

Implementation of Work Immersion Program in Public Senior High Schools in the Division of Batangas Province

Chris B. De Jesus, PhD ¹

1 – Batangas State University - The National Engineering University

chris.dejesus@deped.gov.ph

Publication Date: March 19, 2026

DOI: [10.5281/zenodo.21054029](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21054029)

Abstract

The study assessed the implementation of the Work Immersion Program in public senior high schools in the Division of Batangas Province, with the goal of designing a practical plan for improvement. An embedded mixed method approach guided the inquiry, integrating survey responses with insights gathered from focus group discussions. Quantitative data were examined through descriptive and inferential techniques, while qualitative data were analyzed using thematic analysis. Findings showed that the implementation of work immersion across its key dimensions had generally been carried out to a great extent, as perceived by students, immersion coordinators, and school heads. Support mechanisms particularly those related to training opportunities and the provision of resources had also been viewed as highly present. However, several gaps emerged, including challenges in conflict management, inconsistencies in evaluation practices, and limited access to digital tools needed for effective monitoring and learning. The analysis further indicated variations in the assessments of respondents across most dimensions, although perceptions regarding training remained aligned across groups. A notable positive relationship was observed between the extent of program implementation and the availability of support mechanisms, suggesting that sufficient preparation and resources strengthened program delivery. Common concerns identified during the focus group discussions included difficulties in securing industry partners, scheduling issues, financial limitations, and occasional behavioral challenges among learners. Based on these findings, a Work Immersion Implementation Plan was developed to promote more effective, inclusive, and sustainable program practices across schools in the division.

Keywords: *Work Immersion, Support Mechanism, Implementation Plan, Technical Vocational and Livelihood Track*

1. INTRODUCTION

Education remains a fundamental pillar of individual development and national advancement. Beyond the transmission of knowledge, it influences how individuals' reason, interact, and make informed decisions within their social contexts. Through sustained and meaningful learning experiences, education cultivates values, attitudes, and competencies that enable individuals to respond thoughtfully to real-world demands. It also develops critical and practical skills that prepare learners to adapt to changing environments and complex challenges. Similarly, it functions as a transformative force that empowers individuals while contributing to the sustainable development of communities and the nation.

Contemporary thinking about learning increasingly foregrounds the idea that education is a fundamental human right and a central driver of sustainable development, requiring inclusive, equitable, and quality opportunities for all throughout life (UNESCO, 2021). This vision reflects a broader understanding that the purpose of formal learning extends beyond the acquisition of facts to the development of competencies that enable individuals to navigate complex social, economic, and environmental realities, contributing meaningfully to their communities and societies. As education systems evolve, there is greater emphasis on connecting classroom instruction with authentic contexts in which knowledge and skills are applied, promoting both cognitive and interpersonal capacities. Within this context, structured experiences such as work immersion programs provide learners with opportunities to engage in professional environments where theoretical understanding intersects with practical tasks and real-world challenges, offering a form of structured engagement that strengthens both technical proficiency and contextual adaptability. [1]

The K to 12 Basic Education Curriculum envisions learners who are holistically developed, equipped with 21st-century skills, and prepared for lifelong learning, productive work, and meaningful participation in society (Department of Education [DepEd], 2023). In the Philippines, the Work Immersion Program has introduced in senior high school as a crucial step in preparing learners for life beyond the classroom. This program provides opportunities for students to engage in authentic work environments related to their chosen tracks, allowing them to experience firsthand the realities of different professions. Through these immersion activities, learners can apply classroom knowledge to real-world situations, develop technical and interpersonal skills, and build a clearer sense of career direction. As stated in DepEd Order No. 30, s. 2017, the program aims to instill values such as discipline, responsibility, and professionalism attributes that are vital for future success. More than a requirement, work immersion serves as a bridge between academic learning and practical experience, ensuring that students are not only academically competent but also career-ready and socially aware. [2], [3]

The effectiveness of the work immersion program may depend on how thoughtfully and consistently schools implement it. Its effectiveness is shaped by several interconnected dimensions: curriculum design, delivery process, student progress, supervision, and monitoring and evaluation, each playing a vital role in shaping students' real-world learning experiences. A well-crafted curriculum design provides the backbone of the program. It ensures that the tasks and activities students engage in are not random but are intentionally connected to the learning

outcomes of their specialization. When the curriculum is clearly mapped out, students can see the relevance of their classroom lessons to actual workplace practices, which makes their learning more meaningful and goal oriented.

Equally important, the delivery process involves how the immersion unfolds from preparation to completion. This includes the pre-immersion orientation, where expectations are set and safety guidelines are discussed, up to the post-immersion reflection, where students look back on their experiences and extract lessons learned. When the process is well-managed, students experience a seamless transition from theory to practice, making their immersion both purposeful and transformative. Moreover, tracking student progress goes beyond simply checking attendance or task completion. It involves observing how students develop practical skills, confidence, and a sense of professionalism throughout the program. Teachers and coordinators play a crucial role here by providing feedback, addressing concerns, and recognizing improvements. This continuous guidance not only refines technical abilities but also shapes character and work values, which are just as important for future employment.

In addition, strong supervision ensures that students are supported and safeguarded during their immersion. Supervisors both from schools and partner institutions act as mentors who guide learners through real work challenges, helping them understand industry expectations while nurturing their enthusiasm and curiosity. Through close supervision, students are more likely to build confidence and make sound decisions in a work setting. Monitoring and evaluation serve as the reflective lens of the program. By systematically reviewing what worked and what did not, schools can identify areas for improvement, celebrate milestones, and strengthen collaboration with industry partners. Continuous evaluation helps refine policies, improve partnerships, and ensure that the work immersion remains relevant and responsive to both students' needs and the evolving demands of the workforce.

Equally vital to the success of the work immersion program are the support systems that uphold and sustain its implementation. These systems form the foundation that allows the program to function effectively and adapt to challenges that may arise along the way. At the heart of these support mechanisms is the training of teachers and coordinators, who serve as the key facilitators of the entire immersion experience. Their role goes far beyond administrative coordination; they are mentors, guides, and bridges between the school and the industry. Well-prepared teachers can establish meaningful partnerships with companies, manage student placements with confidence, and provide constructive assessments that help learners grow both professionally and personally.

Given these considerations, the present study was conducted to assess and enhance the implementation of the work immersion program in public senior high schools within the Division of Batangas Province. It seeks to evaluate how well the program is being carried out across the five key dimensions curriculum, delivery process, student progress, supervision, and monitoring and evaluation while also examining the sufficiency of support mechanisms in terms of training and resources. The study aims to gather insights from students, immersion coordinators, and school heads to gain a clearer understanding of the program's strengths, challenges, and areas for improvement. This is particularly important in the division of Batangas Province, where schools vary widely in resources, community partnerships, and geographical

conditions. A localized analysis provides an opportunity to craft solutions that are both practical and context-sensitive, ensuring that the program remains inclusive and sustainable across different school settings.

The need to conduct this research arises from the ongoing challenges that schools continue to face in implementing the work immersion program effectively. Despite its promising goals, many institutions struggle with limited industry partnerships, lacking resources, and inconsistencies in supervision and coordination. These issues may compromise the quality of students' learning experiences and limit their opportunities for skill development. In a labor market that increasingly values adaptability and technical competence, schools face challenges in implementing work immersion programs that respond to these demands. This study identifies what works, what gaps exist, and what strategies can be adopted to make the program more responsive and impactful. It also emphasizes the importance of collaboration among schools, industries, and local government units in ensuring that work immersion remains a meaningful component of the K–12 curriculum.

This research, therefore, aims to lay the groundwork for that plan, one that reflects the realities faced by educators and students in the province. By refining processes, enhancing teacher training, and improving resource allocation, schools can better ensure that every student benefits from a purposeful and enriching immersion experience. Beyond examining how the program is implemented, the study seeks to become an instrument for continuous improvement, helping educators design more effective programs, strengthen collaborations, and empower learners to grow with confidence and competence.

Objectives

This study aimed to assess work immersion implementation in public senior high schools in the Division of Batangas Province focusing on TVL Track with end goal of developing work immersion implementation plan. It examined the extent of implementation as assessed by students, school heads, and coordinators in terms of curriculum, delivery process, student progress, supervision, and monitoring and evaluation. It also assessed the level of support mechanisms in terms of training and resources, identified differences in assessments among the three groups, determined the relationship between implementation and support mechanisms, and identified issues and concerns in the program.

The study tested two null hypotheses: (1) there are no significant differences among the assessments of students, school heads, and coordinators regarding the extent of implementation, and (2) there is no significant relationship between the extent of implementation and the level of support mechanisms provided.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study employed an embedded mixed-methods research design, integrating quantitative and qualitative approaches to comprehensively examine the implementation of the

TVL work immersion program in public senior high schools in the Division of Batangas Province.

Quantitative data were gathered through a researcher-made, validated, and highly reliable questionnaire (Cronbach's Alpha = .964 for implementation and .972 for support mechanisms) administered to 368 TVL Grade 12 students, 43 work immersion coordinators, and 43 school heads selected through stratified proportionate sampling for students and total enumeration for coordinators and school heads across four congressional districts. The instrument measured the extent of implementation in terms of curriculum, delivery process, student progress, supervision, and monitoring and evaluation, as well as the level of support mechanisms related to training and resources.

Qualitative data were collected through purposive sampling, utilizing focus group discussions to identify issues and concerns related to program implementation. Data collection was conducted through digital and face-to-face methods with informed consent and strict adherence to ethical standards.

Descriptive statistics, Kruskal–Wallis test, and Spearman's rho were used for quantitative analysis, while thematic analysis was applied to qualitative data to support and enrich the findings.

2. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Extent of the Implementation of Work Immersion Programs

Curriculum

The implementation of work immersion in terms of curriculum was assessed by three groups of respondents' students, teachers, and school heads. For students, enhancing their personal and professional growth through mentorship during work immersion was implemented to a great extent. This suggested that students perceived mentorship as a crucial and well-implemented aspect, likely due to the hands-on guidance from industry professionals that bridged the gap between theoretical knowledge and practical application. Moreover, teachers assessed that compliance with the required number of hours for students' exposure and experiences in their specialization ranked first and was interpreted to a great extent. This reflected a strong emphasis on adhering to DepEd guidelines on work immersion hours, ensuring adequate industry exposure. School heads observed that the program implemented activities that promoted students' skills development, highlighting its effectiveness in fostering industry-relevant competencies.

The results showed that the Work Immersion Program performed strongest in developing students' skills, ensuring competency achievement, and providing sufficient exposure in their chosen fields. These aspects highlighted the

program's effectiveness in linking classroom learning with practical workplace experiences through consistent guidance and mentorship. However, areas such as adaptability to industry changes and post-immersion career transition support still needed further enhancement to sustain long-term employability. As Acut et al. (2021) highlighted, the most effective immersion programs cultivate both practical competence and personal growth, equipping students to thrive in an ever-changing professional landscape. [4]

Table 1. Extent of Work Immersion Implementation in Curriculum

Indicators	Students		Immersion Coordinators		School Heads		AVERAGE	
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI
1. Implements activities that promote students' skills development	3.66	GE	3.91	GE	3.98	GE	3.85	GE
2. Ensures that the Work Immersion Program (WIP) develops consistently, covering all intended competencies	3.67	GE	3.91	GE	3.95	GE	3.84	GE
3. Complies with the required number of hours for students' exposure and experiences in their specialization	3.6	GE	3.98	GE	3.93	GE	3.84	GE
4. Enhances students' personal and professional growth through mentorship during work immersion	3.71	GE	3.91	GE	3.88	GE	3.83	GE
5. Incorporates activities that develop students' work ethics	3.56	GE	3.93	GE	3.95	GE	3.81	GE
6. Offers track that fits the needs and requirements of the community	3.65	GE	3.93	GE	3.86	GE	3.81	GE
7. Creates an opportunity for students to observe, identify, and describe the management process of an industry	3.61	GE	3.86	GE	3.95	GE	3.81	GE
8. Integrates academic knowledge with real-world workplaces	3.63	GE	3.86	GE	3.91	GE	3.80	GE
9. Fosters a sense of responsibility and professionalism among students	3.63	GE	3.86	GE	3.88	GE	3.79	GE
10. Provides activities for students to apply theoretical concepts in practical settings	3.56	GE	3.91	GE	3.88	GE	3.78	GE
11. Develop skills that remain adaptable to industry changes and students' requirements	3.64	GE	3.86	GE	3.84	GE	3.78	GE
12. Facilitates smooth transitions for students into their careers, bridging school and the workforce	3.57	GE	3.81	GE	3.84	GE	3.74	GE
Composite Mean	3.63	GE	3.83	GE	3.91	GE	3.81	GE

Legend: WM-Weighted Mean, VI-Verbal Interpretation, GE- Great Extent

Delivery Process

Students highly rated the indicators related to reflecting on immersion experiences and developing real-world adaptability and critical thinking skills. Coordinators also gave high ratings to the development of students' adaptability and the practice of sending letters for Memorandum of Agreement (MOA).

School heads rated similarly, emphasizing the importance of sending letters for MOAs and providing work plans for the immersion program. This demonstrated their commitment to ensuring that the program was implemented in a structured and organized manner to meet educational and industry standards.

The Work Immersion Program effectively built strong partnerships with industries, allowing students to gain real-world experience aligned with their field of study. According to Borling et al. (2023), training students to respond to dynamic and complex workplace situations equips them with versatile competencies essential for career readiness. [5]

It also promoted reflection and adaptability, helping learners connect classroom lessons with practical applications while developing problem-solving and resilience skills. However, the study highlighted the need for better alignment of competencies, stronger coordination among stakeholders, and structured evaluation to further enhance the program's effectiveness. Bustamante (2019) highlights that such evaluation mechanisms consolidate understanding, reinforce good practices, and guide students toward improved performance in future work settings. [6]

Table 2. Extent of Work Immersion Implementation in Delivery Process

Indicators	Students		Immersion Coordinators		School Heads		AVERAGE	
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI
1. Sends letters to the possible immersion partners for a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA)	3.57	GE	3.93	GE	3.98	GE	3.83	GE
2. Requires students to reflect on immersion experiences which give them understanding and learning.	3.67	GE	3.93	GE	3.88	GE	3.83	GE
3. Trains students to adapt to real-world situations and creative and critical thinking skills.	3.64	GE	3.98	GE	3.81	GE	3.81	GE
4. Conducts a post-work immersion activity to gather feedback on experiences gained during the program.	3.6	GE	3.91	GE	3.91	GE	3.81	GE
5. Provides work plans for work immersion.	3.62	GE	3.84	GE	3.95	GE	3.80	GE
6. Conducts pre-immersion sessions that enhance students' workplace readiness by imparting fundamental soft skills like communication, teamwork, problem-solving, work ethics, workplace safety, and confidentiality.	3.6	GE	3.93	GE	3.88	GE	3.80	GE
7. Expects students' awareness of diverse career opportunities and their professional choices.	3.64	GE	3.84	GE	3.91	GE	3.80	GE
8. Conducts orientation for students, parents, and other immersion partners.	3.59	GE	3.86	GE	3.91	GE	3.79	GE
9. Organizes profiles of confirmed work immersion partners.	3.61	GE	3.91	GE	3.84	GE	3.79	GE
10. Delivers activity through independent learning and discovery that promotes students' interest in their fields.	3.62	GE	3.86	GE	3.86	GE	3.78	GE
11. Fosters engaging interactions between professionals and students, providing guidance and support.	3.6	GE	3.88	GE	3.86	GE	3.78	GE
12. Plans and ensures the alignment of specific competencies to students' field of study.	3.55	GE	3.84	GE	3.93	GE	3.77	GE
13. Evaluates immersion experiences by comparing school and work application of skills.	3.58	GE	3.86	GE	3.88	GE	3.77	GE
14. Strengthens resiliency in dynamic work environments.	3.59	GE	3.86	GE	3.86	GE	3.77	GE
15. Creates Joint Working Group before the start of Work Immersion.	3.48	ME	3.86	GE	3.84	GE	3.73	GE
Composite Mean	3.60	GE	3.89	GE	3.89	GE	3.78	GE

Legend: WM-Weighted Mean, VI-Verbal Interpretation, Moderate Extent, GE- Great Extent

Student Progress

Students rated the work immersion program to a great extent, particularly appreciating the structured assessment process and clear guidelines, which supported their growth mindset and understanding of how progress was evaluated. Coordinators provided the highest ratings, emphasizing fair, timely, and clear evaluations, including immediate feedback and constructive communication of results, which aligned with a learner-centered approach. However, they noted that further support was needed for reflective practices and peer assessments. Further, School heads also rated the program highly, recognizing the importance of clear assessment and feedback, but similarly highlighted the need for more effective peer assessments and fully embedding a growth mindset.

Assessment practices were among the strongest aspects of the Work Immersion Program, as they promoted student engagement, timely feedback, and reflective learning. Coordinators and supervisors effectively used evaluation and feedback to guide students' improvement and readiness for real-world work. However, the least practiced areas included structured reflection and peer assessment, which limited opportunities for deeper learning, collaboration, and self-regulation among students. According to Smith and Worsfold (2015), immediate feedback enables learners to make timely adjustments, deepen understanding, and link performance outcomes with workplace expectations. [7]

Table 3. Extent of Work Immersion Implementation in Students' Progress

Indicators	Students		Immersion Coordinators		School Heads		AVERAGE	
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI
1. Assesses performance of the students to provide them with immediate feedback	3.63	GE	3.93	GE	3.93	GE	3.83	GE
2. Conducts an orientation about criteria and methods of assessment about students' progress	3.63	GE	3.93	GE	3.88	GE	3.81	GE
3. Communicates the results of the assessment with complete descriptions and constructive feedback	3.56	GE	3.93	GE	3.88	GE	3.79	GE
4. Conducts self-assessment among students to help them measure their performance and track their improvement	3.6	GE	3.91	GE	3.86	GE	3.79	GE
5. Considers numerical and descriptive assessment among students	3.55	GE	3.93	GE	3.88	GE	3.79	GE
6. Assists students in setting up their goals and track their growth	3.62	GE	3.88	GE	3.84	GE	3.78	GE
7. Encourages students to set SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound) goals aligned with their learning objectives	3.6	GE	3.86	GE	3.88	GE	3.78	GE
8. Demonstrates students' growth mindset through a structured assessment process	3.64	GE	3.91	GE	3.77	GE	3.77	GE
9. Designs transparent and objective assessment tools and criteria	3.49	ME	3.93	GE	3.84	GE	3.75	GE
10. Facilitates feedback sessions with teachers and supervisors to provide students with personalized guidance and support	3.56	GE	3.88	GE	3.81	GE	3.75	GE
11. Uses assessment results to help students reflect on their performance, make informed decisions, and adjust their strategies to improve learning outcomes	3.57	GE	3.81	GE	3.84	GE	3.74	GE
12. Designs assessment context which includes not only academic achievement but also personal and professional development	3.58	GE	3.91	GE	3.7	GE	3.73	GE
13. Performs peer assessment which allows learning from one another	3.52	GE	3.72	GE	3.7	GE	3.65	GE
Composite Mean	3.58	GE	3.89	GE	3.83	GE	3.77	GE

Legend: WM-Weighted Mean, VI-Verbal Interpretation, ME- Moderate Extent, GE- Great Extent

Supervision

Students assessed the implementation of the work immersion program as to a great extent. The immersion coordinators rated the implementation as to a great extent. The two highest-rated indicators were assuring that teachers and immersion partners were skilled in executing work immersion activities and visiting companies for observation and assessment of students' engagement and learning experiences, both interpreted as to a great extent. These high ratings emphasized the importance of ensuring well-equipped personnel and conducting direct observations to monitor student progress. School heads also provided an assessment of to a great extent. This reflected their focus on maintaining strong oversight and actively involving stakeholders to gather a variety of perspectives. Muyco and Leopardas (2024) highlight that

continuous professional development enhances collaboration, leadership, and instructional quality, especially in programs requiring inter-agency coordination. [8]

Supervision in the Work Immersion Program was effectively implemented through organized planning, competent mentors, and consistent student monitoring. Schools maintained strong collaboration with partner institutions to ensure quality guidance. However, professional development, performance reviews, and data-driven improvements needed greater emphasis for more effective supervision.

Table 4. Extent of Work Immersion Implementation in Supervision

Indicators	Students		Immersion Coordinators		School Heads		AVERAGE	
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI
1. Assures that the teachers and immersion partners are skilled in executing work immersion activities	3.59	GE	3.9	GE	3.88	GE	3.79	GE
2. Observe and assess students' engagement and learning experiences	3.59	GE	3.9	GE	3.88	GE	3.79	GE
3. Ensures oversight through an accomplished supervisory plan	3.59	GE	3.88	GE	3.91	GE	3.79	GE
4. Improves student learning experiences by analyzing the results for continuous improvement	3.63	GE	3.84	GE	3.88	GE	3.78	GE
5. Creates feedback mechanisms for input from immersion partners on their experiences and perceptions of the Work Immersion Program.	3.56	GE	3.88	GE	3.88	GE	3.77	GE
6. Engages stakeholders in the assessment process to gather diverse perceptions	3.52	GE	3.88	GE	3.91	GE	3.77	GE
7. Builds the provision of high-quality work immersion experiences for students	3.6	GE	3.84	GE	3.84	GE	3.76	GE
8. Determines meeting schedules to review of Work Immersion Program progress and address challenges or improvement opportunities promptly	3.58	GE	3.84	GE	3.84	GE	3.75	GE
9. Executes supervisor plan throughout the Work Immersion Program duration	3.55	GE	3.84	GE	3.86	GE	3.75	GE
10. Discusses supervision results to appropriate individuals to collaboratively address any identified issues in the work immersion experience delivery	3.53	GE	3.86	GE	3.86	GE	3.75	GE
11. Provides professional development opportunities to personnel involved in supervising the Work Immersion Program	3.54	GE	3.81	GE	3.86	GE	3.74	GE
12. Conducts regular performance reviews to assess the success of the Supervisory Plan and recognize opportunities for enhancement to better support the goals and objectives of the Work Immersion Program	3.58	GE	3.81	GE	3.81	GE	3.73	GE
13. Analyzes data from supervisory activities to identify trends and areas of concern	3.54	GE	3.79	GE	3.84	GE	3.72	GE
Composite Mean	3.57	GE	3.85	GE	3.87	GE	3.76	GE

Legend: WM-Weighted Mean, VI-Verbal Interpretation, GE- Great Extent

Monitoring and Evaluation.

Students rated the implementation of the work immersion program as great extent. The two highest-rated indicators were reviews the monitoring and evaluation plan to ensure the alignment of objectives and outcomes of the work immersion program and establish open communication and collaboration by engaging with teachers, industry partners, students, and parents throughout the immersion process, both interpreted as great extent.

The immersion coordinators also assessed the implementation as great extent. The two highest-rated indicators were Monitors the partnership's progress and ensures adherence to the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) and establishes open communication and collaboration by engaging with teachers, industry partners, students, and parents throughout the immersion process, both interpreted as great extent.

School heads provided the highest overall assessment with a composite rating of Great Extent. The two highest-rated indicators were Monitor the partnership's progress and ensure adherence to the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) and ensure that data collection methods are systematic, reliable, and appropriate for getting important information, both interpreted as Great Extent. This reflects their emphasis on maintaining compliance and ensuring the reliability of data collection.

These findings echo Islahiddin et al. (2016), who emphasized that integrated partnerships among schools, communities, and industries enhance learning outcomes when guided by reflective and data-informed practices. As schools continue to refine their monitoring systems, such balanced integration of collaborative engagement and evaluative rigor will ensure that work immersion remains a transformative and future-ready learning experience for every senior high school student. [9]

Table 5. Extent of Work Immersion Implementation in Monitoring and Evaluation

Indicators	Students		Immersion Coordinators		School Heads		AVERAGE	
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI
1. Monitors the partnership's progress and ensures adherence to the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA).	3.59	GE	3.95	GE	3.98	GE	3.84	GE
2. Establishes open communication and collaboration by engaging with teachers, industry partners, students, and parents throughout the immersion process.	3.6	GE	3.93	GE	3.88	GE	3.80	GE
3. Reviews the monitoring and evaluation plan to ensure the alignment of objectives and outcomes of the work immersion program.	3.6	GE	3.84	GE	3.88	GE	3.77	GE
4. Ensures that data collection methods are systematic, reliable, and appropriate for getting important information.	3.56	GE	3.79	GE	3.93	GE	3.76	GE
5. Establishes clear and measurable indicators to track progress and outcomes of the work immersion program.	3.55	GE	3.84	GE	3.88	GE	3.76	GE
6. Ensures that monitoring and evaluation processes comply with Department of Education issuances.	3.54	GE	3.86	GE	3.86	GE	3.75	GE
7. Identifies trends, challenges, and areas for improvement.	3.55	GE	3.79	GE	3.88	GE	3.74	GE
8. Allocates adequate resources to support monitoring and evaluation activities throughout the work immersion program.	3.58	GE	3.81	GE	3.79	GE	3.73	GE
9. Documents best practices from monitoring and evaluation activities to inform future program design and implementation.	3.57	GE	3.79	GE	3.79	GE	3.72	GE
10. Utilizes both quantitative and qualitative data analysis techniques to gain complete insights into program delivery.	3.6	GE	3.79	GE	3.74	GE	3.71	GE
11. Gathers feedback from stakeholders on the relevance and effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation activities.	3.56	GE	3.77	GE	3.79	GE	3.71	GE
12. Matches actual outcomes against planned targets to identify discrepancies and make necessary adjustments.	3.52	GE	3.77	GE	3.7	GE	3.66	GE
13. Conducts mid-program and end-of-program evaluations to assess the overall impact and work immersion program.	3.56	GE	3.7	GE	3.7	GE	3.65	GE
14. Includes external evaluations or third-party assessments to provide neutral perceptions on program success.	3.46	GE	3.81	GE	3.63	GE	3.63	GE
Composite Mean	3.66	GE	3.82	GE	3.82	GE	3.73	GE

Legend: WM-Weighted Mean, VI-Verbal Interpretation, GE- Great Extent

Level of Support Mechanisms Provided for Work Immersion Implementation

Training and Resources

The feedback from students, immersion coordinators, and school heads showed that training support for the Work Immersion Program was generally strong. Students appreciated clear orientations about the program's goals and valued teachers who were prepared to work with diverse learners. However, they noticed a lack of focus on conflict resolution and workplace ethics training. Immersion focal persons also rated the orientation and inclusivity efforts highly, reflecting the value they placed on a strong foundation for the program. Yet, they observed the need for better training on evaluation methods and on supporting students with special needs.

School heads echoed similar strengths, highlighting the importance of preparing teachers and staying updated with trends in work-based learning. Still, they noted that revising the curriculum and strengthening conflict management training required more attention.

The study showed that training support for the Work Immersion Program was highly effective, especially in orientations, inclusivity, and career guidance. These efforts promoted clarity, diversity, and student preparedness. However, specialized training, curriculum alignment, and conflict resolution needed further attention to enhance the program's relevance and inclusiveness.

As Binavides (2022) emphasized, effective leadership and collaboration are key to sustaining such continuous improvement, ensuring that the work immersion program evolves to meet the diverse needs of learners and the demands of the modern workforce. [10]

Table 6. Level of Support Mechanism in Training

Indicators	Students		Immersion Coordinators		School Heads		AVERAGE	
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI
1. Provides orientation on the objectives, structure, and expectations of the Work Immersion Program	3.62	VH	3.91	VH	3.86	VH	3.80	VH
2. Prepares teachers and focal persons for working with students from diverse backgrounds and communities	3.61	VH	3.7	VH	3.84	VH	3.72	VH
3. Implements career guidance seminars that aid students in identifying interests	3.58	VH	3.85	VH	3.77	VH	3.67	VH
4. Maintains updates on best practices and emerging trends in work-based learning and education	3.55	VH	3.65	VH	3.72	VH	3.64	VH
5. Conducts training sessions on safety practices and disaster procedures for students' welfare during immersion placements	3.59	VH	3.72	VH	3.58	VH	3.63	VH
6. Gives industry-specific skills training relevant to placements	3.56	VH	3.63	VH	3.67	VH	3.62	VH
7. Organizes workshops on communication and social skills to enhance collaboration among teachers, industry partners, and students	3.59	VH	3.58	VH	3.58	VH	3.58	VH
8. Hosts seminars on workplace ethics and professionalism to instill values of integrity and accountability in students	3.5	VH	3.6	VH	3.63	VH	3.58	VH
9. Organizes workshops for effective mentoring and supervision techniques in overseeing student immersion experiences	3.54	VH	3.51	VH	3.65	VH	3.57	VH
10. Implements training on utilizing technology and online platforms for managing and documenting student activities and assessments during the Work Immersion Program	3.54	VH	3.56	VH	3.6	VH	3.57	VH
11. Conducts capacity-building sessions on evaluation strategies to assess student progress and program effectiveness	3.58	VH	3.44	VH	3.58	VH	3.53	VH
12. Provides specialized training on managing and accommodating students with special needs or disabilities in immersion placements	3.55	VH	3.47	VH	3.51	VH	3.51	VH
13. Revises the curriculum and instructional strategies to align with industry standards and practices	3.54	VH	3.51	VH	3.35	H	3.47	H
14. Conducts training sessions on conflict resolution and problem-solving skills	3.5	VH	3.49	H	3.37	H	3.45	H
Composite Mean	3.56	VH	3.60	VH	3.62	VH	3.60	VH

Legend: WM- Weighted Mean, VI-Verbal Interpretation, H- High, VH- Very High

Students, immersion coordinators, and school heads all agreed that the resources for the Work Immersion Program were generally available. Students were most appreciative of the orientation, training, safe work environment, and the insurance coverage they received during immersion. These provisions gave them a sense of security and confidence to perform their tasks effectively. However, they felt that more materials and better supervision could have enhanced the experience. Immersion focal persons also rated orientation and overall program implementation highly, reflecting the value they placed on a solid program structure. Yet, they pointed out challenges such as limited access to Learning Management Systems and budget

shortages. School heads emphasized the importance of assigning competent coordinators and ensuring the smooth flow of the program. Still, like focal persons, they noted gaps in digital access and the need to update the curriculum to align with industry requirements. Despite these few issues, all groups generally perceived the resources as strong and supportive.

This finding resonates with the study of Akins (2020), who asserted that comprehensive orientation and clear safety protocols empower learners to perform confidently in real-world settings. Similarly, Creswell (2016) observed that programs with strong logistical coordination and participative planning processes are more likely to achieve desired learning outcomes. [11]

Table 7. Level of Support Mechanism in Resources

Indicators	Students		Immersion Coordinators		School Heads		AVERAGE	
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI
1. Provides students with orientation, training, varied work activities, and a safe working environment	3.63	VH	3.84	VH	3.88	VH	3.78	VH
2. Facilitates the successful implementation of the Work Immersion Program, considering factors such as relevance, accessibility, and comprehensiveness	3.6	VH	3.79	VH	3.93	VH	3.77	VH
3. Assigns a skilled immersion coordinator to liaise with the school and supervise students, ensuring efficient program implementation	3.57	VH	3.79	VH	3.95	VH	3.77	VH
4. Provides students with an insurance policy during work immersion	3.63	VH	3.79	VH	3.88	VH	3.77	VH
5. Provides guidance to teachers throughout the implementation of the Work Immersion Program	3.61	VH	3.72	VH	3.86	VH	3.73	VH
6. Incorporates "program" guidelines, procedures, and expectations for teachers and focal persons	3.61	VH	3.74	VH	3.81	VH	3.72	VH
7. Assists in coordinating immersion placements, scheduling activities, and managing documentation and paperwork related to the program	3.57	VH	3.77	VH	3.79	VH	3.71	VH
8. Provides accessible facilities and venues to teachers and students	3.59	VH	3.74	VH	3.72	VH	3.68	VH
9. Provides support from professional organizations and community groups	3.57	VH	3.6	VH	3.77	VH	3.65	VH
10. Allots adequate budget for work immersion expenses	3.52	VH	3.49	H	3.86	VH	3.62	VH
11. Offers materials and relevant supplies available for students and teachers for work immersion	3.54	VH	3.58	VH	3.74	VH	3.62	VH
12. Offers training materials designed to the needs of teachers and focal persons	3.6	VH	3.58	VH	3.6	VH	3.59	VH
13. Provides access to any Learning Management Systems (LMS) for organizing and disseminating materials, assignments, and assessments	3.58	VH	3.37	VH	3.63	VH	3.53	VH
Composite Mean	3.59	VH	3.68	VH	3.80	VH	3.69	VH

Legend: WM-Weighted Mean, VI-Verbal Interpretation, H-High, VH- Very High

Difference in the Assessments of the Implementation of Work Immersion by the Three Groups of Respondents

Across the key areas curriculum, delivery process, students' progress, supervision, and monitoring and evaluation there were significant differences in how the three groups perceived the implementation of the work immersion program. The greatest variation appeared in the delivery process, highlighting how each group's role shaped their perspective of how the program was carried out. School heads tended to view delivery from a policy and compliance standpoint, focal persons focused on practical execution, while students assessed it based on their firsthand experiences. Similarly, perceptions of the curriculum varied, with school heads emphasizing alignment with standards, focal persons considering feasibility, and students valuing real-world relevance.

Differences also emerged in assessing students' progress, depending on whether outcomes were viewed through measurable achievements or personal growth. Supervision was likewise perceived differently: administrators stressed compliance, focal persons highlighted management aspects, and students focused on the quality of support they received. Monitoring and evaluation processes were interpreted uniquely by each group, influenced by their respective levels of involvement in feedback and decision-making. These findings revealed that each group experienced the immersion program differently, shaped by their responsibilities and expectations. Enhancing communication and aligning perspectives among stakeholders could have strengthened both the implementation and overall experience of the work immersion program.

Table 8. Differences in the Assessments of the Implementation of Work Immersion

Work Immersion Implementation	Computed value	p-value	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Curriculum	40.195	.000	Rejected	Significant
Delivery Process	45.006	.000	Rejected	Significant
Students' Progress	28.544	.000	Rejected	Significant
Supervision	33.998	.000	Rejected	Significant
Monitoring and Evaluation	23.824	.000	Rejected	Significant

Meanwhile, perceptions about training revealed no notable differences among the groups, suggesting that training practices were implemented consistently and uniformly. However, there were marked differences in how resources were evaluated. School heads focused on budgeting and the overall allocation of materials, immersion focal persons encountered operational challenges in distribution, and students assessed the adequacy and accessibility of available learning tools. Moving forward, maintaining the consistency of training while addressing coordination and communication gaps in resource management would have contributed to a more equitable and effective program implementation.

Table 9. Differences in the Assessments of the Levels of Support Mechanism

Work Immersion Implementation	Computed value	p-value	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Training	1.434	.488	Failed to reject	Not significant
Resources	11.848	.003	Rejected	Significant

Relationship Between the Extent of Implementation and the Level of Support Mechanism Provided for the Work Immersion Program

Across five key dimensions curriculum, delivery process, students' progress, supervision, and monitoring and evaluation results revealed a strong positive relationship, indicating that improvements in training support led to more effective work immersion implementation. This meant that as the quality and consistency of training increased, so did the overall effectiveness of the program.

Monitoring and evaluation and supervision showed the strongest connections, highlighting that effective training was crucial in guiding, overseeing, and assessing students' work immersion experiences, while also positively influencing student progress, delivery processes, and curriculum implementation. Similarly, strong relationships were found between resource support and program implementation, showing that access to adequate materials, facilities, and logistical support greatly improved effectiveness, particularly in supervision and monitoring. These findings resonate with the work of Smith and Worsfold (2015), who emphasized the critical role of well-prepared educators in ensuring the successful delivery of work-integrated learning programs. [7]

Table 10. Relationship of the Extent of Work Immersion Implementation and Level of Support Mechanism in Terms of Training

Work Immersion Implementation	r-value	p-value	Verbal Interpretation	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Curriculum	.632	.000	Strong Relationship	Rejected	Significant
Delivery Process	.644	.000	Strong Relationship	Rejected	Significant
Students' Progress	.703	.000	Strong Relationship	Rejected	Significant
Supervision	.728	.000	Strong Relationship	Rejected	Significant
Monitoring and Evaluation	.736	.000	Strong Relationship	Rejected	Significant

Legend: Coefficient of correlation (r): +1.0 (Perfect relationship), +.76 to .99 (Very Strong relationship), +.51 to .75 (Strong relationship), +.26-.50 (Moderate Relationship), +.11 to .25 (Weak relationship), +.01 to .10 (Very weak relationship), .00 (No relationship)

A strong and meaningful relationship was also found between resource support and the extent of work immersion implementation across the same dimensions. The results showed that when schools had better access to resources such as learning materials, facilities, and logistical support, the program was implemented more effectively. Supervision and monitoring and evaluation emerged as the most resource-dependent areas, demonstrating that adequate materials and tools were essential for proper oversight and assessment. Similarly, having sufficient resources positively affected students' progress, delivery process, and curriculum implementation. These findings emphasized the importance of prioritizing resource provision to ensure a high-quality and impactful work immersion experience for all participants. As echoed by Smith and Worsfold (2015), learning in work-integrated contexts is enriched when students are given sufficient resources to fully participate and apply their skills in authentic scenarios. [7]

Table 11. Relationship of the Extent of Work Immersion Implementation and Level of Support Mechanism in terms of Resources

Work Immersion Implementation	r-value	p-value	Verbal Interpretation	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Curriculum	.631	.000	Strong Relationship	Rejected	Significant
Delivery Process	.636	.000	Strong Relationship	Rejected	Significant
Students' Progress	.665	.000	Strong Relationship	Rejected	Significant
Supervision	.716	.000	Strong Relationship	Rejected	Significant
Monitoring and Evaluation	.715	.000	Strong Relationship	Rejected	Significant

Legend: Coefficient of correlation (r): +1.0 (Perfect relationship), +.76 to .99 (Very Strong relationship), +.51 to .75 (Strong relationship), +.26 to .50 (Moderate Relationship), +.11 to .25 (Weak relationship), +.01 to .10 (Very weak relationship), .00 (No relationship)

Issues and Concerns in the Implementation of TVL Immersion Program

Some issues and concerns were encountered during the implementation of work immersion, including a limited number of industry partners and a mismatch between available partners and students' specializations, which hindered effective placement. Scheduling conflicts, such as immersion overlapping with other school activities, and delayed immersion start times, compressed the learning experience. Financial challenges, particularly high transportation costs and remote immersion sites, placed additional burdens on students. Moreover, behavioral issues in the workplace and insufficient access to technical resources further complicated the program's success.

These findings resonate with Necio et al. (2022), who observed that many students felt disconnected from their assigned tasks due to weak alignment between academic preparation and workplace demands. In addition, Datinguino (2019) observed that even when school-community relationships are well-intentioned, administrative gaps and uneven participation among stakeholders hinder long-term sustainability. [12], [13]

Work Immersion Implementation Plan

The Work Immersion Implementation Plan titled TULAY: Training and Understanding the Life Ahead of Youth was designed to bridge the gap between classroom learning and the realities of the workplace. The word "TULAY" symbolizes connection, linking students' academic preparation to real-world experiences that will shape their professional and personal growth. This plan provides a structured yet flexible framework that ensures every learner is given a meaningful opportunity to apply what they have learned, explore career paths and gain confidence in real work environments.

Through this program, students are not only exposed to industry practices but are also guided to understand the value of discipline, teamwork, and integrity qualities that are essential in any career. It builds on the belief that education should not end in theory but continue through experience and reflection. By blending innovative strategies like simulation hubs, mentorship programs, and collaborative projects, the plan encourages students to think critically, adapt to changing work demands, and develop a sense of responsibility toward their chosen fields. The

plan also responds to the growing call for stronger partnerships between schools, industries, and communities. It advances collaboration through shared goals, regular dialogue, and mutual accountability, ensuring that immersion activities remain relevant and impactful.

Moreover, TULAY emphasizes inclusivity by providing training for teachers and supervisors on how to support students with different needs and learning styles, ensuring that no learner is left behind. At its core, this implementation plan serves as a roadmap for schools to deliver purposeful immersion experiences that are not only compliant with policy but truly transformative. It recognizes that preparing youth for the future requires more than academic excellence; it demands empathy, resilience, and readiness to face real-world challenges. By connecting learning with living, TULAY empowers students to step into their next chapter with competence, confidence, and character.

The TULAY Implementation Plan is designed as a bridge connecting students' academic experiences to the professional realities they will soon encounter. The integration of theory with practice is one of its strongest features, reflecting Pascua's (2022) assertion that aligning classroom instruction with real work settings greatly enhances the quality of learning and overall student preparedness. Through activities such as the Applied Learning Immersion Hubs and Community-Based Projects, learners are given opportunities to apply theoretical knowledge in simulated and real settings, fostering deeper understanding and practical competence. [14]

The inclusion of feedback-centered activities such as Dual Lens Evaluation Day and Peer Circles of Insight supports Favila et al. (2019) claimed that interactive mentorship and consistent feedback exchanges between students and supervisors strengthen accountability and professional growth. By allowing both students and mentors to assess performance through shared reflection, these strategies create an authentic learning cycle where communication, empathy, and responsibility thrive. [15]

In terms of collaboration, TULAY also reflects Buenaventura's (2019) call for strengthened stakeholder partnerships in sustaining effective work immersion. Initiatives such as the Industry Connect Caravan, Adopt-a-Batch Partnership Drive, and Collaborative Road mapping Sessions highlight the plan's commitment to building long-term relationships with local industries, alumni, and government units. These partnerships expand student opportunities while ensuring that the immersion remains aligned with evolving industry needs and community realities. [16]

Innovative support mechanisms like the Virtual Reality Workplace Scenarios (VRWS) and Immersion Connect Portal further illustrate the program's forward-thinking design. These technology-driven initiatives create inclusive and accessible learning spaces, addressing both logistical and equity challenges. The focus on inclusivity, especially through the Empathy in Action Workshop, shows that the program values diversity and is prepared to adapt to the varied needs of learners.

4. CONCLUSIONS

In light of the foregoing findings, the following conclusions are drawn.

1. The work immersion program in Senior High School was implemented to a great extent, indicating a general effectiveness of its objectives.
2. There was a high level of support mechanisms for the implementation of work immersion reflecting a strong institutional and stakeholders' partnership.
3. There are significant differences in the assessment of the three groups of respondents on the implementation of work immersion, however, with respect to support mechanisms only the resources showed significant differences while training did not.
4. A significant relationship existed between the extent of work immersion implementation and the level of support mechanism, suggesting that stronger support contributes to more effective implementation.
5. The identified issues and concerns such as limited industry partners, tight schedules, financial strains on students, and challenges with student behavior and readiness underscore the need for stronger industry partnership, flexible scheduling, financial assistance, and enhanced preparation for students, to improve the effectiveness of the program.
6. A work immersion implementation plan was developed to strengthen the execution of the work immersion program in senior high schools.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings and conclusions drawn from study, the researcher recommends the following:

1. The implementation plan may be submitted to school heads for review and validation to ensure it meets program standards and stakeholder expectations.
2. The implementation plan may be adopted for management of the work immersion program.
3. Future evaluation and research on aspects beyond the current plan's scope may be recommended to guide continuous improvement and potential expansion.
4. Similar studies may be conducted to include the perspective of industry partners, parents and private schools.

REFERENCES

- [1] United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2021). Futures of education: A new social contract for education. UNESCO.
<https://www.unesco.org/en/futures-education/vision>
- [2] Department of Education. (2023). Partnership in Education: Assessing the Senior High School Work Immersion in DepEd–Bataan. DepEd e-Saliksik.
<https://e-saliksik.deped.gov.ph>
- [3] Department of Education. (2017). DepEd Order No. 30, s. 2017: Policy guidelines on the implementation of the Senior High School Voucher Program effective School Year 2017–2018.
https://www.deped.gov.ph/wpcontent/uploads/2017/04/DO_s2017_019.pdf
- [4] Acut, D., et al. (2021). Work immersion performance appraisal and evaluation of Grade 12 STEM students in science and technology-based industries. Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 1835, 012013.
<https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1742-6596/1835/1/012013>
- [5] Borling, K., Lozarito, N., Lagdamen, Q. B., Fegarido, J., & Besa, A. (2023). Implementation of work immersion and its effects on the social development of senior high school graduates. Indonesian Journal of Educational Research and Technology. Advance online publication.
<https://ejournal.upi.edu/index.php/IJERT/>
- [6] Bustamante, J. A. (2019). Senior high school work immersion pioneers: A phenomenological study. Journal of International Academic Research for Multidisciplinary, 7(2), 66–75.
<https://www.researchgate.net/>
- [7] Smith, C., & Worsfold, K. (2015). Unpacking the learning–work nexus: “Priming” as lever for high quality learning outcomes in work-integrated learning curricula. Studies in Higher Education, 40(1), 22–42.
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/03075079.2013.806456>

[8] Muyco, M. A. B., & Leopardas, M. M. (2024). Lived

experiences of coordinators in the implementation of

Senior High School (SHS) work immersion: A

qualitative study. EPRA International Journal of

Multidisciplinary Research, 10(8), 66–76.

<https://eprajournals.com/IJMR/article/13725>

[9] Islahuddin, Tolla, I., & Mansyura. (2016). A holistic

model of partnership in education. International

Journal of Environmental & Science Education,

11(13), 5915–5924.

<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1115524.pdf>

[10] Benavides, K. R. (2022). Leading for sustainability

in school-community partnerships (Doctoral

dissertation). Digital Commons @ ACU.

<https://digitalcommons.acu.edu/etd/498>

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

[12] Necio, C. R., Acosta, N. P., Arzaga, M. L. S., & Buhalog, C. J. E. (2022). Challenges encountered and level of satisfaction of work immersion students and partners:

Basis for school policy work immersion plan. International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation, 3(4), 434–440.

[13] Necio, C. R., Acosta, N. P., Arzaga, M. L. S., & Buhalog, C. J. E. (2022). Challenges encountered and level of satisfaction of work immersion students and partners: Basis for school policy work immersion plan. International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation, 3(4), 434–440.

[14] Pascua, K. F. (2021). Extent of implementation of

work immersion and level of satisfaction of senior

high school students during crisis management:

Basis for proposed work immersion action plan

(Doctoral dissertation, Cavite State University).

<https://www.academia.edu/114986530/>

[15] Favila, S. A., Erfe, J. P., Pimentel, M. M., Naval, D.

J., Rabina, M. G., Castro, L. A., Macascas, C. D., &

Agustin, M. L. S. (2019). UGNAYAN: A proposed

knowledge sharing model for senior high school

work immersion program. The Normal Lights,

13(2), 111–131.

[16] Buenaventura, D. U. D. (2019). Developing a model



for stakeholder engagement management
for SHS

immersion program.