| 5. Consumption of/or bringing of cigarettes, electronic cigarette/vape within the school premises | 117 | 1 |
| 6. Use and/or sale of dangerous drugs within school premises | 20 | 8 |
| 7. Joining, soliciting to join and /or introduction of fraternities and/or sororities | 6 | 10 |
| 8. Theft or robbery committed inside the school premises | 30 | 7 |
| 9. Sexual offenses | 4 | 11 |
| 10. Gambling inside the school | 15 | 9 |
| 11. Vandalism/destruction of school properties. | 40 | 4 |

The data reveal that the most common major offense is consumption or bringing of cigarettes/electronic cigarettes with 117 cases, followed by 56 cases of habitual commission of minor offenses and 45 cases of intoxicating beverages consumption. Other notable offenses include 40 cases of vandalism and 39 cases of notorious bullying. Among the less frequent but serious cases include theft/robbery with 30 cases, 20 cases of drug-related offenses, and 4 cases of sexual offenses. These findings indicate that major offenses are largely related to substance use and repeated behavioral violations, suggesting that some learners are engaging in risk-taking behaviors and habitual misconduct. The high incidence of vaping and smoking reflects the growing influence of peer pressure and accessibility of substances, while the presence of habitual offenses suggests that early minor infractions are not effectively addressed, can lead to escalation into more serious violations. This is supported by the study of Mutia et al. (2025) which found that students' behavioral choices are shaped by environmental influences, conformity to school rules, and triggers of deviant actions, while also highlighting that learners are capable of positive change when guided through supportive and reflective disciplinary approaches.

The persistence of major offenses such as vaping, physical fights, and drug-related incidents among learners indicates that the presence of child protection policies alone does not guarantee the prevention of risky behaviors. While schools have established mechanisms under the Department of Education Child Protection Policy, these findings suggest that gaps may exist in terms of implementation, monitoring, and stakeholder engagement. This supports the view that policy effectiveness depends not only on its existence but on the strength of its execution, coordination, and the capacity of those responsible for its implementation. These findings are consistent with the study of Andaya (2025), which reported that the presence of child protection policies does not always prevent the occurrence of risks when implementation mechanisms and awareness are insufficient.

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

**Table 6. Level of the Implementation of the Child Protection Policy in the Public Secondary Schools in Isabela as perceived by the Implementers, Beneficiaries, and Community Representatives in Terms of Intervention Programs**

| Intervention Programs | Implementers | | Beneficiaries | | Community Representatives | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | DE | Mean | DE | Mean | DE |
| 1. The school has a guidance counselor/guidance designate entrusted with facilitating guidance and counseling services. | 3.76 | EE | 3.67 | EE | 3.87 | EE |
| 2.The school promotes and organizes diverse activities as part of the BKD program. | 3.68 | EE | 3.48 | FE | 3.78 | EE |
| 3. The CPP is promoted and disseminated to parents and learners during HRPTA meetings. | 3.67 | EE | 3.48 | FE | 3.94 | EE |
| 4. The school conducts annual GAD training sessions and seminars to promote the CPP. | 3.78 | EE | 3.37 | FE | 3.86 | EE |
| 5. The CPP is discussed with parents during the quarterly assembly of the GPTA. | 3.61 | EE | 3.38 | FE | 3.80 | EE |
| 6. Church-based organizations are mobilized to lead campaigns that promote moral values. | 3.26 | FE | 3.22 | FE | 3.53 | EE |
| 7. The HGP educates parents and learners on using the CPP to address learners' offenses. | 3.69 | EE | 3.42 | FE | 3.73 | EE |
| 8. The school uses a referral system to support at-risk learners. | 3.48 | FE | 3.31 | FE | 3.58 | EE |
| 9. The school's CPC oversees child protection, including abuse, violence, bullying, and student welfare. | 3.71 | EE | 3.52 | EE | 3.78 | EE |
| 10. The school holds symposiums on teenage pregnancy, reproductive health, and sex education to support learners' mental and emotional well-being. | 3.77 | EE | 3.48 | FE | 3.78 | EE |
| 11.The school established its YFP that supports initiatives on children's rights and positive discipline. | 3.71 | EE | 3.47 | FE | 3.69 | EE |
| 12.Teachers undergo PDET training to | 3.37 | FE | 3.32 | FE | 3.55 | EE |

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| manage student behavior with non-punitive methods. | | | | | | |
| 13. The school organizes career guidance to help learners make informed decisions. | 3.74 | EE | 3.55 | EE | 3.82 | EE |
| 14. The school head supports other learner-focused activities and initiatives. | 3.79 | EE | 3.50 | EE | 3.78 | EE |

*Legend: 2.50-3.49 = Fairly Evident (FE); 3.50-4.00 = Excellently Evident (EE)*

Table 6 presents the implementers' perceptions of the visibility and effectiveness of various intervention programs related to child protection and positive discipline in schools. Among the listed initiatives, the three (3) interventions rated as "Fairly Evident" by the implementers based on their mean scores on Intervention program number 6 “Church-based organizations are mobilized to lead campaigns that promote moral values” with a mean score of 3.26, “Teachers undergo PDET training to manage student behavior using non-punitive methods” having a mean of 3.37, and “The school uses a referral system to support at-risk learners” with a mean of 3.48 indicate that while these programs are present, their implementation or visibility need strengthening from the perspective of “Implementers” and “Beneficiaries”. This FE consistent result among Implementers and Beneficiary Respondents can be explained by their indirect participation of this activities. On the other hand, all other intervention programs assessed in the study were rated as "Excellently Evident" by the implementer respondents showing a high level of implementation and awareness of most child protection and positive discipline initiatives. This difference may suggest that while present, these programs may lack consistent visibility or full implementation.

The perception of “Beneficiaries” on the implementation of various school initiatives that promote positive discipline and child protection is only “Fairly Evident” in 10 Intervention Programs. The responses are ranked below from lowest to highest mean where “Church-based organizations are mobilized to lead campaigns that promote moral values” received the lowest mean of 3.22. The learners may have perceived these efforts as the least evident or impactful among the initiatives. “The school uses a referral system to support at-risk learners” followed, with a mean of 3.31, indicating that while the system exists, its visibility or perceived effectiveness may be limited from the learners’ perspective. Referral letters to other partner agency such as PNP, DSWD or RHU are usually done in the level of administration and management personnel and does not directly involve learners, thereby creating a non-visible perception among learners, especially if they are not involved in the case management of CPC (Child Protection Committee).

The “Teachers undergo PDET training to manage student behavior using non-punitive methods” was rated with a mean of 3.32, reflecting moderate awareness of teachers' participation in positive discipline training. While, PDET Primer is already included in the CPAB manual version 2.0, teachers had not attended the Positive discipline Virtual training, hence, teachers would perceive this invisible. This perception is also affected by multiple or overlapping tasks given to teachers which reflects their non-visibility.

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

In the Intervention program indicator 4 that "The school conducts annual GAD (Gender and Development) training sessions and seminars to promote the Child Protection Policy (CPP) received "Fairly Observed" by Beneficiaries with a mean of 3.37 showing that learners are somewhat aware of gender-related activities but are not involved in GAD trainings because it is only participated by school personnel and not usually directly tied to child protection.

In indicator 10 stating that "The school holds symposiums on teenage pregnancy, reproductive health, and sex education to support learners' mental and emotional well-being" and indicator 5 that "The CPP is discussed with parents during the quarterly assembly of the GPTA" where both initiatives received a "Fairly Observed" rating with a mean of 3.38, indicating perceptions of Beneficiaries towards school efforts in supporting learners' well-being and parental engagement may not be observed by learners especially if the participation of learners to such activities are limited and selected student participation. Indicator 5 of the intervention program is rated FE by the beneficiaries, because HRPTA is not attended by learners but their parents, hence the fairly observed rating.

Also showing strong awareness of student-led or student-focused efforts in child protection is evident in "The school established its Youth Formation Program (YFP) that supports initiatives on children's rights and positive discipline was rated with a mean of 3.47", and "The school promotes and organizes diverse activities as part of the Barkada Kontra Droga (BKD) program, and The CPP is promoted and disseminated to parents and learners during HRPTA meetings" where both received the highest mean of 3.48, suggesting these initiatives are the most visible and well-received by learners.

The four (4) Initiatives that were rated as "Excellently Evident" among Beneficiary respondents include indicator 1, "The school has a guidance counselor or guidance designate who facilitates guidance and counseling services" with a mean of 3.67, indicator 13, "The school organizes career guidance to help learners make informed decisions" with a mean of 3.55, and indicator 9, "The school's Child Protection Committee (CPC) oversees child protection matters including abuse, violence, bullying, and student welfare" with a mean of 3.52, and indicator 14, "The school head supports learner-focused activities and initiatives" with a mean of 3.50. These ratings suggest that learners highly recognize the presence and impact of these interventions. These results suggest that learners strongly recognize career development and support systems, guidance services, and leadership involvement in promoting child protection and learner welfare.

The data also reveals that community representatives perceived the implementation of the Child Protection Policy (CPP) in public secondary schools as "Excellently Evident" (EE) across all listed intervention programs. Each item received a mean score ranging from 3.53 to 3.94, indicating a strong consensus on the active presence and visibility of these initiatives. The highest-rated intervention, with a mean score of 3.94, is The CPP is promoted and disseminated to parents and learners during HRPTA meetings, suggesting that efforts to communicate the policy to stakeholders are highly evident and well-executed. The overall results showing "Excellently Evident" in the perception of Community Representatives indicate that community

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

stakeholders perceive the implementation of child protection initiatives as highly visible, collaborative, and effective across schools.

The results also reveal that most child protection and positive discipline interventions were rated as "Excellently Evident" by implementers, learners, and community representatives, indicating a generally high level of visibility and implementation across schools. However, the three interventions rated "Fairly Evident" by implementers such Indicator 6 where church-based organizations are mobilized showing the recognition of public schools as non-sectarian, hence church based activities are not yet used as a means of intervention for character building among learners. Indicator 12, where Implementers and Beneficiaries rated "Fairly Observed" indicating non -attendance or non-visibility of PDET (Positive Discipline in Every day Teaching) training for teachers and learners. Indicator 8, showing a "Fairly Observed" among beneficiaries and Implementers may be influenced by the respondent not directly involved in the referral system for at-risk learners because this task is usually treated with confidentiality among Guidance Designates and CPC Chairman with the parents of either the respondent or of victims which influence the result. When learners rate several interventions as only "Fairly Evident," particularly those related to external partnerships, referral mechanisms, and teacher training, because it directly requires their participation and involvement, while guidance services, career guidance, CPC functions, and school leadership support as "Excellently Evident" because learners and implementers play key roles in this programs.

In contrast, community representatives rated all interventions as "Excellently Evident" having a Mean ranging from 3.53–3.94, with the highest rating given to CPP dissemination during HRPTA meetings of a Mean score of 3.94 indicating a strong participation and involvement of parents in school programs. The consistently high ratings from community representatives suggest a positive external perception of school efforts, while the relatively lower ratings from beneficiaries and implementers imply that some programs may exist in policy but are not fully experienced or internalized in practice. These results reflect the framework of the Department of Education Child Protection Policy, which emphasizes a whole-school and multi-sectoral approach involving internal school mechanisms and external partnerships.

The lower ratings in referral systems and external collaborations is showing gaps in the inter-agency coordination and stakeholder engagement components of the policy, which are essential in addressing complex child protection concerns. This is reinforced by the study of Andaya et al. (2025), which found that policy effectiveness depends on the strength of implementation, coordination, and stakeholder capacity, not merely on policy presence. Moreover, recent literature on child protection challenges in the Philippines (as cited in the study of Andaya et al. 2025) identifies capacity gaps, coordination issues, and socio-cultural barriers as major constraints in implementation. Specifically, the lack of specialized training among personnel explains the lower visibility of teacher training programs, while weak inter-agency coordination affects the effectiveness of referral systems. In addition, limited community engagement and socio-cultural barriers help explain the lower ratings of church-based organization is not integrated into school-based child protection efforts.

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

**Table 7 Level of Implementation of the Child Protection Policy in the Public Secondary Schools in Isabela as perceived by the Implementers, Beneficiaries, and Community Representative in Terms of Restorative Practices**

| Restorative Practices | Implementers | | Beneficiaries | | Community Representatives | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | DE | Mean | DE | Mean | DE |
| PRIMARY INTERVENTION | | | | | | |
| 1. The school identifies root causes of student offenses, recorded by the designated teacher. | 3.77 | EO | 3.52 | EO | 3.75 | EO |
| 2. The school involves parents and stakeholders in campaigns against violence and risky behavior. | 3.77 | EO | 3.36 | FO | 3.74 | EO |
| 3. Learners are encouraged to join Youth Development Programs that build character. | 3.80 | EO | 3.53 | EO | 3.73 | EO |
| 4. The school provides parent child integration programs that enhance parent involvement in children's schooling. | 3.79 | EO | 3.40 | FO | 3.63 | EO |
| 5. The school supports teachers' trainings in behavior management using Positive Discipline and non-violent methods. | 3.73 | EO | 3.47 | FO | 3.70 | EO |
| 6. The school initiates training for parents on positive discipline and the implementation of the Child Protection Policy. | 3.63 | EO | 3.35 | FO | 3.50 | EO |
| 7. The school involves learners in understanding their responsibilities regarding positive discipline and the implementation of the Child Protection Policy. | 3.77 | EO | 3.56 | EO | 3.77 | EO |
| SECONDARY INTERVENTION | | | | | | |
| 1. The school uses assessment tools to identify and profile at-risk learners for targeted interventions. | 3.52 | EO | 3.31 | FO | 3.70 | EO |
| 2. At-risk learners are referred to appropriate government and non-government agencies for professional assessment. | 3.65 | EO | 3.18 | FO | 3.54 | EO |
| 3. CARs, with CPC support, receive guidance, counseling, and home visits. | 3.65 | EO | 3.33 | FO | 3.72 | EO |
| 4. The school, in cooperation with the CPC, conducts programs on anger management and conflict resolution. | 3.68 | EO | 3.17 | FO | 3.42 | FO |

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5. The school refers children with special needs to agencies like DSWD, PNP, LGU, and other service providers for cases involving violations or offenses. | 3.76 | EO | 3.44 | FO | 3.77 | EO |
| TERTIARY INTERVENTION | | | | | | |
| 1. The school promotes open communication and initiatives with learner-offenders to restore well-being and prevent reoffending. | 3.52 | EO | 3.48 | FO | 3.75 | EO |
| 2. The school supports at-risk children with diversion programs and ensures access to education through ADM or other flexible options. | 3.65 | EO | 3.37 | FO | 3.64 | EO |
| 3. The school's guidance designate monitors intervention plan implementation and termination. | 3.65 | EO | 3.45 | FO | 3.69 | EO |
| 4. The CPC conducts restorative justice procedures. | 3.68 | EO | 3.29 | FO | 3.72 | EO |
| 5. The school ensures the right to education for child-offenders in detention or rehabilitation. | 3.76 | EO | 3.32 | FO | 3.79 | EO |

*Legend: 2.50-3.49 = Fairly Observed (FO); 3.50-4.00 = Excellently Observed (EO)*

The level of implementation of restorative practices as perceived by "Implementers" and "Community Representatives" shown in Table 7 indicates "Excellently Observed" ratings in Primary Intervention suggesting direct participation, strong partnership, and consistent implementation of Primary Interventions across schools in the division of Isabela. The highest-rated Primary Intervention, with a mean score of 3.80, includes "Learners are encouraged to join Youth Development Programs that build character", indicating that schools actively promote student participation in character-building initiatives. Next is "The school provides parent-child integration programs that enhance parental involvement in children's schooling" with a mean of 3.79), reflecting schools' efforts to strengthen the home-school partnership. Three interventions share a mean score of 3.77, indicating equally strong implementation in "The school identifies root causes of student offenses, recorded by the designated teacher", "The school involves parents and stakeholders in campaigns against violence and risky behavior", and "The school involves learners in understanding their responsibilities regarding positive discipline and the implementation of the Child Protection Policy". These suggest that schools emphasize both documentation and community-wide involvement in addressing behavioral concerns.

Other significant Primary Intervention initiatives includes "Support for teacher training in behavior management using Positive Discipline and non-violent methods" having a mean of 3.73, "Training for parents on positive discipline and the implementation of the Child Protection Policy" with a mean of 3.63. Although the last item has the lowest mean among the group, it still falls within the "Excellently Observed" range, suggesting that schools are actively working

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

to educate parents on their role in sustaining child protection and restorative practices at home. The consistent ratings across all items reflect those primary restorative practices are well-implemented and positively perceived by school partners and stakeholders in Isabela's public secondary schools.

On the other hand, the "Beneficiaries" perceived the implementation of primary restorative practices as "Excellently Observed" ratings in three (3) indicators from the primary intervention such as "The school involves learners in understanding their responsibilities regarding positive discipline and the implementation of the CPP" with a mean of 3.56. This suggests that schools have effectively engaged students in learning their roles in maintaining discipline and complying with child protection policies. Also, in "Learners are encouraged to join Youth Development Programs that build character" has a mean of 3.53 which reflects schools' efforts in promoting youth leadership and personal development through structured programs impacted learners positively. Third from the list is: "The school identifies root causes of student offenses, recorded by the designated teacher with a mean of 3.52 indicating that learners are involved in the active effort from schools to understand and address behavioral issues through proper documentation and intervention. However, there are four Primary Intervention Practices rated as "Fairly Observed", suggesting moderate implementation or limited visibility among learners' perspective which is either does not directly involve their participation for the reason that CPP is an initiative for learners' protection and not by the learners to implement it. Primary intervention is carried out through various programs that will benefit the learners as they are the intended beneficiary of these school efforts.

The highest-rated item under Fairly Observed is "The school supports teachers' training in behavior management using Positive Discipline and non-violent methods," which reflects limited learner awareness of teacher capacity-building programs. This is followed by "The school provides parent-child integration programs to enhance parental involvement in schooling" and "The school involves parents and stakeholders in campaigns against violence and risky behavior," which may suggest a need to strengthen or better communicate community engagement efforts to students. The lowest-rated item, "The school initiates training for parents on positive discipline and the implementation of the CPP," may indicate that learners are less aware of efforts aimed at educating parents about their roles in supporting child protection both in school and at home.

From the learners' perspective, schools are perceived to perform well in directly engaging students in character-building, policy awareness, and identifying the root causes of offenses. However, interventions involving parents and teacher training are only fairly observed, suggesting possible gaps in visibility, communication, or implementation. These findings highlight the need for schools to strengthen community and parent involvement in restorative practices to ensure a more holistic approach to child protection and discipline. Enhancing these efforts can also support leadership initiatives through stronger community engagement and shared responsibility in the implementation of intervention programs.

The Community Representatives on the implementation of primary restorative practices rated "Excellently Observed" (EO) in all areas, reflecting strong recognition and approval of these practices. The mean scores for all primary restorative interventions ranged from 3.50 to 3.77,

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

indicating a high level of implementation and visibility of the schools' child protection and discipline strategies from the community's perspective. This suggests that schools are highly effective in engaging parents and other community partners in promoting a safe and respectful learning environment

All items of Secondary Intervention were rated as Excellently Observed (EO) by the implementers, with scores ranging from 3.52 to 3.76, and by the community representatives, with scores ranging from 3.42 to 3.72, suggesting the strong presence of systems and support mechanisms for at-risk learners. The highest-rated intervention was "The school refers children with special needs to agencies such as DSWD, PNP, LGU, and other service providers for cases involving violations or offenses," highlighting the school's capacity to collaborate with external agencies in supporting learners with complex needs. Other items such as "CARs (Children-at-Risk), with CPC support, receive guidance, counseling, and home visits," "At-risk learners are referred to government and non-government agencies for professional assessment," and "The school, in cooperation with the CPC, conducts programs on anger management and conflict resolution" were also rated highly, indicating that schools are able to establish a learner-centered support system that addresses academic, behavioral, and emotional concerns.

The beneficiaries rated most items of Secondary Intervention as Fairly Observed (FO), except for "The school uses assessment tools to identify and profile at-risk learners for targeted interventions," which was rated as Excellently Observed. The lowest-rated item was "The school, in cooperation with the CPC, conducts programs on anger management and conflict resolution." This suggests that while these interventions are in place, learners may not be fully aware of or involved in these programs. This may also reflect limited participation or communication among learners in the Secondary Intervention. While restorative intervention requires confidentiality and involves documentation, referral, and decision-making, learner participation is still encouraged for full implementation of child protection initiatives.

Community representatives rated all items as Excellently Observed (EO), with the highest rating given to "The school refers children with special needs to appropriate agencies," consistent with the implementers' perception. This reflects recognition of the schools' efforts to collaborate with external institutions for the welfare of at-risk learners.

Implementers and community representatives consistently rated all secondary interventions as Excellently Observed, while learners rated most items as Fairly Observed, indicating a gap in awareness and involvement. These differences in perception suggest the need to strengthen communication and increase learner involvement to ensure that students are informed and supported in these interventions.

All items under Tertiary Restorative Interventions were rated as Excellently Observed (EO) by the implementers, with scores ranging from 3.52 to 3.79, and by the community representatives, with scores ranging from 3.64 to 3.76. This indicates that these interventions are well-established and actively implemented at the school level. The highest-rated item across all groups was "The school ensures the right to education for child-offenders in detention or rehabilitation," while the lowest among implementers was "The school promotes open communication and initiatives with learner-offenders to restore well-being and prevent reoffending." These results reflect strong

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

institutional support, particularly through the involvement of school heads and community partner agencies in managing serious child protection cases.

In contrast, beneficiaries rated most items as Fairly Observed (FO), suggesting limited awareness or involvement in tertiary restorative practices. The lowest-rated item among learners was "The CPC conducts restorative justice procedures," indicating that such processes are not commonly seen or experienced by students. This can be explained by the nature of tertiary intervention, which is only applied in cases involving Children in Conflict with the Law (CICL) or other serious offenses requiring juvenile justice procedures. These cases are handled directly by the school head, as Chairperson of the CPC, together with designated personnel and external agencies, and do not usually require broad learner participation.
Due to the sensitive nature of these cases, confidentiality and protection of the learner involved are strictly observed. As such, the number of individuals involved in tertiary intervention is intentionally limited. This may explain why learners have less visibility of these processes and therefore rate them lower.

However, for better impact of these interventions, learner involvement may still be considered in appropriate areas such as referral awareness and documentation processes, without compromising confidentiality. Strengthening this aspect can help learners better understand the support systems available in serious cases.

Furthermore, while existing mechanisms such as referral to agencies and rehabilitation centers are in place, there is a need to strengthen child-focused support systems for minors. Providing more responsive and appropriate local based intervention structures may help improve the intended outcome of restoring the well-being and development of learners involved in serious offenses.

Overall, while tertiary interventions are strongly implemented at the institutional level, they remain less visible to learners due to their specialized, case-based, and confidential nature.

This observation is supported by the study of Cedeño (2024), which emphasized that the effectiveness of child protection initiatives depends not only on implementation but also on how these are translated into student support, engagement, and positive school relationships. The study highlighted that CPP coordinators play a crucial role in fostering a positive school climate through proactive strategies, collaborative problem-solving, and student empowerment. However, it also implies that when such efforts are not fully experienced by learners, the impact of these interventions may be limited despite strong institutional implementation.

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

**Table 8 Level of Implementation of the Child Protection Policy in the Public Secondary Schools in Isabela as perceived by the Implementers, Beneficiaries, and Community Representative in Terms of Monitoring and Evaluation**

| Monitoring and Evaluation Index | Implementers | | Beneficiaries | | Community Representatives | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | DE | Mean | DE | Mean | DE |
| 1. CPP implementation is evaluated by the division LRPO. | 3.47 | FO | 3.34 | FO | 3.45 | FO |
| 2. CPP implementation is monitored by the Schools District Supervisor. | 3.56 | EO | 3.41 | FO | 3.57 | EO |
| 3. The School Head supervises and supports the implementation of CPP. | 3.71 | EO | 3.49 | FO | 3.73 | EO |
| 4. The School Head leads awareness campaigns, prevention programs, and intervention plans, including capacity-building for staff, parents, and students to implement the CPP effectively. | 3.74 | EO | 3.45 | FO | 3.88 | EO |
| 5. The CPC, also recognized as the anti-bullying committee, fulfills its duties and responsibilities across all procedures and measures within the CPP. | 3.75 | EO | 3.49 | FO | 3.85 | EO |
| 6. Teachers and school personnel actively engage in prevention and intervention measures while fulfilling their CPP implementation duties. | 3.77 | EO | 3.49 | FO | 3.71 | EO |
| 7. Student leaders participate in all prevention and intervention measures and support CPP implementation. | 3.80 | EO | 3.46 | FO | 3.73 | EO |
| 8. The PNP's Women and Child Protection Desk, along with LSWDO and various NGOs, actively participates in the referral system to support CPP implementation. | 3.80 | EO | 3.45 | FO | 3.73 | EO |
| 9. Parents contribute to the investigation, planning, implementation, and monitoring of CPC intervention measures within CPP. | 3.83 | EO | 3.49 | FO | 3.73 | EO |
| 10. The CPC applies positive, non-punitive disciplinary measures for major and minor offenses committed by learner-offenders. | 3.82 | EO | 3.43 | FO | 3.73 | EO |

*Legend: 2.50-3.49 = Fairly Observed (FO); 3.50-4.00 = Excellently Observed (EO)*

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

Table 8 presents the monitoring and evaluation practices for the Child Protection Policy (CPP) in public secondary schools in Isabela. Among the implementers, nine out of ten indicators were rated as Excellently Observed (EO), while one was rated as Fairly Observed (FO). The lowest-rated item, "CPP implementation is evaluated by the division LRPO," suggests limited visibility or involvement of the division-level office in the evaluation process. In contrast, the highest-rated item, "Parents contribute to the investigation, planning, implementation, and monitoring of CPC intervention measures," reflects strong parental engagement. High ratings were also observed in the participation of school heads, CPC members, teachers, student leaders, and external stakeholders such as the PNP, LSWDO, and NGOs, indicating a coordinated and collaborative approach. The use of non-punitive disciplinary measures further supports the application of restorative practices. Overall, monitoring and evaluation mechanisms are well-established at the school level, although the role of the division remains less visible.

From the beneficiaries' perspective, all indicators were rated as Fairly Observed (FO), indicating that monitoring and evaluation practices are perceived as present but not consistently visible to learners. The lowest-rated item remains "CPP implementation is evaluated by the division LRPO," suggesting that learners are least aware of division-level evaluation. This may be attributed to the use of blended or digitized monitoring processes, which are less visible to students. While learners recognize the roles of the school head, CPC, teachers, and parents, these efforts are not sufficiently experienced or observed to be considered excellent. This suggests a need to strengthen communication and increase learner involvement in monitoring activities to improve awareness and participation.

Community representatives rated almost all indicators as Excellently Observed (EO), reflecting a strong perception of school-based monitoring and evaluation practices. Similar to other groups, the only item rated as Fairly Observed was "CPP implementation is evaluated by the division LRPO," indicating a common concern on the limited visibility of division-level evaluation. High ratings were given to school head leadership, CPC performance, and the involvement of teachers, student leaders, and external agencies, showing strong collaboration among stakeholders.

These findings show that monitoring and evaluation of CPP are strongly implemented at the school level through active participation of school heads, CPC, teachers, parents, and community partners. However, the consistent Fairly Observed rating on division-level evaluation across all groups points to a gap in visibility and coordination. Strengthening the role and presence of the division in monitoring and evaluation may improve alignment and ensure more consistent implementation across schools.

The study is showing a strong school-level implementation is consistent with the study of Rabor (2025), which found that schools demonstrate a high level of responsiveness in implementing child protection policies across preventive, protective, and remedial measures. This reinforces the idea that schools are effectively fulfilling their roles and responsibilities in safeguarding learners. However, a consistent weakness is observed in the evaluation of CPP by the division LRPO, which was rated "Fairly Observed" across all groups, indicating a gap in division-level monitoring and coordination.

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

The consistently lower ratings on the evaluation of CPP by the division LRPO indicate a gap in monitoring and coordination between school and division levels. This finding aligns with the study of Andaya et al. (2025), which emphasized that child protection efforts are often challenged by coordination issues and policy implementation gaps, particularly in linking institutional practices with higher-level oversight mechanisms.

The disparity between school-level implementation and division-level oversight resonates with the findings of Roche and Flynn (2021), who highlighted that local child protection actors often operate within fragmented processes, where systemic risks are exacerbated by a lack of coordinated monitoring across different levels of governance.

While this study found that schools exhibit strong leadership and parental involvement, its sustainability requires more than just local effort. As Mobo (2021) suggests in agreement that strengthening the child protection program nationwide requires more than just local effort; it necessitates sustainable development and a more robust institutional framework. In support, Herbert et al. (2019) also described the necessity of cross-agency collaboration as "critical for the safety and well-being of children" in child abuse and misconduct cases.

**Table 9 Differences on the Level of Implementation of the Child Protection Policy in the Public Secondary Schools in Isabela as perceived by the Implementer Respondents in Terms of Intervention Programs**

| Intervention Programs | F-value | p-value |
|---|---|---|
| 1. The school has a guidance counselor/guidance designate entrusted with facilitating guidance and counseling services. | 3.02 ns | .06 |
| 2.The school promotes and organizes diverse activities as part of the BKD program. | 5.34* | .02 |
| 3. The CPP is promoted and disseminated to parents and learners during HRPTA meetings. | 15.52* | .01 |
| 4. The school conducts annual GAD training sessions and seminars to promote the CPP. | 21.08* | .01 |
| 5. The CPP is discussed with parents during the quarterly assembly of the GPTA. | 9.12* | .01 |
| 6. Church-based organizations are mobilized to lead campaigns that promote moral values. | 4.20* | .02 |
| 7. The HGP educates parents and learners on using the CPP to address learners' offenses. | 7.76* | .01 |
| 8. The school uses a referral system to support at-risk learners. | 3.81* | .02 |
| 9. The school's CPC oversees child protection, including abuse, violence, bullying, and student welfare. | 5.47* | .01 |
| 10. The school holds symposiums on teenage pregnancy, reproductive health, and sex education to support learners' mental and emotional well-being. | 8.61* | .01 |
| 11. The school established its YFP that supports initiatives on children's rights and positive discipline. | 4.23* | .01 |

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 12. Teachers undergo PDET training to manage student behavior with non-punitive methods. | 2.85 ns | .06 |
| 13. The school organizes career guidance to help learners make informed decisions. | 5.85* | .01 |
| 14. The school head supports other learner-focused activities and initiatives. | 7.40* | .01 |

*Legend: * = significant; ns = not significant at 0.05 level*

The differences in implementation across schools of intervention programs could be observed that out of the 14 items, 12 intervention programs showed statistically significant differences among schools. In particular, items "The Promotion of CPP in HRPTA meetings" having an F value of 15.52 and p values of .01 and the "Conduct of annual GAD training/seminars" with F of 21.08 and p values.01 has the most significant difference, suggesting that some schools are far more effective than others in involving parents through HRPTA channels and showing major variation in gender and development awareness efforts among schools. The "Symposiums on reproductive health, teenage pregnancy, and sex education" with F value of 8.61 and p =value of .01 reflects on the attention given to students' mental, emotional, and physical well-being in a particular school. In like manner that the "Support for learner-focused activities by school heads" with F value of 7.40, p value of .01 showing that the leadership commitment of school head that influence program reach and effectiveness. Among the lowest were "Church-based organizations leading moral campaigns" F value of 4.20, and p value of .02), "YFP (Youth Formation Program) establishment" (F value of 4.23 and p value of .01) and "Referral systems for at-risk learners" with F value of 3.81, p value of .02. These significant differences highlight that implementation is not uniform across public secondary schools. Some schools may lack adequate resources, support, training, or coordination, causing these disparities.

However, two intervention programs "Guidance counselor/designate facilitates counseling services" with F values of 3.02 and p values of .06), and "PDET training for teachers on non-punitive behavior management" (F = 2.85, p = .06) did not show significant difference highlighting only minimal gap in implementation across schools.

The findings underscore both strengths and implementation gaps in intervention programs under the CPP. Programs such as GAD training, parental involvement (HRPTA/GPTA), and child-focused initiatives (e.g., symposiums, career guidance, YFP) show major variation, which may affect learner protection outcomes. Individual school-level leadership and external partnerships (e.g., church organizations, CPCs, referral systems) play a crucial role in influencing this gap in implementation across schools.

The findings indicate that while schools show strong variation and innovation in areas such as parental involvement, GAD programs, and leadership-driven initiatives, weaker areas persist in referral systems, community partnerships, and teacher capacity-building. Moreover, the lack of significant differences in guidance services and teacher training suggests that these programs are perceived consistently across all schools suggesting a standardized level of implementation.

The results in Table 9 reinforce the patterns observed in Tables 6 and 7, particularly in distinguishing between strong school-based practices and weaker system-level interventions. The significant differences in programs such as HRPTA involvement, GAD training, symposiums, and school head support highlight that leadership-driven and learner-focused initiatives are the

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

most dynamic aspects of CPP implementation. This is consistent with Tables 6 and 7, where guidance services, leadership support, and student engagement programs were rated highly, indicating that interventions directly experienced within the school are more visible and impactful.

However, the weaker areas identified in Table 9—particularly referral systems, church-based partnerships, and Youth Formation Programs—align with the gaps noted in Tables 6 and 7, where external linkages, parent/community involvement, and teacher capacity-building were only fairly observed by learners. Furthermore, the non-significant findings on guidance services and PDET training suggest that while these programs are consistently implemented across schools, they may lack depth or enhanced effectiveness, echoing the earlier finding that such interventions are not strongly felt or recognized by learners.

Overall, the three tables consistently show that while school-level and leadership-driven interventions are strong, programs that require coordination, external collaboration, and capacity-building like referral systems and church-based partnerships remain weaker and less visible by actual beneficiaries. Roche and Flynn (2021) also found a misalignment between child protection policies and community-based responses in which they noted that while formal institutions address severe cases through structured systems, community actors such as families, neighbors, and local organizations play a crucial role in early intervention but are often not fully integrated into the formal process.

**Table 10 Differences on the Level of Implementation of the Child Protection Policy in the Public Secondary Schools in Isabela as perceived by the Implementer Respondents in Terms of Restorative Practices**

| Restorative Practices | F-value | p-value |
|---|---|---|
| PRIMARY INTERVENTION | | |
| 1. The school identifies root causes of student offenses, recorded by the designated teacher. | 6.54* | .01 |
| 2. The school involves parents and stakeholders in campaigns against violence and risky behavior. | 13.65* | .01 |
| 3. Learners are encouraged to join Youth Development Programs that build character. | 5.78* | .01 |
| 4. The school provides parent child integration programs that enhance parent involvement in children's schooling. | 9.65* | .01 |
| 5. The school supports teachers' trainings in behavior management using Positive Discipline and non-violent methods. | 4.73* | .01 |
| 6. The school initiates training for parents on positive discipline and the implementation of the Child Protection Policy. | 3.54* | .03 |
| 7. The school involves learners in understanding their responsibilities regarding positive discipline and the implementation of the Child Protection Policy. | 4.23* | .02 |
| SECONDARY INTERVENTION | | |
| 1.The school uses assessment tools to identify and profile at-risk learners for targeted interventions. | 9.23* | .01 |
| 2. At-risk learners are referred to appropriate government and non- | 14.59* | .01 |

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

government agencies for professional assessment.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 3. CARs, with CPC support, receive guidance, counseling, and home visits. | 11.20* | .01 |
| 4. The school, in cooperation with the CPC, conducts programs on anger management and conflict resolution. | 14.62* | .01 |
| 5. The school refers children with special needs to agencies like DSWD, PNP, LGU, and other service providers for cases involving violations or offenses. | 11.21* | .01 |
| TERTIARY INTERVENTION | | |
| 1. The school promotes open communication and initiatives with learner-offenders to restore well-being and prevent reoffending. | 7.14* | .01 |
| 2. The school supports at-risk children with diversion programs and ensures access to education through ADM or other flexible options. | 11.48* | .01 |
| 3. The school's guidance designate monitors intervention plan implementation and termination. | 6.03* | .01 |
| 4. The CPC conducts restorative justice procedures. | 15.20* | .01 |
| 5. The school ensures the right to education for child-offenders in detention or rehabilitation. | 17.91* | .01 |

*Legend: * = significant at 0.05 level*

The data from Table 10 reveal statistically significant differences in the level of implementation of restorative practices under the Child Protection Policy (CPP) across public secondary schools in Isabela, as perceived by the implementers. All practices, across the primary, secondary, and tertiary intervention levels, yielded significant F-values ($p < 0.05$), indicating that the implementation of these practices varies meaningfully between schools. Among the primary interventions, the most notable differences were observed in: "The involvement of parents and stakeholders in campaigns against violence and risky behavior" ($F = 13.65$, $p < 0.01$), "Parent-child integration programs to enhance involvement in schooling" ($F = 9.65$, $p < 0.01$), and "Identification of root causes of student offenses" ($F = 6.54$, $p < 0.01$). These results suggest variability in how schools mobilize parental and community engagement, as well as their internal processes in understanding student behavior.

Stronger differences emerged in the implementation of secondary restorative practices, particularly: "Programs on anger management and conflict resolution" ($F = 14.62$, $p < 0.01$), "Referral of at-risk learners to professional agencies" ($F = 14.59$, $p < 0.01$), "Provision of guidance, counseling, and home visits to CARs" ($F = 11.20$, $p < 0.01$). This highlights disparities in the access to and quality of psychosocial and referral services across schools.

The highest F-values were recorded in tertiary interventions are: "Ensuring the right to education for child-offenders in detention or rehabilitation" ($F = 17.91$, $p < 0.01$), "CPC-led restorative justice procedures" ($F = 15.20$, $p < 0.01$), and "Support for diversion programs and ADM" ($F = 11.48$, $p < 0.01$). These figures show significant gaps in how schools provide for the most vulnerable learners and how restorative justice mechanisms are activated and implemented. The results point to a non-uniform implementation of restorative practices among public secondary schools in Isabela. While all practices are recognized as vital components of the CPP,

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

their implementation varies, potentially due to differences in school resources, leadership commitment, community support, or access to inter-agency partnerships.

The results show that all restorative practices significantly differ across schools, with the largest gaps found in tertiary (high-risk cases) and secondary (support systems) interventions, followed by variability in parental engagement and preventive practices. The results in Table 10 further strengthen the patterns observed in Tables 6, 7, and 9 by showing that all restorative practices significantly vary across schools, particularly in referral systems, psychosocial support, and interventions for high-risk learners. These findings are consistent with Table 6, where referral systems and teacher training were rated lower, and Table 7, where secondary and tertiary interventions were only fairly observed by learners, indicating limited visibility and engagement.

Moreover, the significant differences in parental involvement and stakeholder engagement in Table 10 align with Table 9, where HRPTA participation and GAD programs showed strong variation, suggesting that leadership-driven and community-based initiatives are not uniformly implemented.

Across all tables, a consistent pattern emerges: while school-based and leadership-driven practices are strong, interventions that require coordination, external linkages, and specialized support systems—such as referral mechanisms, counseling services, and restorative justice processes—show the greatest disparities. This indicates that implementation is not only uneven across schools but also reflects a gap between policy presence and actual delivery of critical support services, especially for at-risk and high-risk learners. Table 10 confirms that the greatest differences across schools are in referral systems and high-risk interventions, which is consistent with earlier findings that these are the weakest and least experienced components of the Child Protection Policy.

The findings also reveal strong school-level implementation of child protection and restorative practices, particularly in guidance services, Youth Formation Programs, and CPC-led initiatives, reflecting committed leadership and multi-stakeholder collaboration (Tables 6–7). Secondary and tertiary restorative practices, including anger management programs, referrals to professional agencies, and restorative justice procedures, also vary significantly across schools (Table 10), highlighting uneven access and engagement. Monitoring and evaluation practices indicate a systemic gap: the division-level LRPO evaluation consistently received the lowest ratings across implementers, learners, and community members (Table 8), suggesting weak vertical coordination despite strong school-level efforts. These patterns align with local and regional studies (Rabor, 2025; Roche & Flynn, 2021; Adlit et al., 2026), emphasizing that while schools effectively operationalize CPP measures, learner involvement, parental participation, and inter-agency collaboration remain key areas for improvement. Addressing these gaps is essential to ensure equitable, visible, and fully internalized child protection practices across all schools.

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

**Table 11 Differences on the Level of Implementation of the Child Protection Policy in the Public Secondary Schools in Isabela as perceived by the Implementer Respondents in Terms of Monitoring and Evaluation**

| Monitoring and Evaluation Index | F-value | p-value |
|---|---|---|
| 1. CPP implementation is evaluated by the division LRPO. | .89 ns | .41 |
| 2. CPP implementation is monitored by the Schools District Supervisor. | 1.77 ns | .17 |
| 3. The School Head supervises and supports the implementation of CPP. | 4.88* | .01 |
| 4. The School Head leads awareness campaigns, prevention programs, and intervention plans, including capacity-building for staff, parents, and students to implement the CPP effectively. | 15.09* | .01 |
| 5. The CPC, also recognized as the anti-bullying committee, fulfills its duties and responsibilities across all procedures and measures within the CPP. | 11.87* | .01 |
| 6. Teachers and school personnel actively engage in prevention and intervention measures while fulfilling their CPP implementation duties. | 6.32* | .01 |
| 7. Student leaders participate in all prevention and intervention measures and support CPP implementation. | 9.63* | .01 |
| 8. The PNP's Women and Child Protection Desk, along with LSWDO and various NGOs, actively participates in the referral system to support CPP implementation. | 10.04* | .01 |
| 9. Parents contribute to the investigation, planning, implementation, and monitoring of CPC intervention measures within CPP. | 10.38* | .01 |
| 10. The CPC applies positive, non-punitive disciplinary measures for major and minor offenses committed by learner-offenders. | 13.46* | .01 |

*Legend: * = significant; ns = not significant at 0.05 level*

The data in Tables 11 reveal both significant and non-significant differences in the implementation of Child Protection Policy (CPP) monitoring and evaluation practices among public secondary schools in Isabela, based on the perceptions of implementers. Two indicators

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

yielded non-significant differences, indicating relative uniformity across schools in these areas: "CPP implementation evaluated by the Division LRPO" ($F = 0.89$, $p = .41$) and "Monitoring by the Schools District Supervisor" ($F = 1.77$, $p = .17$). These results suggest that evaluation and monitoring at the division and district levels are perceived as being implemented consistently across schools, possibly due to standardized procedures or centralized oversight.

In contrast, eight (8) indicators showed statistically significant differences ($p < .05$), highlighting variability in how schools implement monitoring and evaluation measures at the school level. These indicators include: "School Head's leadership in awareness, prevention, and intervention programs" ($F = 15.09$); "CPC fulfilling duties across procedures" ($F = 11.87$); "Application of non-punitive disciplinary measures" ($F = 13.46$); "Active engagement of teachers and personnel" ($F = 6.32$); "Involvement of student leaders" ($F = 9.63$); "Participation of external agencies like the PNP, LSWDO, and NGOs" ($F = 10.04$); "Parental contribution to intervention planning and monitoring" ($F = 10.38$); and "School Head supervision and support for CPP" ($F = 4.88$). These significant results reflect variability in internal monitoring practices, particularly in how different stakeholders—school heads, teachers, students, parents, and community partners—are involved in CPP implementation. Differences in access to resources, leadership quality, and community engagement across schools may explain these inconsistencies.

Division- and district-level monitoring of CPP is relatively uniform across schools (non-significant differences), but school-level practices—leadership, CPC functionality, teacher and student engagement, parental involvement, and external agency participation—show significant variability ($F = 4.88–15.09$, $p < .05$). This mirrors gaps identified in Tables 6–10, where institutional systems exist, yet learners' awareness, parent engagement, and referral mechanisms are uneven, underscoring the need for stronger school-level coordination and multi-stakeholder collaboration (Rabor, 2025; Roche & Flynn, 2021). The non-significant findings for division and district M&E ($F=.89$, $F=1.77$) indicate that higher-level oversight is uniformly weak across all schools. Rabor (2025) documented that DepEd division monitoring is often infrequent and checklist-based rather than developmental. The data suggests that Isabela schools experience this uniformly—no school receives strong division-level support. Conversely, the significant variation in school-level M&E (leadership, CPC functionality, parent involvement) indicates that school autonomy produces uneven results.

The largest F-value for school head leadership ($F=15.09$) is critical as this suggests that prioritization of CPP M&E across different implementing school heads varies. School heads are the single most important factor in CPP implementation, (Estremera, 2018) as their decisions impact the timeline, impact, and manageability of the programs implemented.

Epstein et al. (2002) have found that school-level stakeholder engagement varies widely when division support is weak which is the same with the result in this study. Chacha & Tangi (2023) further notes that stakeholder's participation can also be influenced by factors such as lack of clear policy, information, and cooperation from authorities causing some schools to better mobilize efforts than others. Liu (2021) supported that lack of policy coordination within and beyond reforms hindered stakeholder collaboration in education groups leading to uneven success in improving lower-performing schools. Hall et al. (2023), whose study notes that community engagement in education has generally lacked depth and breadth, particularly so for traditionally marginalized communities, observed that greater support for effective implementation is often necessary.

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

**Table 12. Difference on the Level of Implementation of the Child Protection Policy in the Public Secondary Schools in Isabela as perceived by the Respondents when Grouped According to School Size in Terms of Intervention Programs**

| Intervention Programs | Medium | | Large | | Very Large | | F-value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | DE | Mean | DE | Mean | DE | |
| 1. The school has a guidance counselor/guidance designate entrusted with facilitating guidance and counseling services. | 3.53 | EE | 3.65 | EE | 3.93 | EE | 4.05* |
| 2.The school promotes and organizes diverse activities as part of the BKD program. | 3.15 | FE | 3.65 | EE | 3.86 | EE | 7.91* |
| 3. The CPP is promoted and disseminated to parents and learners during HRPTA meetings. | 3.38 | FE | 3.54 | EE | 3.88 | EE | 4.44* |
| 4. The school conducts annual GAD training sessions and seminars to promote the CPP. | 3.53 | EE | 3.70 | EE | 3.93 | EE | 6.32* |
| 5. The CPP is discussed with parents during the quarterly assembly of the GPTA. | 3.48 | FE | 3.45 | FE | 3.81 | EE | 3.12* |
| 6. Church-based organizations are mobilized to lead campaigns that promote moral values. | 2.84 | FE | 3.18 | FE | 3.46 | FE | 2.71$^{ns}$ |
| 7. The HGP educates parents and learners on using the CPP to address learners' offenses. | 2.92 | FE | 3.77 | EE | 3.83 | EE | 16.24* |
| 8. The school uses a referral system to support at-risk learners. | 2.92 | FE | 3.43 | FE | 3.69 | EE | 5.67* |
| 9. The school's CPC oversees child protection, including abuse, violence, bullying, and student welfare. | 3.46 | FE | 3.77 | EE | 3.72 | EE | 1.33$^{ns}$ |
| 10. The school holds symposiums on teenage pregnancy, reproductive health, and sex education to support learners' mental and emotional well-being. | 3.61 | EE | 3.68 | EE | 3.90 | EE | 3.49* |
| 11.The school established its YFP that supports initiatives on children's rights and positive discipline. | 3.15 | FE | 3.77 | EE | 3.81 | EE | 7.07* |
| 12.Teachers undergo PDET training to manage student behavior with non-punitive methods. | 2.92 | FE | 3.22 | FE | 3.65 | EE | 6.14* |
| 13. The school organizes career guidance to help learners make informed decisions. | 3.15 | FE | 3.77 | EE | 3.88 | EE | 11.99* |
| 14. The school head supports other learner-focused activities and initiatives. | 3.46 | FE | 3.77 | EE | 3.90 | EE | 4.30* |

*Legend: 2.50-3.49 = Fairly Evident (FE); 3.50-4.00 = Excellently Evident (EE); * = significant; ns = not significant at 0.05 level*

The findings in Table 12 reveal that school size plays a significant role in how intervention programs related to the Child Protection Policy (CPP) are perceived and implemented across public secondary schools in Isabela. Out of the 14 indicators, 12 showed statistically significant differences ($p < 0.05$), suggesting that the extent of implementation increases with school size—from medium to large and very large schools. This trend indicates that larger schools tend to implement CPP-related intervention programs more extensively and visibly compared to smaller ones. The highest significance was found in "CPP use through HGP education" ($F = 16.24^*$) and "Career guidance for informed decision-making" ($F = 11.99^*$), indicating these areas are particularly well-developed in larger schools. Very large schools rated most practices as "Excellently Evident (EE)", suggesting stronger implementation capacity and stakeholder involvement, possibly due to better resources, sufficient staffing, and greater access to external support programs.

In contrast, two indicators showed no significant differences across school size: "Mobilization of church-based organizations to promote moral values" ($F = 2.71$, $p = .07$) and "CPC oversight on child protection and welfare issues" ($F = 1.33$, $p = .26$). These results imply that, regardless of school size, these areas are implemented with comparable frequency or emphasis. Overall, the analysis shows that larger schools-especially very large ones-demonstrate higher levels of CPP intervention program implementation, likely due to greater human resources, logistical support, and stronger community linkages. Medium-sized schools, meanwhile, tend to lag slightly behind, with several practices rated only as "Fairly Evident." This underscores the need to further capacitate medium-sized schools by providing more training, improved resource access, and enhanced stakeholder engagement.

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

Table 12 shows that larger schools implement CPP interventions more extensively, especially in "HGP education" and "Career guidance," while medium-sized schools lag behind. Across all schools, church-based moral campaigns and CPC oversight remain weak and uniform, highlighting systemic gaps. These findings align with earlier tables, emphasizing strong school-level capacity but persistent. The findings from Table 12 indicate that larger schools demonstrate stronger implementation of CPP interventions, particularly in "HGP education" and "Career guidance," while medium-sized schools show comparatively lower engagement. This trend is consistent with earlier tables (6–11), where school-level leadership, internal monitoring, and stakeholder engagement were strong, yet gaps persisted in external partnerships, referral systems, and parent/community involvement. These results align with Rabor (2025), who observed that school responsiveness to CPP is generally high but emphasized the need to build capacity among school heads and teachers to strengthen implementation. Similarly, Roche and Flynn (2021) highlighted that formal child protection actors often operate effectively within schools but are constrained by limited community reach, underscoring the importance of enhancing collaboration with local and church-based organizations. Together, these studies suggest that while school-level CPP implementation is robust, systematic gaps in inter-agency coordination and external support limit the uniformity and visibility of interventions, particularly in medium-sized schools.

**Table 13 Difference on the Level of Implementation of the Child Protection Policy in the Public Secondary Schools in Isabela based as perceived by the Respondents when Grouped According to School Size in Terms of Restorative Practices**

| Restorative Practices | Medium | | Large | | Very Large | | F-value | p-value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | DE | Mean | DE | Mean | DE | | |
| PRIMARY INTERVENTION | | | | | | | | |
| 1. The school identifies root causes of student offenses, recorded by the designated teacher. | 3.23 | FO | 3.77 | EO | 3.93 | EO | 14.07* | .01 |
| 2. The school involves parents and stakeholders in campaigns against violence and risky behavior. | 3.23 | FO | 3.79 | EO | 3.90 | EO | 10.61* | .01 |
| 3. Learners are encouraged to join Youth Development Programs that build character. | 3.38 | FO | 3.79 | EO | 3.93 | EO | 9.59* | .01 |
| 4. The school provides parent child integration programs that enhance parent involvement in children's schooling. | 3.46 | FO | 3.81 | EO | 3.86 | EO | 3.82* | .02 |
| 5. The school supports teachers' trainings in behavior management using Positive Discipline and non-violent methods. | 3.30 | FO | 3.79 | EO | 3.79 | EO | 4.16* | .01 |
| 6. The school initiates training for parents on positive discipline and the implementation of the Child Protection Policy. | 3.23 | FO | 3.65 | EO | 3.72 | EO | 3.24* | .04 |
| 7. The school involves learners in understanding their responsibilities regarding positive discipline and the implementation of the Child Protection Policy. | 3.46 | FO | 3.81 | EO | 3.81 | EO | 2.27 ns | .10 |
| SECONDARY INTERVENTION | | | | | | | | |
| 1.The school uses assessment tools to identify and profile at-risk learners for targeted interventions. | 3.23 | FO | 3.61 | EO | 3.51 | EO | 1.72 ns | .18 |
| 2. At-risk learners are referred to appropriate government and non-government agencies for professional assessment. | 3.23 | FO | 3.72 | EO | 3.69 | EO | 4.26* | .01 |
| 3. CARs, with CPC support, receive guidance, counseling, and home visits. | 3.23 | FO | 3.61 | EO | 3.81 | EO | 6.72* | .01 |
| 4. The school, in cooperation with the CPC, conducts programs on anger management and conflict resolution. | 3.38 | FO | 3.70 | EO | 3.74 | EO | 1.78 ns | .17 |
| 5. The school refers children with special needs to agencies like DSWD, PNP, LGU, and other service providers for cases involving violations or offenses. | 3.30 | FO | 3.77 | EO | 3.88 | EO | 7.03* | .01 |
| TERTIARY INTERVENTION | | | | | | | | |
| 1. The school promotes open communication and initiatives with learner-offenders to restore well-being and prevent reoffending. | 3.23 | FO | 3.70 | EO | 3.93 | EO | 13.23* | .01 |
| 2. The school supports at-risk children with diversion programs and ensures access to education through ADM or other flexible options. | 3.23 | FO | 3.81 | EO | 3.93 | EO | 15.33* | .01 |
| 3. The school's guidance designate monitors intervention plan implementation and termination. | 3.23 | FO | 3.70 | EO | 3.83 | EO | 8.35* | .01 |
| 4. The CPC conducts restorative justice procedures. | 3.23 | FO | 3.68 | EO | 3.76 | EO | 5.13* | .01 |
| 5. The school ensures the right to education for child-offenders in detention or rehabilitation. | 3.23 | FO | 3.81 | EO | 3.79 | EO | 7.56* | .01 |

*Legend: 2.50-3.49 = Fairly Observed (EO); 3.50-4.00 = Excellently Observed (EO); * = significant; ns = not significant at 0.05 level*

schools (large and very large) consistently receiving higher mean ratings than medium-sized

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

schools. These practices were rated either Fairly Observed (FO) or Excellently Observed (EO) depending on the school size, with very large schools most often rating practices as EO.

Out of 19 indicators across the three intervention levels, 16 items showed statistically significant differences ($p < .05$), highlighting a trend where larger schools implement restorative practices more consistently and effectively.

From the Primary Interventions, the following indicators showed significant differences in "Identifying root causes of offenses" with an F value of 14.07; involving parents in anti-violence campaigns" with a significant F value of 10.61; "Supporting teacher training on positive discipline" with a significant F value of 4.16.

Among the Secondary Interventions, significant indicators include the "Referral of at-risk learners to agencies" with a significant F value of 4.26; "CAR support via CPC" with a significant F value of 6.72; and the "Referrals for children with special needs" with an F value of 7.03.

For the Tertiary Interventions, significant items include "Promotion of open communication with learner-offenders" having an F value of 13.23; "Diversion programs and ADM access" with a significant F value of 15.33; and the "Monitoring of intervention plans by guidance designates" with a significant F value of 8.35."Implementation of restorative justice by CPC" with an F value of 5.13.

These differences suggest that larger schools may benefit from greater resources, stronger partnerships, and better-trained personnel, allowing them to implement multi-tiered restorative practices more effectively.

However, three items were found to be not statistically significant from the Secondary Interventions: "Learner involvement in understanding their responsibilities under the CPP" ($F = 2.27$, $p = .10$) and "Programs on anger management and conflict resolution" ($F = 1.78$, $p = .17$), while from the Tertiary Interventions is the "Use of assessment tools to profile at-risk learners" ($F = 1.72$, $p = .18$). These results suggest similar levels of implementation across school sizes in these areas, possibly due to uniform division-wide initiatives or standardized program delivery.

Overall, the findings indicate that the implementation of restorative practices under the Child Protection Policy is more robust in larger schools, likely due to greater institutional capacity, external linkages, and support systems. The findings across Tables 6–13 collectively illustrate that while public secondary schools in Isabela demonstrate strong implementation of restorative practices and child protection interventions at the school level, significant disparities persist. Implementers and community members consistently rate programs such as parental engagement, CPC functionality, and teacher capacity-building as "Excellently Observed," yet learners perceive these areas as only "Fairly Observed," highlighting a visibility and engagement gap. School size also emerges as a critical factor for larger schools to achieve higher levels of implementation across primary, secondary, and tertiary interventions, particularly in identifying root causes of offenses, involving parents in anti-violence campaigns, promoting open communication with learner-offenders, and providing diversion programs and ADM access (Table 13). In contrast, medium-sized schools show lower implementation, mirroring learner-reported gaps in awareness and participation. Across all sizes, systemic weaknesses remain

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

evident in division-level monitoring, consistently rated lowest by implementers, learners, and community representatives, suggesting a need for stronger vertical coordination. Together, these results point to the importance of leveraging institutional capacity while enhancing learner engagement, communication, and inter-level coordination to ensure holistic and equitable child protection practices. The findings of Antiza and Labitad (2025) support the strong school-level implementation of the Child Protection Policy (CPP) observed in Tables 6–13, showing that teachers with training and experience exhibit high awareness and responsiveness in safeguarding children. This corresponds with the high involvement of school heads, Child Protection Committees (CPCs), parents, and community stakeholders in monitoring, restorative practices, and intervention programs. At the same time, the study highlights those differences in school responsiveness exist based on teacher experience, position, and participation in training, which mirrors the gaps identified in medium-sized schools and less-visible interventions, such as division-level monitoring and learner engagement in secondary and tertiary restorative practices. The significant differences in primary interventions, particularly in identifying the root causes of learner behavior ($F = 14.07$), suggest that larger schools have more organized and systematic approaches in documenting and addressing student concerns. This supports the idea of John Braithwaite (1989), who emphasized that effective interventions depend on proper understanding of root causes; without this, responses may not fully address the problem.

Similarly, the significant differences in tertiary interventions, such as diversion programs ($F = 15.33$), indicate that larger schools are better equipped to implement more complex support systems. According to Howard Zehr (1990), these interventions require trained personnel and strong coordination with external agencies. Larger schools are more likely to have available guidance counselors and support staff, while medium-sized schools may rely on limited personnel, affecting the consistency of implementation. On the other hand, the non-significant result for anger management programs ($F = 1.78$, $p = .17$) suggests that this area remains a common challenge across all school sizes. This may be due to the lack of trained facilitators or limited resources. Supporting this, Herlitz et al (2020) noted that no interventions were sustained in full; a major barrier was insufficient funding, equipment, materials, and space, which led to discontinuation or heavy adaptation of programs. In the local context, the findings of Estremera (2018) further support this result, showing that Child Protection Committee (CPC) members, regardless of school size, still need additional training in handling complex interventions. This aligns with the present findings where no significant differences were observed in areas requiring specialized skills, such as anger management and assessment tools. These findings suggest the need for targeted capacity-building, enhanced communication, and consistent implementation strategies to ensure all schools provide equitable and fully experienced child protection measures.

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

**Table 14** Difference on the Level of Implementation of the Child Protection Policy in the Public Secondary Schools in Isabela as perceived by the Respondents when Grouped According to School Size in Terms of Monitoring and Evaluation

| Monitoring and Evaluation Index | Medium | | Large | | Very Large | | F-value | p-value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | DE | Mean | DE | Mean | DE | | |
| 1. CPP implementation is evaluated by the division LRPO. | 3.15 | FO | 3.34 | FO | 3.69 | EO | 3.52* | .03 |
| 2. CPP implementation is monitored by the Schools District Supervisor. | 3.23 | FO | 3.40 | FO | 3.81 | EO | 6.06* | .01 |
| 3. The School Head supervises and supports the implementation of CPP. | 3.30 | FO | 3.68 | EO | 3.86 | EO | 5.92* | .01 |
| 4. The School Head leads awareness campaigns, prevention programs, and intervention plans, including capacity-building for staff, parents, and students to implement the CPP effectively. | 3.61 | EO | 3.65 | EO | 3.86 | EO | 2.44 ns | .09 |
| 5. The CPC, also recognized as the anti-bullying committee, fulfills its duties and responsibilities across all procedures and measures within the CPP. | 3.23 | FO | 3.79 | EO | 3.86 | EO | 8.11* | .01 |
| 6. Teachers and school personnel actively engage in prevention and intervention measures while fulfilling their CPP implementation duties. | 3.23 | FO | 3.88 | EO | 3.81 | EO | 11.23* | .01 |
| 7. Student leaders participate in all prevention and intervention measures and support CPP implementation. | 3.30 | FO | 3.90 | EO | 3.83 | EO | 8.93* | .01 |
| 8. The PNP's Women and Child Protection Desk, along with LSWDO and various NGOs, actively participates in the referral system to support CPP implementation. | 3.30 | FO | 3.90 | EO | 3.83 | EO | 8.93* | .01 |
| 9. Parents contribute to the investigation, planning, implementation, and monitoring of CPC intervention measures within CPP. | 3.30 | FO | 3.88 | EO | 3.93 | EO | 16.65* | .01 |
| 10. The CPC applies positive, non-punitive disciplinary measures for major and minor offenses committed by learner-offenders. | 3.30 | FO | 3.86 | EO | 3.93 | EO | 15.29* | .01 |

*Legend: 2.50-3.49 = Fairly Observed (EO); 3.50-4.00 = Excellently Observed (EO); * = significant; ns = not significant at 0.05 level*

Table 14 presents the respondents' perceptions of how Monitoring and Evaluation mechanisms for the Child Protection Policy (CPP) are implemented in public secondary schools of Isabela, grouped by school size: medium, large, and very large. Across most indicators, the data show that very large schools receive higher mean scores compared to large and medium-sized schools, suggesting a more effective and observable implementation of CPP Monitoring and Evaluation mechanisms in these institutions. Out of the 10 indicators, 8 items showed statistically significant differences ($p < .05$), indicating that school size plays a significant role in how CPP monitoring and evaluation is conducted and perceived.

Systemic monitoring and oversight are manifested in items: "CPP evaluation by the division LRPO" ($F = 3.52^*$, $p = .03$) and "Monitoring by Schools District Supervisors" ($F = 6.06^*$, $p = .01$). Leadership and school-based support are implied in "School Head supervision of CPP implementation" ($F = 5.92^*$, $p = .01$), while stakeholders' participation is seen in the "Anti-Bullying Committee (CPC) fulfilling its responsibilities" ($F = 8.11^*$, $p = .01$), "Teachers' active involvement in implementation" ($F = 11.23^*$, $p = .01$), "Participation of student leaders" ($F = 8.93^*$, $p = .01$), "Support from external agencies (PNP, NGOs) in referrals" ($F = 8.93^*$, $p = .01$), "Parental involvement in CPC planning and monitoring" ($F = 16.65^*$, $p = .01$), and "Positive, non-punitive disciplinary actions by CPC" ($F = 15.29^*$, $p = .01$). These significant results suggest that larger schools, especially very large ones, likely have stronger institutional mechanisms, more personnel, and active partnerships, allowing for more thorough monitoring, evaluation, and stakeholder engagement in CPP implementation.

The item showing no significant difference across school sizes is: "The School Head leads awareness campaigns, prevention programs, and intervention plans, including capacity-building for staff, parents, and students to implement the CPP effectively" ($F = 2.44$, $p = .09$).

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

The lack of significance may suggest that awareness campaigns and related leadership actions are uniformly implemented across schools, regardless of size—possibly due to standard directives from the division level. The findings in Table 14, where most indicators show significant differences favoring larger schools, suggest that school size influences the effectiveness of CPP monitoring and evaluation. The significant result in Division LRPO evaluation indicates that monitoring processes are more evident in larger schools, possibly due to their more complex structures and higher volume of cases, as supported by Rabor (2025). The highest difference in parental involvement further shows that larger schools are more capable of engaging parents, which aligns with the work of Epstein et al. (2002) on structured school–family partnerships. Meanwhile, the non-significant finding on school head awareness campaigns suggests that this practice is consistently implemented across all school sizes due to standard DepEd requirements, although slightly higher ratings in larger schools indicate a trend toward stronger implementation.

**Table 24 Difference on the Level of Implementation of the Child Protection Policy in the Public Secondary Schools in Isabela as Perceived by the Respondents when Grouped According to Years in the Service in Terms of Intervention Programs**

| Intervention Programs | 0-5 | | 6-10 | | 11-20 | | More than 20 years | | F-value | p-value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | DE | Mean | DE | Mean | DE | Mean | DE | | |
| 1. The school has a guidance counselor/guidance designate entrusted with facilitating guidance and counseling services. | 3.84 | EE | 3.59 | EE | 3.69 | EE | 4.00 | EE | 2.57 ns | .06 |
| 2.The school promotes and organizes diverse activities as part of the BKD program. | 3.69 | EE | 3.54 | EE | 3.57 | EE | 4.00 | EE | 3.20* | .02 |
| 3. The CPP is promoted and disseminated to parents and learners during HRPTA meetings. | 3.76 | EE | 3.68 | EE | 3.57 | EE | 3.78 | EE | .61 ns | .60 |
| 4. The school conducts annual GAD training sessions and seminars to promote the CPP. | 3.76 | EE | 3.77 | EE | 3.78 | EE | 3.78 | EE | .01 ns | .99 |
| 5. The CPP is discussed with parents during the quarterly assembly of the GPTA. | 3.76 | EE | 3.63 | EE | 3.64 | EE | 3.43 | FE | .69 ns | .55 |
| 6. Church-based organizations are mobilized to lead campaigns that promote moral values. | 3.23 | FE | 3.09 | FE | 3.33 | FE | 3.30 | FE | .36 ns | .78 |
| 7. The HGP educates parents and learners on using the CPP to address learners' offenses. | 3.69 | EE | 3.45 | FE | 3.64 | EE | 4.00 | EE | 3.53* | .01 |
| 8. The school uses a referral system to support at-risk learners. | 3.07 | FE | 3.36 | FE | 3.61 | EE | 3.56 | EE | 1.95 ns | .12 |
| 9. The school's CPC oversees child protection, including abuse, violence, bullying, and student welfare. | 3.76 | EE | 3.36 | FE | 3.71 | EE | 4.00 | EE | 4.62* | .01 |
| 10. The school holds symposiums on teenage pregnancy, reproductive health, and sex education to support learners' mental and emotional well-being. | 3.61 | EE | 3.59 | EE | 3.78 | EE | 4.00 | EE | 3.68* | .01 |
| 11.The school established its YFP that supports initiatives on children's rights and positive discipline. | 3.84 | EE | 3.40 | FE | 3.66 | EE | 4.00 | EE | 4.20* | .01 |
| 12.Teachers undergo PDETtraining to manage student behavior with non-punitive methods. | 3.46 | FE | 3.13 | FE | 3.42 | FE | 3.43 | FE | .83 ns | .48 |
| 13. The school organizes career guidance to help learners make informed decisions. | 3.92 | EE | 3.50 | EE | 3.69 | EE | 3.95 | EE | 3.78* | .01 |
| 14. The school head supports other learner-focused activities and initiatives. | 3.92 | EE | 3.54 | EE | 3.76 | EE | 4.00 | EE | 3.77* | .01 |

*Legend: 2.50-3.49 = Fairly Evident (FE); 3.50-4.00 = Excellently Evident (EE); * = significant; ns = not significant at 0.05 level*

Table 24 presents a comparative analysis of perceptions on the implementation of Intervention Programs under the Child Protection Policy based on years in service. The results show that seven out of fourteen indicators yielded statistically significant differences, indicating that length of service influences perceptions in selected areas of CPP implementation. In BKD Program Activities, there is a significant difference with an F-value of 3.20 and a p-value of .02, where teachers with more than 20 years of service recorded the highest mean of 4.00, suggesting

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

stronger perceived implementation among veteran teachers. In HGP education on CPP use, there is also a significant difference with an F-value of 3.53 and a p-value of .01, where the most experienced group again rated highest at 4.00, reflecting greater awareness and engagement gained through experience. In CPC oversight on child protection, with an F-value of 4.62 and a p-value of .01, the 6 to 10 years group posted the lowest mean of 3.36, while the 20 plus years group again rated highest at 4.00, indicating stronger confidence among more experienced personnel. In symposiums on teen pregnancy and reproductive health, with an F-value of 3.68 and a p-value of .01, ratings consistently increased with years of service and peaked at 4.00 among veterans. In YFP support on children's rights and discipline, with an F-value of 4.20 and a p-value of .01, the 6 to 10 years group gave the lowest rating of 3.40 while other groups rated it higher, showing a noticeable gap in perception among mid-career teachers. In career guidance organization, with an F-value of 3.78 and a p-value of .01, both the 0 to 5 years group with a mean of 3.92 and the more than 20 years group with a mean of 3.95 gave higher ratings, indicating stronger perception among early and highly experienced teachers. In school head support for learner-focused activities, with an F-value of 3.77 and a p-value of .01, the highest rating was again from those with more than 20 years of service at 4.00, while the 6 to 10 years group gave the lowest at 3.54.

These findings suggest that years in service significantly influence perceptions of CPP intervention implementation, with veteran teachers consistently giving higher ratings, particularly in areas involving leadership, coordination, and stakeholder engagement. The pattern of higher ratings among experienced teachers reflects accumulated exposure to child protection systems and stronger familiarity with program implementation processes. Consistent with Braithwaite (1989), restorative and protective practices improve with experience in handling conflicts and stakeholder interactions over time. The lower ratings among mid-career teachers in selected indicators also suggest a possible gap in engagement or confidence during this stage of service. Epstein et al. (2002) further supports that sustained experience enhances parent and community engagement practices, which explains the stronger perception among veteran teachers. In addition, Zehr (1990) emphasizes that effective diversion and referral systems require practical knowledge of community partnerships, which develops through long-term service. These findings imply that schools should strengthen mentorship programs where veteran teachers guide mid-career teachers, particularly in parent engagement, coordination of programs, and implementation of diversion strategies, to ensure more consistent and uniform CPP implementation across all experience levels.

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

**Table 25 Difference on the Level of Implementation of the Child Protection Policy in the Public Secondary Schools in Isabela as Perceived by the Respondents when Grouped According to Years in the Service in Terms of Restorative Practices**

| Restorative Practices | 0-5 | | 6-10 | | 11-20 | | More than 20 years | | F-value | p-value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | DE | Mean | DE | Mean | DE | Mean | DE | | |
| PRIMARY INTERVENTION | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. The school identifies root causes of student offenses, recorded by the designated teacher. | 3.84 | EO | 3.59 | EO | 3.73 | EO | 3.95 | EO | 2.58 ns | .06 |
| 2. The school involves parents and stakeholders in campaigns against violence and risky behavior. | 3.84 | EO | 3.50 | EO | 3.76 | EO | 4.00 | EO | 4.06 * | .01 |
| 3. Learners are encouraged to join Youth Development Programs that build character. | 3.76 | EO | 3.72 | EO | 3.73 | EO | 4.00 | EO | 2.30 ns | .08 |
| 4. The school provides parent child integration programs that enhance parent involvement in children's schooling. | 3.84 | EO | 3.63 | EO | 3.73 | EO | 4.00 | EO | 2.58 ns | .06 |
| 5. The school supports teachers' trainings in behavior management using Positive Discipline and non-violent methods. | 3.84 | EO | 3.50 | EO | 3.66 | EO | 4.00 | EO | 3.33 * | .02 |
| 6. The school initiates training for parents on positive discipline and the implementation of the Child Protection Policy. | 3.69 | EO | 3.59 | EO | 3.57 | EO | 3.73 | EO | .41 ns | .74 |
| 7. The school involves learners in understanding their responsibilities regarding positive discipline and the implementation of the Child Protection Policy. | 3.92 | EO | 3.59 | EO | 3.69 | EO | 4.00 | EO | 2.73 * | .04 |
| SECONDARY INTERVENTION | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.The school uses assessment tools to identify and profile at-risk learners for targeted interventions. | 3.38 | FO | 3.40 | FO | 3.57 | EO | 3.60 | EO | .60 ns | .61 |
| **2.** At-risk learners are referred to appropriate government and non-government agencies for professional assessment. | 3.46 | FO | 3.50 | EO | 3.66 | EO | 3.86 | EO | 2.16 ns | .09 |
| **3.** CARs, with CPC support, receive guidance, counseling, and home visits. | 3.53 | EO | 3.54 | EO | 3.73 | EO | 3.65 | EO | .83 ns | .48 |
| **4.** The school, in cooperation with the CPC, conducts programs on anger management and conflict resolution. | 3.92 | EO | 3.45 | FO | 3.66 | EO | 3.78 | EO | 1.91 ns | .13 |
| **5.** The school refers children with special needs to agencies like DSWD, PNP, LGU, and other service providers for cases involving violations or offenses. | 3.76 | EO | 3.54 | EO | 3.73 | EO | 4.00 | EO | 3.16 * | .02 |

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| TERTIARY INTERVENTION | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. The school promotes open communication and initiatives with learner-offenders to restore well-being and prevent reoffending. | 3.84 | EO | 3.63 | EO | 3.73 | EO | 3.78 | EO | .59 ns | .61 |
| 2. The school supports at-risk children with diversion programs and ensures access to education through ADM or other flexible options. | 3.84 | EO | 3.63 | EO | 3.73 | EO | 4.00 | EO | 2.85 * | .04 |
| 3. The school's guidance designate monitors intervention plan implementation and termination. | 3.84 | EO | 3.63 | EO | 3.71 | EO | 3.65 | EO | .55 ns | .64 |
| 4. The CPC conducts restorative justice procedures. | 3.69 | EO | 3.59 | EO | 3.69 | EO | 3.65 | EO | .16 ns | .91 |
| 5. The school ensures the right to education for child-offenders in detention or rehabilitation. | 3.84 | EO | 3.59 | EO | 3.69 | EO | 3.86 | EO | 1.84 ns | .26 |

Legend: 2.50-3.49 = Fairly Observed (EO); 3.50-4.00 = Excellently Observed (EO); * = significant; ns = not significant at 0.05 level

Table 25 shows that only selected restorative practices yielded statistically significant differences when grouped according to years in service. In primary intervention, significant differences were found in parent and stakeholder involvement with an F-value of 4.06 and p-value of .01, teacher training in Positive Discipline with an F-value of 3.33 and p-value of .02, and learner involvement in CPP implementation with an F-value of 2.73 and p-value of .04. In all indicators, respondents with more than 20 years of service recorded the highest mean of 4.00, compared with 3.84 for those with 0 to 5 years, 3.50 to 3.59 for those with 6 to 10 years, and 3.66 to 3.76 for those with 11 to 20 years, indicating stronger engagement of veteran educators in preventive and participatory practices.

In secondary intervention, only referral to appropriate agencies was significant, with an F-value of 3.16 and p-value of .02, where those with more than 20 years again obtained the highest mean of 4.00 compared with 3.76, 3.54, and 3.73 from the other groups, reflecting stronger capability in inter-agency coordination.

In tertiary intervention, support through diversion programs was significant, with an F-value of 2.85 and p-value of .04, where respondents with more than 20 years of service posted the highest mean of 4.00 compared with 3.84 for those with 0 to 5 years and 3.63 and 3.73 for those with 6 to 10 years and 11 to 20 years. This indicates that veteran teachers possess greater familiarity with alternative learning systems such as ADM and ALS and more established referral pathways for children in conflict with the law. This finding supports the view that effective restorative practices require practical knowledge of community resources and agency partnerships developed through experience, as explained by Zehr (1990). It also aligns with Proctor (2023), who emphasized that experienced teachers demonstrate stronger reflexivity or the ability to critically examine their role in managing conflicts, which strengthens implementation.

These findings strengthen the claim that years of service influence key restorative practices, as veteran educators consistently demonstrate higher engagement across critical

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

areas. In view of this, it is recommended that the Child Protection Committee establish a mentorship program where teachers with more than 20 years of service guide those with 6 to 10 years, particularly in parent engagement, referral systems, and diversion practices. The Division Office may also facilitate cross-visits and demonstrations of restorative practices to address the observed gap among mid-career teachers.

**Table 26 Difference on the Level of Implementation of the Child Protection Policy in the Public Secondary Schools in Isabela as Perceived by the Respondents when Grouped According to Years in the Service in Terms of Monitoring and Evaluation**

| Monitoring and Evaluation Index | 0-5 | | 6-10 | | 11-20 | | More than 20 years | | F-value | p-value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | DE | Mean | DE | Mean | DE | Mean | DE | | |
| 1. CPP implementation is evaluated by the division LRPO. | 3.76 | EO | 3.54 | EO | 3.33 | FO | 3.47 | FO | 1.09 ns | .35 |
| 2. CPP implementation is monitored by the Schools District Supervisor. | 3.76 | EO | 3.54 | EO | 3.52 | EO | 3.52 | EO | .46 ns | .71 |
| 3. The School Head supervises and supports the implementation of CPP. | 3.84 | EO | 3.54 | EO | 3.71 | EO | 3.78 | EO | 1.11 ns | .34 |
| 4. The School Head leads awareness campaigns, prevention programs, and intervention plans, including capacity-building for staff, parents, and students to implement the CPP effectively. | 3.84 | EO | 3.59 | EO | 3.76 | EO | 3.78 | EO | .99 ns | .40 |
| 5. The CPC, also recognized as the anti-bullying committee, fulfills its duties and responsibilities across all procedures and measures within the CPP. | 3.84 | EO | 3.54 | EO | 3.69 | EO | 4.00 | EO | 3.21* | .02 |
| 6. Teachers and school personnel actively engage in prevention and intervention measures while fulfilling their CPP implementation duties. | 3.84 | EO | 3.54 | EO | 3.80 | EO | 3.86 | EO | 2.12 ns | .10 |
| 7. Student leaders participate in all prevention and intervention measures and support CPP implementation. | 3.84 | EO | 3.59 | EO | 3.78 | EO | 4.00 | EO | 2.78* | .04 |
| 8. The PNP's Women and Child Protection Desk, along with LSWDO and various NGOs, actively participates in the referral system to support CPP implementation. | 3.84 | EO | 3.59 | EO | 3.78 | EO | 4.00 | EO | 2.78* | .04 |
| 9. Parents contribute to the investigation, planning, implementation, and monitoring of CPC intervention measures within CPP. | 3.84 | EO | 3.63 | EO | 3.83 | EO | 4.00 | EO | 3.27* | .02 |
| 10. The CPC applies positive, non-punitive disciplinary measures for major and minor offenses committed by learner-offenders. | 3.84 | EO | 3.63 | EO | 3.83 | EO | 3.95 | EO | 2.43 ns | .06 |

Legend: 2.50-3.49 = Fairly Observed (EO); 3.50-4.00 = Excellently Observed (EO); * = significant; ns = not significant at 0.05 level

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

Table 26 shows that only four monitoring and evaluation mechanisms yielded statistically significant differences when respondents were grouped according to years in service. The functioning of the Child Protection Committee as the Anti-Bullying Committee registered an F-value of 3.21 and p-value of .02, with respondents having more than 20 years of service obtaining the highest mean of 4.00 compared with 3.54 for those with 6 to 10 years and 3.69 for those with 11 to 20 years, indicating that veteran teachers demonstrate a stronger understanding of committee roles and processes. This supports the view that effectiveness in committee work improves with experience and continuity, as longer-serving members develop institutional memory and familiarity with established protocols.

Similarly, student leaders' participation in CPP activities showed a significant difference with an F-value of 2.78 and p-value of .04, where respondents with more than 20 years of service again posted the highest mean of 4.00 compared with 3.59 among those with 6 to 10 years, suggesting that experienced teachers are more effective in engaging student leaders in policy-related initiatives. The involvement of external agencies in the referral system also revealed a significant difference with an F-value of 2.78 and p-value of .04, with the most experienced group obtaining the highest mean of 4.00 compared with 3.59 for those with 6 to 10 years, reflecting stronger collaboration built through long-term partnerships and repeated coordination with agencies such as PNP, LSWDO, and other stakeholders. In addition, parental participation in monitoring and implementation of intervention plans yielded an F-value of 3.27 and p-value of .02, with respondents having more than 20 years of service recording the highest mean of 4.00, indicating stronger parent engagement facilitated by experience in communication and relationship-building.

These findings strengthen the claim that years of service influence key monitoring and evaluation practices, as veteran teachers consistently demonstrate higher engagement in committee functionality, student leadership involvement, external collaboration, and parental participation. This pattern supports the idea that experiential knowledge enhances understanding of monitoring systems and partnership management. In view of this, it is recommended that schools retain experienced teachers in Child Protection Committees to sustain institutional memory and strengthen coordination systems, while structured mentorship and documentation of processes should be implemented to support mid-career teachers and ensure continuity of effective monitoring and evaluation practices.

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

**Table 27 Difference on the Level of Implementation of the Child Protection Policy in the Public Secondary Schools in Isabela based as Perceivedby the Respondents when Grouped According to Highest Educational Attainment in Terms of Intervention Programs**

| Intervention Programs | Bachelor's Degree | | With MA Units | | MA Degree | | With Doctorate Units | | Doctorate Degree | | F-value | p-value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | DE | Mean | DE | Mean | DE | Mean | DE | Mean | DE | | |
| 1. The school has a guidance counselor/guidance designate entrusted with facilitating guidance and counseling services. | 3.60 | EE | 3.72 | EE | 3.53 | EE | 4.00 | EE | 4.00 | EE | 3.13* | .01 |
| 2.The school promotes and organizes diverse activities as part of the BKD program. | 3.40 | FE | 3.66 | EE | 3.39 | FE | 4.00 | EE | 3.95 | EE | 4.40* | .01 |
| 3. The CPP is promoted and disseminated to parents and learners during HRPTA meetings. | 3.20 | FE | 3.69 | EE | 3.53 | EE | 3.76 | EE | 3.85 | EE | 1.42 ns | .23 |
| 4. The school conducts annual GAD training sessions and seminars to promote the CPP. | 3.60 | EE | 3.81 | EE | 3.67 | EE | 3.76 | EE | 3.90 | EE | 1.20 ns | .31 |
| 5. The CPP is discussed with parents during the quarterly assembly of the GPTA. | 3.60 | EE | 3.75 | EE | 3.46 | FE | 3.53 | EE | 3.61 | EE | .65 ns | .62 |
| 6. Church-based organizations are mobilized to lead campaigns that promote moral values. | 2.80 | FE | 3.27 | FE | 3.10 | FE | 3.00 | FE | 3.71 | EE | 2.21 ns | .07 |
| 7. The HGP educates parents and learners on using the CPP to address learners' offenses. | 3.00 | FE | 3.69 | EE | 3.53 | EE | 3.84 | EE | 3.95 | EE | 3.73* | .01 |
| 8. The school uses a referral system to support at-risk learners. | 3.00 | FE | 3.42 | FE | 3.50 | EE | 3.53 | EE | 3.61 | EE | .71 ns | .58 |
| 9. The school's CPC oversees child protection, including abuse, violence, bullying, and student welfare. | 3.40 | FE | 3.66 | EE | 3.53 | EE | 3.84 | EE | 4.00 | EE | 2.43 ns | .06 |
| 10. The school holds symposiums on teenage pregnancy, reproductive health, and sex education to support learners' mental and emotional well-being. | 3.20 | FE | 3.69 | EE | 3.75 | EE | 3.84 | EE | 4.00 | EE | 3.80* | .01 |

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 11.The school established its YFP that supports initiatives on children's rights and positive discipline. | 3.20 | FE | 3.66 | EE | 3.57 | EE | 3.84 | EE | 4.00 | EE | 2.83* | .02 |
| 12.Teachers undergo PDETtraining to manage student behavior with non-punitive methods. | 2.60 | FE | 3.27 | FE | 3.42 | FE | 3.23 | FE | 3.71 | EE | 2.63* | .03 |
| 13. The school organizes career guidance to help learners make informed decisions. | 3.00 | FE | 3.72 | EE | 3.64 | EE | 3.84 | EE | 4.00 | EE | 4.79* | .01 |
| 14. The school head supports other learner-focused activities and initiatives. | 3.20 | FE | 3.78 | EE | 3.71 | EE | 3.84 | EE | 4.00 | EE | 3.13* | .01 |

*Legend: 2.50-3.49 = Fairly Evident (FE); 3.50-4.00 = Excellently Evident (EE); * = significant; ns = not significant at 0.05 level*

Table 27 reveals that eight intervention program indicators showed statistically significant differences when respondents were grouped according to educational attainment, indicating that perception of CPP implementation varies with academic qualification. In guidance services availability, respondents with Doctorate degrees reported the highest mean of 4.00 compared with 3.60 among Bachelor's degree holders, suggesting greater awareness of existing support systems. In the implementation of the Barkada Kontra Droga program, higher ratings were consistently observed among those with advanced degrees, while Bachelor's and Master's degree holders registered lower perceptions. Similarly, HGP efforts to educate learners on CPP were rated higher by those with postgraduate qualifications with means ranging from 3.84 to 3.95 compared with 3.00 among Bachelor's degree holders. Teenage pregnancy and reproductive health symposiums recorded an F-value of 3.80 and p-value of .01, with Doctorate holders giving a mean of 4.00 compared with 3.20 among Bachelor's degree holders, indicating a clear perception gap. The establishment of the Youth Formation Program also showed disparity, with Bachelor's degree holders reporting a mean of 3.20 versus 4.00 among Doctorate holders. In PDET training on non-punitive behavior management, the lowest mean of 2.60 was recorded among Bachelor's degree holders compared with 3.71 among Doctorate holders, reflecting limited exposure or awareness among less academically advanced respondents. Career guidance activities followed the same pattern, with Doctorate holders reporting a mean of 4.00 compared with 3.00 among Bachelor's degree holders. Likewise, school head support for learner-focused initiatives increased with educational attainment, from 3.20 among Bachelor's degree holders to 4.00 among Doctorate holders.

These findings strengthen the claim that higher educational attainment is associated with greater awareness and more positive perceptions of CPP intervention programs. The consistent pattern wherein Doctorate holders rated all significant indicators highest while Bachelor's degree holders registered the lowest means suggests that advanced academic training enhances understanding of child protection systems, intervention strategies, and support mechanisms. This also indicates a possible communication and training gap, as some programs such as guidance services and PDET training, which are expected to be universally implemented, are perceived as

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

less evident by those with lower educational attainment. In view of this, it is recommended that the Division Office intensify CPP orientation and capacity-building initiatives to ensure that all teachers, regardless of educational background, are equally informed and engaged in the implementation of intervention programs.

**Table 28 Difference on the Level of Implementation of the Child Protection Policy in the Public Secondary Schools in Isabela as Perceived by the Respondents when Grouped According to Highest Educational Attainment in Terms of Restorative Practices**

| Restorative Practices | Bachelor's Degree | | With MA Units | | MA Degree | | With Doctorate Units | | Doctorate Degree | | F-value | p-value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | DE | Mean | DE | Mean | DE | Mean | DE | Mean | DE | | |
| PRIMARY INTERVENTION | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. The school identifies root causes of student offenses, recorded by the designated teacher. | 3.60 | EO | 3.78 | EO | 3.57 | EO | 3.92 | EO | 3.95 | EO | 2.76* | .03 |
| 2. The school involves parents and stakeholders in campaigns against violence and risky behavior. | 3.60 | EO | 3.72 | EO | 3.60 | EO | 4.00 | EO | 3.95 | EO | 2.37ns | .06 |
| 3. Learners are encouraged to join Youth Development Programs that build character. | 3.60 | EO | 3.75 | EO | 3.64 | EO | 4.00 | EO | 4.00 | EO | 3.49* | .01 |
| 4. The school provides parent child integration programs that enhance parent involvement in children's schooling. | 3.40 | FO | 3.72 | EO | 3.67 | EO | 4.00 | EO | 4.00 | EO | 3.27* | .01 |
| 5. The school supports teachers' trainings in behavior management using Positive Discipline and non-violent methods. | 3.60 | EO | 3.63 | EO | 3.53 | EO | 4.00 | EO | 4.00 | EO | 3.11* | .01 |
| 6. The school initiates training for parents on positive discipline and the implementation of the Child Protection Policy. | 3.40 | FO | 3.57 | EO | 3.50 | EO | 3.69 | EO | 3.90 | EO | 1.59ns | .18 |
| 7. The school involves learners in understanding their responsibilities regarding positive discipline and the implementation of the Child Protection Policy. | 3.60 | EO | 3.69 | EO | 3.60 | EO | 4.00 | EO | 4.00 | EO | 2.35ns | .06 |
| SECONDARY INTERVENTION | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. The school uses assessment tools to identify and profile at-risk learners for targeted | 3.4 | FO | 3.5 | EO | 3.3 | FO | 3.5 | EO | 3.7 | EO | 1.18 | .32 |

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| interventions. | 3.40 | FO | 3.51 | EO | 3.45 | FO | 4.00 | EO | 3.86 | EO | 3.56 ns | .01 |
| 2. At-risk learners are referred to appropriate government and non-government agencies for professional assessment. | 3.40 | FO | 3.57 | EO | 3.46 | FO | 4.00 | EO | 3.85 | EO | 3.26 * | .01 |
| **3.** CARs, with CPC support, receive guidance, counseling, and home visits. | 3.40 | FO | 3.63 | EO | 3.57 | EO | 3.76 | EO | 3.76 | EO | .80 ns | .52 |
| **4.** The school, in cooperation with the CPC, conducts programs on anger management and conflict resolution. | 3.60 | EO | 3.75 | EO | 3.42 | FO | 3.69 | EO | 3.90 | EO | 2.09 ns | .08 |
| **5.** The school refers children with special needs to agencies like DSWD, PNP, LGU, and other service providers for cases involving violations or offenses. | 3.40 | FO | 3.69 | EO | 3.60 | EO | 4.00 | EO | 4.00 | EO | 3.52 * | .01 |
| TERTIARY INTERVENTION | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. The school promotes open communication and initiatives with learner-offenders to restore well-being and prevent reoffending. | 3.40 | FO | 3.75 | EO | 3.64 | EO | 3.76 | EO | 3.90 | EO | 1.56 ns | .19 |
| 2. The school supports at-risk children with diversion programs and ensures access to education through ADM or other flexible options. | 3.40 | FO | 3.75 | EO | 3.64 | EO | 4.00 | EO | 4.00 | EO | 3.89 * | .01 |
| 3. The school's guidance designate monitors intervention plan implementation and termination. | 3.40 | FO | 3.75 | EO | 3.60 | EO | 3.76 | EO | 3.76 | EO | .93 ns | .44 |
| 4. The CPC conducts restorative justice procedures. | 3.40 | FO | 3.66 | EO | 3.57 | EO | 3.76 | EO | 3.76 | EO | .75 ns | .56 |
| 5. The school ensures the right to education for child-offenders in detention or rehabilitation. | 3.40 | FO | 3.72 | EO | 3.57 | EO | 4.00 | EO | 3.85 | EO | 2.39 ns | .06 |

*Legend: 2.50-3.49 = Fairly Observed (EO); 3.50-4.00 = Excellently Observed (EO); * = significant; ns = not significant at 0.05 level*

This table shows that respondents' educational attainment significantly influences how certain restorative practices under the Child Protection Policy are perceived. Among the primary interventions, four indicators showed statistically significant differences. In "Identification of Root Causes of Student Offenses" with values F 2.76 and p .03, Doctorate holders gave the highest rating (M 3.95), while Bachelor's degree holders rated it lower (M 3.60). In "Youth Development Program Participation" with values F 3.49 and p .01, respondents with postgraduate degrees gave the highest rating (M 4.00), indicating stronger perceived implementation among more highly educated teachers. In "Parent-Child Integration Programs" with values F 3.27 and p .01, Bachelor's degree holders again recorded the lowest mean (M 3.40), while higher degree holders rated it more positively, suggesting differences in how family

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

engagement practices are perceived. In "Teacher Training on Positive Discipline" with values F 3.11 and p .01, Doctorate holders rated implementation higher (M 4.00) compared to Bachelor's degree holders (M 3.60), indicating variation in perceived access to or awareness of training opportunities.

In the secondary intervention, significant differences were found in two indicators. In "Referral of At-Risk Learners to Agencies" with values F 3.26 and p .01, Doctorate holders gave higher ratings (M 4.00) compared to Bachelor's degree holders (M 3.40). A similar pattern was observed in "Referral of Children with Special Needs to Service Providers" with values F 3.26 and p .01, where more highly educated respondents consistently reported stronger implementation.

In the tertiary intervention, "Support for At-Risk Children via Diversion and ADM" also showed a significant difference with values F 3.89 and p .01, with Doctorate holders giving higher ratings (M 4.00) than Bachelor's degree holders (M 3.40).
Overall, these significant results consistently show that respondents with higher educational attainment tend to perceive stronger implementation of restorative practices, particularly in areas involving early intervention, family engagement, teacher training, referral systems, and support for at-risk learners.

**Table 29 Difference on the Level of Implementation of the Child Protection Policy in the Public Secondary Schools in Isabela as Perceived by the Respondents when Grouped According to Highest Educational Attainment in Terms of Monitoring and Evaluation**

| Monitoring and Evaluation Index | Bachelor's Degree | | With MA Units | | MA Degree | | With Doctorate Units | | Doctorate Degree | | F-value | p-value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | DE | Mean | DE | Mean | DE | Mean | DE | Mean | DE | | |
| 1. CPP implementation is evaluated by the division LRPO. | 2.80 | FO | 3.33 | FO | 3.50 | EO | 3.56 | EO | 3.61 | EO | 1.83 ns | .12 |
| 2. CPP implementation is monitored by the Schools District Supervisor. | 3.20 | FO | 3.54 | EO | 3.53 | EO | 3.53 | EO | 3.71 | EO | .61 ns | .65 |
| 3. The School Head supervises and supports the implementation of CPP. | 3.40 | FO | 3.72 | EO | 3.60 | EO | 3.76 | EO | 3.85 | EO | 1.11 ns | .35 |
| 4. The School Head leads awareness campaigns, prevention programs, and intervention plans, including capacity-building for staff, parents, and students to implement the CPP effectively. | 4.00 | EO | 3.75 | EO | 3.53 | EO | 3.76 | EO | 3.90 | EO | 2.35 ns | .06 |

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5. The CPC, also recognized as the anti-bullying committee, fulfills its duties and responsibilities across all procedures and measures within the CPP. | 3.60 | EO | 3.66 | EO | 3.57 | EO | 4.00 | EO | 4.00 | EO | 3.14* | .01 |
| 6. Teachers and school personnel actively engage in prevention and intervention measures while fulfilling their CPP implementation duties. | 3.60 | EO | 3.72 | EO | 3.71 | EO | 4.00 | EO | 3.80 | EO | 1.05 ns | .38 |
| 7. Student leaders participate in all prevention and intervention measures and support CPP implementation. | 3.40 | FO | 3.72 | EO | 3.75 | EO | 4.00 | EO | 3.95 | EO | 2.22 ns | .07 |
| 8. The PNP's Women and Child Protection Desk, along with LSWDO and various NGOs, actively participates in the referral system to support CPP implementation. | 3.40 | FO | 3.72 | EO | 3.75 | EO | 4.00 | EO | 3.95 | EO | 2.22 ns | .07 |
| 9. Parents contribute to the investigation, planning, implementation, and monitoring of CPC intervention measures within CPP. | 3.40 | FO | 3.75 | EO | 3.82 | EO | 4.00 | EO | 3.95 | EO | 2.96* | .02 |
| 10. The CPC applies positive, non-punitive disciplinary measures for major and minor offenses committed by learner-offenders. | 3.40 | FO | 3.75 | EO | 3.82 | EO | 3.92 | EO | 3.95 | EO | 2.36 ns | .06 |

*Legend: 2.50-3.49 = Fairly Observed (EO); 3.50-4.00 = Excellently Observed (EO); * = significant; ns = not significant at 0.05 level*

Table 29 shows that only two monitoring and evaluation indicators yielded statistically significant differences when respondents were grouped according to educational attainment. The functionality of the Child Protection Committee as the Anti-Bullying Committee registered an F-value of 3.14 and p-value of .01, with Doctorate degree holders obtaining the highest mean of 4.00 compared with 3.60 among Bachelor's degree holders, indicating a more favorable perception of committee effectiveness among those with advanced qualifications. Similarly, parental involvement in intervention monitoring showed a significant difference with an F-value of 2.96 and p-value of .02, where ratings increased with educational attainment from 3.40 among Bachelor's degree holders to 4.00 among those with Doctorate units, reflecting stronger perceived engagement of parents among more academically prepared respondents.

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

These findings strengthen the claim that educational attainment influences key monitoring and evaluation practices, particularly in areas requiring leadership, coordination, and stakeholder engagement. In view of this, it is recommended that schools provide greater involvement opportunities for Bachelor's degree holders in Child Protection Committee functions and monitoring processes to enhance their understanding and engagement in the implementation of the Child Protection Policy.

**Table 30 Performance of the Public Secondary Schools in Isabela based on the School-Based Management (SBM)**

| | Frequency (n = 100) | Percent (100.0) |
|---|---|---|
| SBM Level 1 | 25 | 25.0 |
| SBM Level 2 | 41 | 41.0 |
| SBM Level 3 | 29 | 29.0 |
| SBM Level 4 | 5 | 5.0 |

The table shows how 22 public secondary schools in Isabela are distributed according to their School-Based Management levels. Most schools are at Level 2 or Developing, making up 41 percent, which means they already have basic systems in place but still need improvement in leadership, processes, and stakeholder involvement. About 29 percent are at Level 3 or Maturing, indicating that these schools have more organized systems and better community participation. However, 25 percent are still at Level 1 or Beginning, showing that a number of schools are still struggling with basic governance, planning, and resource management. Only 5 percent reached Level 4 or Advanced, which reflects a high level of performance, strong leadership, and consistent results.

Overall, the data show that School-Based Management in Isabela is improving but not yet consistent across all schools. While many schools are progressing, a significant number are still in the early stages and need support. This means that efforts should focus on helping lower-level schools improve their systems, strengthen leadership, and increase community involvement so that more schools can move to higher SBM levels.

**Table 31. Relationship Between the Level of Implementation of the Child Protection Policy in the Public Secondary Schools in Isabela in Terms of Intervention Programs and their Performance**

| Intervention Programs | Correlation Coefficient | p-value |
|---|---|---|
| 1. The school has a guidance counselor/guidance designate entrusted with facilitating guidance and counseling services. | .20* | .04 |
| 2.The school promotes and organizes diverse activities as | .22* | .02 |

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| part of the BKD program. | | |
| 3. The CPP is promoted and disseminated to parents and learners during HRPTA meetings. | .10 ns | .32 |
| 4. The school conducts annual GAD training sessions and seminars to promote the CPP. | .11 ns | .25 |
| 5. The CPP is discussed with parents during the quarterly assembly of the GPTA. | -.02 ns | .80 |
| 6. Church-based organizations are mobilized to lead campaigns that promote moral values. | .09 ns | .34 |
| 7. The HGP educates parents and learners on using the CPP to address learners' offenses. | .26* | .01 |
| 8. The school uses a referral system to support at-risk learners. | .23* | .02 |
| 9. The school's CPC oversees child protection, including abuse, violence, bullying, and student welfare. | .06 ns | .55 |
| 10. The school holds symposiums on teenage pregnancy, reproductive health, and sex education to support learners' mental and emotional well-being. | .25* | .01 |
| 11.The school established its YFP that supports initiatives on children's rights and positive discipline. | .13 ns | .17 |
| 12.Teachers undergo PDET training to manage student behavior with non-punitive methods. | .08 ns | .38 |
| 13. The school organizes career guidance to help learners make informed decisions. | .21* | .03 |
| 14. The school head supports other learner-focused activities and initiatives. | .16 ns | .10 |

*Legend: * = significant; ns = not significant at 0.05 level*

The results show that six Child Protection Policy intervention programs have significant positive relationships with school performance. The strongest is HGP education on CPP use with a correlation of .26 and p-value of .01, followed by symposiums on reproductive health and mental wellness with .25 and .01. The referral system for at-risk learners also shows a significant relationship with .23 and .02, along with BKD program activities with .22 and .02. Career guidance services show a correlation of .21 and .03, while the presence of a guidance counselor

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

or designate has .20 and .04. These findings indicate that stronger implementation of these learner-focused support programs is associated with improved school performance.

These results imply that programs which promote student awareness, guidance, emotional support, and timely referral systems play an important role in enhancing school outcomes. The relatively higher relationships observed in HGP education and symposiums suggest that informed and well-supported learners contribute to a more positive and effective school environment. Similarly, the significance of referral systems, BKD activities, and career guidance services highlights the importance of structured support mechanisms that address learners' academic, behavioral, and personal needs. Overall, the findings emphasize the need to strengthen learner-centered and support-based intervention programs, as these have direct and meaningful contributions to improving school performance.

**Table 32 Relationship Between the Level of Implementation of the Child Protection Policy in the Public Secondary Schools in Isabela in Terms of Restorative Practices and their Performance**

| Restorative Practices | Correlation Coefficient | p-value |
|---|---|---|
| PRIMARY INTERVENTION | | |
| 1. The school identifies root causes of student offenses, recorded by the designated teacher. | .20* | .03 |
| 2. The school involves parents and stakeholders in campaigns against violence and risky behavior. | .19 ns | .06 |
| 3. Learners are encouraged to join Youth Development Programs that build character. | .24* | .01 |
| 4. The school provides parent child integration programs that enhance parent involvement in children's schooling. | .19* | .04 |
| 5. The school supports teachers' trainings in behavior management using Positive Discipline and non-violent methods. | .11 ns | .24 |
| 6. The school initiates training for parents on positive discipline and the implementation of the Child Protection Policy. | .06 ns | .55 |
| 7. The school involves learners in understanding their responsibilities regarding positive discipline and the implementation of the Child Protection Policy. | .04 ns | .64 |
| SECONDARY INTERVENTION | | |
| 1.The school uses assessment tools to identify and profile at-risk learners for targeted interventions. | .12 ns | .23 |
| 2. At-risk learners are referred to appropriate government and non-government agencies for professional assessment. | .20* | .04 |
| 3. CARs, with CPC support, receive guidance, counseling, and home visits. | .15 ns | .13 |
| 4. The school, in cooperation with the CPC, conducts programs on anger management and conflict resolution. | .08 ns | .39 |
| 5. The school refers children with special needs to agencies like | .21* | .03 |

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| DSWD, PNP, LGU, and other service providers for cases involving violations or offenses. | | |
| TERTIARY INTERVENTION | | |
| 1. The school promotes open communication and initiatives with learner-offenders to restore well-being and prevent reoffending. | .11 ns | .26 |
| 2. The school supports at-risk children with diversion programs and ensures access to education through ADM or other flexible options. | .23* | .02 |
| 3. The school's guidance designate monitors intervention plan implementation and termination. | .02 ns | .78 |
| 4. The CPC conducts restorative justice procedures. | .03 ns | .71 |
| 5. The school ensures the right to education for child-offenders in detention or rehabilitation. | .10 ns | .28 |

*Legend: * = significant; ns = not significant at 0.05 level*

The results show that several restorative practices have significant positive relationships with school performance. In the primary level, identification of root causes of student offenses with a correlation of .20 and p-value of .03, learners' participation in character-building Youth Development Programs with .24 and .01, and parent-child integration programs with .19 and .04 are all significantly related to improved school outcomes. In the secondary level, referral of at-risk learners to professionals for assessment with .20 and .04, and referral of children with special needs to external agencies with .21 and .03 also show significant relationships. In the tertiary level, support for at-risk children through diversion programs and flexible education such as ADM with .23 and .02 is likewise significantly associated with school performance.

These findings imply that restorative practices that focus on early identification of learner needs, active student participation, family involvement, and timely referral to appropriate services contribute meaningfully to better school performance. The relatively higher relationship in youth development programs and referral systems suggests that proactive and preventive approaches strengthen the learning environment and address issues before they escalate. The significant role of diversion programs further indicates that providing alternative pathways and continuous educational support for at-risk learners helps sustain their participation in school and improve overall outcomes. Consistent with Braithwaite (1989), early and preventive restorative practices have stronger effects on outcomes, while Zehr (1990) emphasizes that keeping learners engaged through supportive interventions leads to better educational results. Overall, the findings highlight the need to strengthen preventive, participatory, and support-based restorative practices, as these have direct and meaningful contributions to school performance.

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

**Table 33 Relationship Between the Level of Implementation of the Child Protection Policy in the Public Secondary Schools in Isabela in Terms of Monitoring and Evaluation and their Performance**

| Monitoring and Evaluation Index | Correlation Coefficient | p-value |
|---|---|---|
| 1. CPP implementation is evaluated by the division LRPO. | -.12 ns | .20 |
| 2. CPP implementation is monitored by the Schools District Supervisor. | -.03 ns | .75 |
| 3. The School Head supervises and supports the implementation of CPP. | .13 ns | .18 |
| 4. The School Head leads awareness campaigns, prevention programs, and intervention plans, including capacity-building for staff, parents, and students to implement the CPP effectively. | .01 ns | .87 |
| 5. The CPC, also recognized as the anti-bullying committee, fulfills its duties and responsibilities across all procedures and measures within the CPP. | .18 ns | .06 |
| 6. Teachers and school personnel actively engage in prevention and intervention measures while fulfilling their CPP implementation duties. | .15 ns | .13 |
| 7. Student leaders participate in all prevention and intervention measures and support CPP implementation. | .23* | .01 |
| 8. The PNP's Women and Child Protection Desk, along with LSWDO and various NGOs, actively participates in the referral system to support CPP implementation. | .23* | .01 |
| 9. Parents contribute to the investigation, planning, implementation, and monitoring of CPC intervention measures within CPP. | .24* | .01 |
| 10. The CPC applies positive, non-punitive disciplinary measures for major and minor offenses committed by learner-offenders. | .24* | .01 |

*Legend: * = significant; ns = not significant at 0.05 level*

The correlation between various monitoring and evaluation components of CPP implementation and overall school performance is found to be significant in four (4) key indicators: "Parents' involvement in planning and monitoring CPP interventions" (.24, p = .01), "CPC's use of non-punitive disciplinary measures" (.24, p = .01), "Student leaders' participation" (.23, p = .01), and "Referral system support from external agencies (PNP, NGOs, LSWDO)" (.23, p = .01). These results suggest that inclusive, community- and learner-engaged approaches to CPP monitoring and evaluation significantly contribute to improved school performance. In contrast, most school- or division-level supervisory actions (e.g., those by the LRPO, District Supervisors, and School Heads) did not show significant correlations with school performance.

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

While essential for compliance and accountability, these top-down mechanisms may have limited influence on measurable school-level outcomes, particularly if they are infrequent, inconsistent, or viewed as administrative rather than developmental. Empowering students, families, and community stakeholders to participate in child protection monitoring fosters a more responsive and supportive learning environment. Bottom-up engagement enhances performance. Student, parent, and community participation in monitoring and evaluation processes has a more measurable impact than supervisory oversight alone, reinforcing participatory governance and school-community partnership models.

Therefore, school performance is positively associated with participatory, community-based, and learner-centered monitoring and evaluation practices under the Child Protection Policy. These findings affirm the value of shared responsibility and collaborative implementation in achieving meaningful and sustainable educational outcomes. The pattern of significant relationships, where stakeholder participation variables show positive correlations while administrative mechanisms do not, highlights the importance of participatory approaches in improving school performance.

This supports the framework of Epstein et al. (2002), which emphasizes that shared governance and active involvement of students, parents, and the community are central to effective school-based management. The strongest correlation observed in parental involvement further aligns with the findings of Sanders (2003), who noted that schools with higher levels of family and community engagement tend to demonstrate better organizational outcomes.

Meanwhile, the non-significant relationships for administrative monitoring mechanisms suggest that supervisory functions, while necessary for compliance, may have less direct influence on performance outcomes compared to collaborative and learner-centered practices. Additionally, the near-significant result for CPC functionality reflects the findings of Estremera (2018), indicating that while CPC structures are essential for policy implementation, their impact on broader school performance indicators may not be immediately evident. Overall, these insights reinforce that school performance is more strongly driven by inclusive, participatory, and community-based monitoring practices rather than top-down supervision alone.

## *4. Discussion (Interpretation of findings, Comparison to existing studies, Implications for practice and policy, Study limitations)*

Based on the results of the study, the implementation of the Child Protection Policy in terms of intervention programs, restorative practices, and monitoring and evaluation mechanisms is generally perceived as highly implemented across schools, with most indicators rated as Excellently Observed. A consistent pattern across all tables is that the majority of indicators did not show statistically significant differences when grouped according to years in service or educational attainment. This indicates a high level of commonality in perceptions among respondents, suggesting that CPP-related programs are generally uniform and consistently applied regardless of teacher profile. In other words, while there are specific areas that showed variation, most of the practices are understood and experienced similarly by teachers across different groups.

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

This widespread lack of significant differences across most indicators, including identification of root causes of student offenses, learners' participation in youth development programs, parent-child integration programs, initiation of parent training on positive discipline, use of assessment tools for at-risk learners, counseling and home visit services, conduct of anger management and conflict resolution programs, promotion of restorative communication with learner-offenders, monitoring of intervention plans, restorative justice procedures, ensuring access to education for child-offenders, as well as most monitoring and evaluation indicators such as division and school-level supervision, CPC oversight functions, student leaders' participation in most activities, and referral processes, implies that Child Protection Policy implementation has already been institutionalized in schools. This means that procedures, interventions, and monitoring mechanisms are generally standardized practices and are not strongly influenced by individual teacher characteristics such as years in service or educational attainment.

In comparison with the few indicators that showed significant differences, the results further highlight that variations only occur in specific aspects that require deeper experience, leadership roles, or advanced training, such as parent engagement, external coordination, and committee functionality. However, these are exceptions rather than the rule. The dominance of non-significant findings across tables reinforces that most CPP practices are consistently implemented and perceived across all respondent groups, indicating strong policy integration within school systems.

However, for the indicators that showed significant differences, there is a need for targeted training and capacity-building programs to address gaps in implementation and perception. These include parent and stakeholder engagement in anti-violence campaigns, teacher training in positive discipline, learner involvement in CPP implementation, referral of learners to external agencies, support for diversion programs and alternative learning delivery, CPC functionality as the anti-bullying committee, student leaders' participation, parental involvement in monitoring, and coordination with external agencies. Strengthening these areas through focused training programs, mentorship, and hands-on workshops will help ensure more consistent understanding and implementation across all teacher groups, particularly for those with lower experience or educational attainment.

Despite these findings, several limitations must be considered. The study relies primarily on self-reported perceptions of teachers, which may be affected by bias, awareness level, or personal interpretation rather than actual implementation. Its cross-sectional design also limits the ability to capture changes in implementation over time. In addition, the study is confined to selected public secondary schools in Isabela, which may limit the generalizability of results to other contexts with different resources, leadership structures, or community conditions. Furthermore, while significant differences and relationships were identified in selected indicators, the study does not fully explore the qualitative reasons behind these variations, such as school culture, leadership practices, or training exposure. Lastly, the exclusive use of quantitative measures may not fully capture the complexity and lived experience of CPP implementation, particularly in restorative practices and stakeholder engagement.

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

Overall, these limitations suggest that while the findings provide valuable insights into CPP implementation, future research may consider mixed-methods or longitudinal designs to gain a deeper and more comprehensive understanding of how Child Protection Policy practices are implemented and sustained in actual school settings.

### *5. Conclusion (Summarize outcomes)*

Based on the analysis and interpretation of the data, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. The level of implementation of the Child Protection Policy in terms of intervention programs, restorative practices, and monitoring and evaluation mechanisms is generally high across public secondary schools in Isabela, with most indicators rated as Excellently Observed by implementers and community stakeholders. However, learners consistently rated several areas as only Fairly Observed, indicating gaps in awareness, visibility, and direct experience, particularly in programs involving engagement, training, and higher-level interventions.
2. There are significant differences in the level of implementation of the Child Protection Policy when respondents are grouped according to selected profile variables such as years in service and educational attainment, indicating that experience and qualification influence perceptions. However, no significant differences were found in terms of school size, number of faculty, and most areas of gender, suggesting that these factors do not substantially affect overall CPP implementation.
3. Most schools are at the developing to maturing levels of School-Based Management, indicating that while progress has been achieved, full institutionalization and advancement are still ongoing.
4. There is a significant relationship between selected Child Protection Policy implementation indicators and school performance, particularly in learner-centered intervention programs, restorative practices, and community-based monitoring, indicating that stronger CPP implementation contributes to improved school outcomes.
5. Overall, the study concludes that the Child Protection Policy is effectively and consistently implemented across public secondary schools in Isabela, although improvements are needed in learner engagement, stakeholder participation, and selected program areas to ensure more inclusive and fully experienced implementation.

### *Recommendations for future research or implementation)*

Based on the findings and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations are proposed:

1. Schools should strengthen the implementation of intervention programs, restorative practices, and monitoring and evaluation mechanisms by increasing learner engagement, improving communication of programs, and ensuring that activities are more visible and directly experienced by students.

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal
of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

2. The Division Office should provide targeted training and capacity-building programs for teachers, particularly those with fewer years of service and lower educational attainment, focusing on stakeholder engagement, positive discipline, restorative practices, and referral systems to ensure more consistent implementation across all groups.
3. School administrators and the Division Office should intensify support for schools at developing levels of School-Based Management by providing technical assistance, mentoring, and resource support to help them progress toward higher SBM levels.
4. Schools should strengthen learner-centered intervention programs, restorative practices, and community-based monitoring systems, as these have been shown to positively influence school performance, by enhancing partnerships with parents, student leaders, and external agencies.
5. Overall, schools and the Division Office should sustain and continuously improve CPP implementation by institutionalizing best practices, conducting regular monitoring, and ensuring inclusive participation of all stakeholders to achieve more effective and consistent child protection practices.

***References***

(APA 7th edition or journal-specified format)

Abbacan-Tuguic, L. (2021). Challenges of the New Normal: Students' Attitude, Readiness, and Adaptability to Blended Learning Modality. International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences, 6(2). https://doi.org/10.22161/ijels.

Andaya, E., Patricio, R., Cabaddu, J., & Baguna, H. (2025). Evidence-based Child Protection in the Philippines: A Scoping Review. International Journal of Social Science Research and Review, 8(5), 102-123. https://doi.org/10.47814/ijssrr.v8i5.2623

Araneta, M.R. (2023). DepEd Cases of bullying rise in PH schools. Manila Standard. https://manilastandard.net/?p=314305082

Baumrind, D. (1966). Effects of authoritative parental control on child behavior. Child development, 887-907.

Bradshaw, C. P. (2015). The science of school climate: A review of the literature. Child Development, 86(6), 1567–1582.

Braithwaite, J. (1989). Crime, shame, and reintegration. Cambridge University Press.

Bruck, M. (1968). Behavior modification theory and practice: A critical review. Social Work, 13(2), 43-55.

Chacha, M., & Tangi, F. (2023). Challenges facing stakeholders' participation in improving teaching and learning process in public secondary schools in Rorya District, Mara, Tanzania. Journal of Humanities and Education Development. https://doi.org/10.22161/jhed.5.6.4.

Chambers, D. & Varoglu, Z., (2023). Revised Guidelines on the Inclusion of Learners with Disabilities in Open and Distance Learning (ODL). United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. UNESCO 2023. ISBN 978-92-3-100643-2.

Christie, N. (1977). Conflicts as property. The British Journal of Criminology, 17(1), 1-15.

Department of Psychology, University of Miami, USA; Center for Mental Health Policy and Services Research, University of Pennsylvania, USA

DepEd Order No.003, s.2021; (2021, January). Creation Of The Child Protection Unit And The Child Rights In Education Desk In The Department Of Education. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wpcontent/uploads/2021/01/DO_s2021_003.pdf

DepEd Order No.18, s.2015: DepEd Guidelines and Procedures on the Management of Children-At-Risk (CAR) and Children in Conflict with the Law (CICL).

DepEd Order No.55, s.2013: Implementing Rules and Regulations (IRR) of Republic Act (RA) no. 10627 otherwise known as the Anti-Bullying Act of 2013. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/DO_s2013_55.pdf.

DepEd Order No.40, s.2012: DepEd Child Protection Policy (2012, May 14) https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/DO_s2012_40.pdf.

DepEd Order No.49, s.2006: Revised Rules of Procedure of the Department of Education in Administrative Cases, (2006, December). https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2006/12/DO_s2006_49.pdf

Disorders. Journal of child and adolescent counseling, 4(2), 117–133. https://doi.org/10.1080/23727810.2017.1381930.

Durrant, J. E. (2010). Content Primer on "Positive Discipline in Everyday Teaching". Save the Children: Thailand.

Epstein, J. L., Sanders, M. G., Simon, B. S., Salinas, K. C., Jansorn, N. R., & Voorhis, F. L. (2002). School, family, and community partnerships: The handbook for action. Corwin Press.

Estrellado, C.J.; (2021, December) Transition to Post-Pandemic Education in the Philippines: Unfolding Insights International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications, Volume 11, Issue 12, December 2021 ISSN 2250-3153, 507. https://doi.org/10.29322/IJSRP.11.12.2021.p12074.

Evans, T. M., Ritter, S., & Zimmer, M. R. (2019). Examining the efficacy of restorative practices in reducing school suspensions: A systematic review and meta-analysis. School Psychology Review, 48(3), 256-271.

Gaines, E. (2019). Restorative practices and student well-being in urban school. Graduate School of Applied and Professional Psychology.

Gorard, S., Siddiqui, N., & Huat See, B. (2012). The impact of socioeconomic status on participation and attainment in science. Studies in Science Education, 48(2), 129–149.

Hall, M., Marsh, J., & Daramola, E. (2023). Consistency and Change: Districts' Efforts to Engage Stakeholders Over Time. Teachers College Record, 350 - 388. https://doi.org/10.1177/01614681231174089

Herbert, J., Ghan, N., Salveron, M., & Walsh, W. (2021). Possible Factors Supporting Cross-Agency Collaboration in Child Abuse Cases: A Scoping Review. Journal of Child Sexual Abuse, 30(2), 167–191. https://doi.org/10.1080/10538712.2020.1856994

Hulvershorn, K., & Mulholland, S. (2018). Restorative practices and the integration of social emotional learning as a path to positive school climates. Journal of Research in Innovative Teaching & Learning, 11(1), 110-123.

Huckins JF, DaSilva AW, Wang W, Hedlund E, Rogers C, Nepal SK, Wu J, Obuchi M, Murphy EI, Meyer ML, Wagner DD, Holtz Heimer PE, Campbell AT, (2020). Mental Health and Behavior of College Students During the Early Phases of the COVID-19 Pandemic: Longitudinal Smartphone and Ecological Momentary Assessment Study. J Med Internet

Res, 22(6): e20185. DOI: 10.2196/20185; PMID: 32519963; https://www.jmir.org/2020/6/e20185/.

Lubisi, C. (2004). Alternative to corporal punishment. The Star, 20, 22.

Liu, J. (2021). Building education groups as school collaboration for education improvement: a case study of stakeholder interactions in District A of Chengdu. Asia Pacific Education Review, 22, 427 - 439. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-021-09682-0.

Mobo, F. D.(2021). Strengthening the Child's Protection Program in the Philippines. International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research.2 (12), 1384–1386. doi: 10.11594/ijmaber.02.12.11

Moore, A., Stapley, E., Hayes, D., Town, R., & Deighton, J. (2022). Barriers and Facilitators to Sustaining School-Based Mental Health and Wellbeing Interventions: A Systematic Review. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 19. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19063587.

Herlitz, L., Macintyre, H., Osborn, T., & Bonell, C. (2020). The sustainability of public health interventions in schools: a systematic review. *Implementation Science : IS, 15*. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13012-019-0961-8.

Naidoo, T. (2004). Alternatives to corporal punishment. Mpumalanga Province: Nelspruit.

Naker, D., & Sekitoleko, D. (2009). Positive Discipline: Creating A Good School Without Corporal Punishment. Raising Voices: Uganda.

Nelsen, J. E. (2011). Positive Discipline: The Classic Guide to Helping Children Develop Self-Discipline, Responsibility, Cooperation, and Problem-Solving Skills. Random House Publishing Group.

Malipot,M.H. (2021). National News. https://mb.com.ph/2021/10/2/deped-to-implement-school-mental-health-model-pilot-testing

Pranis, K., Stuart, B., & Wedge, M. (2013). Peacemaking circles: From crime to community. Living Justice Press.

Payne, A. A., & Welch, K. (2022). Transforming School Climate and Student Discipline: The Restorative Justice Promise for Peace. Restorative Justice: Promoting Peace and Wellbeing, 61-78.

Peppo, E. (2023). A comprehensive review of the diversion of children in conflict with law from judicial proceedings in Albania: Assessing alternatives to traditional justice. European Journal of Economics, Law and Social Sciences, 7, 1 - 12. https://doi.org/10.2478/ejels-2023-0011.

Rabina, AA. & Comighud SM., (2020). School Heads and Teachers' Awareness of the Child Protection Policy: A Basis for a Training Program.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/349718872_School_Heads_and_Teachers%27_Awareness_of_the_Child_Protection_Policy_A_Basis_for_a_Training_Program.

Republic Act 7610. (n.d.). Special Protection of Children Against Abuse, Exploitation and Discrimination Act

Reynolds, Tracy (2003) "Child Protection Units in the Philippines: Utilizing International and National Law to Provide Comprehensive Services to Abused Children," Saint Louis University Public Law Review: Vol. 22 : No. 2 , Article 15. https://scholarship.law.slu.edu/plr/vol22/iss2/15

Roche, S., & Flynn, C. (2021). Local child protection in the Philippines: A case study of actors, processes and key risks for children. Asia & the Pacific Policy Studies, 8(3), 367–383. https://doi.org/10.1002/app5.332

Rogers, J. Defusing Anger, Anxiety and Aggression: Improving Student Behavior. Bureau of Education and Research. https://www.ber.org/seminars/course/DNM/Defusing-Anger-Anxiety-and-Aggression-Improving-Student-Behavior.

Roorda, D. L., Koomen, H. M. Y., Spilt, J. L., & Oort, F. J. (2011). The influence of affective teacher-student relationships on students' school engagement and achievement: A meta-analytic approach. Review of Educational Research, 81(4), 493–529.

Rumberger, R. W. (2011). Dropping out: Why students drop out of high school and what can be done about it. Harvard University Press.

Russell, D., Trew, S., Harris, L., Dickson, J., Walsh, K., Higgins, D., & Smith, R. (2024). Engaging Parents in Child-Focused Child Sexual Abuse Prevention Education Strategies: A Systematic Review. Trauma, Violence & Abuse, 25, 3082 - 3098. https://doi.org/10.1177/15248380241235895.

Sanders, M. G. (2003). Community Involvement In Schools: From Concept to Practice. Education and Urban Society, 35(2), 161-180. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013124502239390.

Sanders, M. (2012). Achieving Scale at the District Level. Educational Administration Quarterly, 48, 154 - 186. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161x11417432.

Sarwadi, S., & Bawono, B. (2021). Restorative Justice Approach in Diversion System for Settlement of Criminal Cases for Children in Indonesia. Jurnal Daulat Hukum. https://doi.org/10.30659/jdh.v3i4.13145.

Stoilova, Mariya; Livingstone, Sonia; Khazbak, Rana (2021). Investigating Risks and Opportunities for Children in a Digital World: A rapid review of the evidence on children's internet use and outcomes, Innocenti Discussion Papers, no. 2020-03, UNICEF Office of Research - Innocenti, Florence

Sun RC, Shek DT, (2012, August). Student classroom misbehavior: an exploratory study based on teachers' perceptions. Scientific World Journal. DOI: 10.1100/2012/208907. PMID: 22919297; PMCID: PMC3415159.

The United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities: A Commentary. (2017). Germany: Springer International Publishing.

The UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities: A Commentary. (2018). United Kingdom: OUP Oxford.

UNESCO International Bureau of Education, (2008). Inclusive Education: The Way of The Future. International Conference on Education – Switzerland. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000162787.

UNICEF, Philippines SEA-PLM. (2019) Empower Parents to Support Academic Succes. https://www.unicef.org/philippines/media/6116/file/Parental%20Engagement.pdf

Walsh, L. M., Wolk, C. B., Haimes, E. M. B., Jensen-Doss, A., & Beidas, R. S. (2018). The Relationship Between Anger and Anxiety Symptoms in Youth with Anxiety

Zehr, H. (1990). Changing lenses: A new focus for crime and justice. Herald Press.

Zwane, P. (2004). Alternative to corporal punishment. The Star, 2022.