

Management for learning resources for Senior High School in an integrated high school: basis for management handbook

Janette B. Senarillos

Department of Education, Sampaguita Village National High School

Molave St, Barangay Calendola, San Pedro City, Laguna

Email: Janette.senarillos@deped.gov.ph

Abstract: This action research aimed to determine the management of learning resources for Senior High School students at Cuyab Integrated National High School, focusing on supervision, monitoring, and evaluation processes. The study utilized a descriptive survey research method to gather data from teachers, parents, and students. The findings revealed that teachers supervised learning resources by organizing tasks, providing instructions, and maintaining communication with students and parents. Monitoring involved tracking resource availability and analyzing their status, while evaluation focused on proofreading materials and setting criteria for assessing their quality. Challenges included limited teacher assistance for students, difficulty in accessing learning materials, and communication issues between teachers and parents. The study concluded that teachers' age, educational attainment, and length of service were significantly correlated with resource management processes. Recommendations were made for improving resource availability, communication, and evaluation practices, and future research is suggested for broader student groups and additional variables.

Keywords: Learning resources management, Supervision and monitoring, Distance learning challenges

Date Submitted: June 8, 2024

Date Accepted: July 1, 2024

Date Published: October 1, 2024

INTRODUCTION

Cuyab Integrated National High School, located at Quezon St., Brgy. Cuyab, City of San Pedro, is one of the public high schools within the municipality offering a Senior High School Program. Its strands are centered on Humanities and Social Sciences (HUMSS) for Academic Track and Home Economics (HE) for Technical-Vocational Track. It has a total of 145 officially enrolled students in the program, composed of 34 HUMSS, HE, in Grade 11; and 46 HUMSS, and 23 HE in Grade 12. The students are under the modular distance learning modality using the self-learning modules provided by the Regional Office as the primary learning material for distance learning. The self-learning modules are distributed every two weeks, during which parents/guardians pick up the modules from the school, while strictly observing health protocols. The researcher is the school head of the institution and oversees the management process of the learning resources. The Senior High School program requires a variety of learning resources other than the self-learning module to be successfully offered, and the limitation on these resources is the primary reason why the school is only offering two strands.

For Humanities and Social Sciences, other learning resources include textbooks and educational materials uploaded online, while the Home Economics strand utilized Google Drive for monitoring and submission of outputs. Learning Activity Sheets (LAS) that are made by teachers are part of the required learning resources. These are helpful to both teachers and students to learn the concepts and acquire the most essential learning competencies. The digitized copies of the self-learning modules are provided by the Regional and Division Office. Printing of these modules for distribution to students is delegated to the schools. Hence, part of the management of these resources is checking the completeness of the digitized copies, printing the modules, and allocating the right quantity of modules to the number of students who will use them. In the printing process, the school encounters several difficulties such as time allocated to reproduce, malfunctions of the printing/photocopying

machine, and limited resources of materials. Distributing and retrieval of printed self-learning modules is part of the supervising and monitoring responsibilities of the school heads and senior high school teachers. Although, absentees during the distribution of the printed materials were the most common problem encountered. While the unreturned self-learning modules were the

problem during the retrieval. Digitized copies were also distributed through the individual learning tablets of the students. The monitoring of downloaded digitized self-learning modules is a priority for the teachers to ensure that the students were able to access the materials. Students who were difficult to reach through messenger, text messages, and/or calls causes the monitoring difficult. Evaluation of the learning materials is crucial when it comes to the content. Teachers were tasked to scan the learning materials for errors and if possible, summarize the content without sacrificing its quality or level of difficulty. Evaluation of the digitized materials is heavily affected when the copies from the Regional or Division office are distributed late to the schools. Holistic checking of learning activity sheets provided by each teacher for their subjects needs a lot of time which became one of the difficulties in the process of evaluation.

These reoccurrences of problems in the supervision, monitoring, and evaluation of learning resources stimulated the idea of producing a management handbook for school heads with senior high school programs. This way, the said problems will be avoided.

Statement of the problem

The study aimed to determine the management of learning resources for senior high school in Cuyab Integrated National High School. Also, it aimed to produce a management of learning resources handbook.

Specifically, it seeks answer the following questions:

1. What is the respondent profile in terms of: (a) Teacher; (b) Age; (c) Gender; (d) Highest Educational Attainment; (e) Length of Service; (f) Parent; (g) Age; (h) Gender; (i) Highest Educational Attainment; (j) Occupation; (k) Student; (l) Level; (m) Gender and; (n) Track/Stand
2. What is the management process of learning resources in terms of: (a) Supervision; (b) Monitoring and; (c) Evaluation
3. What are the challenges in the management of learning resources in terms of: (a) Supervision; (b) Monitoring and; (c) Evaluation
4. What management of learning resources handbook may be developed?

METHODOLOGY

Research design

The study used the descriptive survey research method. Maxwell (2017) defined the descriptive research method as a design that provides quantitative or numeric descriptions of trends, attitudes, or opinions of a population about a certain condition or phenomenon which involves the use of survey instruments and unstructured interviews in gathering data. The design was deemed appropriate for the study since its primary aim was to determine the management of learning resources for senior high school in terms of three processes: supervision, monitoring, and evaluation. The study also included the challenges in the management of learning resources in terms of the three processes.

Locale of the study and respondents

The study was centered on the management of learning resources for senior high school students, specifically focused on the three processes namely supervision, monitoring, and

evaluation of learning resources. It involved Grade 11 and Grade 12 students enrolled in the academic and technical-vocational programs at Cuyab Integrated National High School. Students under the Humanities and Social Sciences (HUMSS), Cookey, and Food and Beverages (F&B) strands were included. The study also involved the teachers and parents of senior high school students who gave their assessment of the management process of learning resources. Furthermore, the study also determined the challenges encountered in the management process of learning resources in terms of supervision, monitoring, and evaluation. Lastly, the study was also concerned with the (a) significant difference in the management of learning resources in terms of supervision, monitoring, and evaluation; (b) significant difference in the challenges in the learning resource management process; and (c) significant relationship between the respondents' profile and the management process of learning resources as to supervision, monitoring, and evaluation.

Research instruments

The researcher-made survey questionnaire was the primary instrument for gathering data in the study. Construction. The instrument was developed based on the relevant readings made by the researcher. It was composed of three major parts. The first part looked into the respondent's profile in terms of age, gender, educational attainment, length of service, occupation, and track/strand according to identified groups of teachers, students, and parents. The second part of the questionnaire focused on the management process of learning resources in terms of supervision, monitoring, and evaluation. Meanwhile, the third part determined the challenges of learning resource management in terms of supervision, monitoring, and evaluation. To quantify the responses of the participants, a 5-point Likert Scale will be used with corresponding verbal descriptions such as 5 - Always, 4 - Often, 3 - Sometimes, 2 - Seldom, and 1 - Never at all.

Data analyses procedure

Data analysis involved the use of descriptive statistics, specifically means and weighted means, to evaluate the frequency and adherence to various management processes. Furthermore, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was employed to identify any significant differences in the management of learning resources across the three groups of respondents. Pearson's correlation coefficient was also used to examine the relationships between respondent profiles (e.g., age, gender, educational attainment) and the effectiveness of learning resource management in terms of supervision, monitoring, and evaluation.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Respondents' profile

Teachers' profile

The teachers' profiles in terms of age, gender, educational attainment, and length of service. It can be gleaned from the table that there was one (1) or 12.5% of teachers aged from 21 to 30, three (3) or 37.5% aged 31 to 40, and eight (8) or 50% aged from 41 to 50. In terms of gender, two (2) or 25% were male, while six (6) or 75% were female. When it comes to the highest educational attainment, three (3) or 3.75% of teachers have Bachelor's degree, four (4) or 50% have Master's degree units and one (1) or 12.5% have graduated with a Master's degree. In terms of length of service, one (1) or 12.5% has 3 years or below, two (2) or 25% have 4 to 9 years, three (3) or 37.5% have 10 to 14 years, and two (2) or 25% have 21 years or more teaching experience. Overall, eight (8) senior high school teachers disclosed their age, gender, highest educational attainment, and length of service.

Parents' profile

The parents' profile in terms of age, gender, highest educational attainment, and employment status. There were eight (8) or 13.11 % parents aged from 21 to 30 years old, fourteen (14) or 22.95% aged from 31 to 40 years old, twenty-eight (28) or 45.90% aged from 41 to 50 years old, and eleven (11) or 18.03 % aged from 51 and above. In terms of gender, there were twenty-four (24) or 39.34% male parent-respondents and thirty-seven (37) or 60.66% female parent-respondents. In highest educational attainment, there were ten (10) or 16.39 % of parents who elementary graduate, thirty-five (35) or 57.38% of parents who were high school 58 graduate, eight (8) or 13.11% of parents who college undergraduate, and eight (8) or 13.11 % have bachelor's degree. In terms of employment, eighteen (18) or 29.51% of parents were employed while forty-three (43) or 70.49% were not employed.

Students' profile

The students' profiles in terms of age, gender, grade level, and senior high school strand. It shows that four (4) or 4.49% of the students aged 16 years old, eighteen (18) or 20.22 % aged 17, and sixty-seven or 75.28% aged 18 and above. When it comes to gender, there were forty-eight (48) or 53.93% male students and forty-one (41) or 46.07% female student respondents. Forty (40) or 44.94% of the student 59 respondents were from grade 11, while forty-nine (49) or 55.06% were from grade 12. Hence, forty (45) or 44.94 student respondents came from the Humanities and Social Sciences strand, twenty-six (26) or 29.21% from Home Economics – Cookery, and twenty-three (23) or 25.84 % from Home Economics – Food and Beverage Services. Overall, there were eighty-nine (89) student respondents who participated in the study.

Mean scores on the management of learning resources

Mean scores on teachers' supervision of learning resources

Item 1 “Provides a clear, step-by-step procedure for accomplishing 60 the learning materials” got a 4.38 weighted mean which means Always. It means that the teacher must provide a clear, definite, and step-by-step procedure on how to accomplish the learning materials so that the students were well-guided in doing the assigned tasks. Teachers must constantly communicate with the students using available means to instruct them properly in dealing with the learning activities.

Item 2 “Schedules tasks and activities” got a 4.50 weighted mean which means Always. It means the tasks and activities given by the teachers must be planned properly based on the schedule considering the pandemic situation wherein limited movement can be done. The assigned tasks and activities must be schedule-sensitive to the capability of the students.

Item 3 “Guides and looks after students when accomplishing the learning materials” got the lowest 3.88 which means Often. It means that the teachers must constantly guide the students when doing the activities in the learning materials. Teachers must look at the students' work and monitor their progress by asking what part of the activities they have done. The teacher must assist the students in accomplishing the self-learning module activities (DepEd Order No. 8, s. 2020).

Item 4 “Allocates needed materials and resources accordingly” got a 4.38 weighted mean which means Always. It seemed that allocation in the provision and duplication of learning materials must be placed accordingly. Teachers need funds to produce the needed learning materials and resources to be distributed to the students. So, the school head must prioritize the provision and distribution of self-learning modules and other teacher-made learning materials by allocating enough funds.

Item 5 “Creates and communicates schedules and dates of distribution and retrieval” got a 4.38 weighted mean which means Always. It means that the teacher needs to communicate the schedules properly including the distribution and retrieval of outputs and modules. Open communication must be established between the parents and teachers since parents were the ones who went to school to get and retrieve learning materials. Communication is key for understanding and a smooth flow of learning amidst the pandemic. So, schedules must be communicated ahead of time to inform the parents accordingly.

Item 6 “Conducts regular follow-ups with parents and students” got a weighted mean of 4.50 which means Always. It means teachers conducted regular follow-ups with the parents and students through proper communication. Teachers need to remind constantly the parents and students about the learning tasks they need to accomplish and schedules of distribution and retrieval so that they keep aware of school activities. Regular follow-ups with the parents and students informed them and motivated them to do the assigned task or activities in the modules. Follow-ups can be done through text, call, personal message, chat, or email to have open communication to check the learning progress in distance learning (DepEd Order No. 8, s. 2020). Overall, the teachers rated the supervision of learning resources by 4.33 which means Often. It means that they constantly supervised the learning resources distributed to their students.

Mean scores on teachers' monitoring of learning resources

Item 1 “Conducts inventories of materials distributed and retrieved from the students” got a 4.13 weighted mean which means Often. It means that teachers were able to monitor the learning materials if they conduct inventories of distributed and retrieved materials from the students. Through this, the number of distributed learning materials will be tallied with the retrieved materials. This will teach the students and parents the accountability of being users. If the learning materials were retrieved properly, these can be used again for the next batch of learners that produce efficiency. Since the school has a limited budget, the reuse of learning materials is highly encouraged.

Item 2 “Periodically collects, analyzes, and uses information on the status and availability of learning resources” got a 4.13 weighted mean which means Often. It means that teachers collected, analyzed, and used information on the status and availability of 63 learning materials periodically. They conduct inventories of retrieved learning materials over the distribution to ensure that the quantity was enough for the number of students. Hence, they check the conditions of learning materials if they can be used again or not. The result of their inventories served as a basis for the reproduction of the next batch of learning materials.

Item 3 “Gives regular feedback to students and parents on the status of learning materials” got a 4.00 weighted mean which means Often. It means that teachers gave regular feedback to the students and parents on the status of learning materials if they were already available to pick up. Communication was done properly to inform the parents and students when they will get the learning materials and when they going to retrieve them.

Item 4 “Communicates key priority areas in accomplishing the learning materials” got a 4.13 weighted mean which means Often. It means that the teachers communicated with their students about important activities and tasks that the students need to accomplish from the distributed learning materials. Not all activities in the self-learning modules were needed to answer by the students. Teachers selected some activities and performance tasks that the students needed to accomplish. The key priority areas were the most important activities needed to accomplish to develop the most essential learning competencies of the students.

Item 5 “Audits financial costs and expenses related to the preparation and procurement of materials” got 4.00 which means Often. It means that the teachers audit financial costs and expenses obtained in the preparation and procurement of learning materials. Teachers check

the availability of funds for the reproduction of learning materials to make it possible to distribute them on time. Hence, the availability of funds is necessary to materialize the reproduction of self-learning modules and other teacher-made materials. The expenses even taking from maintenance and other operating expenses (MOOE) of the school must be utilized properly to maximize efficiency and produce better learning effectively.

Item 6 “Regularly checks the status of learning materials distributed to and retrieved from the students” got a 3.88 weighted mean which means Often. It means that the teachers regularly check the status of the learning materials to be distributed and retrieved from the students. The learning materials’ completeness, readability, and physical appearance were checked by the teachers before the distribution to ensure that the students received quality materials. Similarly, once the materials were retrieved, they check the status to ensure that the materials were in good condition and can be used again for the next school year. Overall, the teachers rated the monitoring of learning resources by 4.04 which means often. It means they often monitor the distributed and retrieved learning materials.

Mean scores on teachers’ evaluation of learning resources

Item 1 “Sets specific criteria to check the merit and suitability of learning resources” got a 3.88 weighted mean which means Often. It means that the teachers believed that specific criteria are needed to check the merit and sustainability of learning modules. Teachers need to have criteria for how to determine the quality of learning materials and how to sustain them. Quality learning resources should be sustained based on the set criteria as standard.

Item 2 “Proofreads the learning materials before printing and distribution” got a weighted mean of which means Often. It means that teachers proofread the learning materials before printing to ensure quality content. This can be done by scanning and reading the content by the subject teachers in terms of completeness, accuracy,

appropriateness, and readability. The learning materials must be proofread first to ensure their quality and avoid fruitless effort. Quality learning materials positively influence learning outcomes.

Item 3 “Surveys the quantity and quality needed learning resources” got a weighted mean of 3.75 which means Often. It shows that teachers surveyed the number of needed learning resources before reproduction to ensure enough quantity needed. This ensures that every student will receive a copy of the learning materials. Also, they check the quality of learning resources by reading the content and judging the value.

Item 4 “Conducts surveys among users of learning resources to determine their issues and concerns” got a weighted mean of 3.75 which means often. The teachers surveyed the students about the issues and concerns regarding the learning materials they received. This was done via group chat or personal message asking the students about the problems experienced in using the learning materials. The issues or concerns regarding the learning materials might affect the learning of the students. The teachers need to determine and address those issues.

Item 5 “Sets clear expectations in using learning resources” got a weighted mean of 4.13 which means Often. It means that the teachers set clear expectations in using learning resources. They assumed that the learning materials from the DepEd region or division undergo quality assurance possessing the highest standards. It means that quality-assured learning materials were free from errors and ready to distribute for a wide area.

Item 6 “Sets a schedule for checking of learning materials” got a weighted mean of 3.50 which means Often. It means that teachers set a schedule to check the learning materials before reproduction. This ensured the quality of learning materials once the teacher critique the content, format, and appropriateness. However, checking of learning materials must be done with enough time far ahead of reproduction to ensure quality review. The material

whether teacher-made or from DepEd sources must undergo validation by the teacher of users to ensure that it is appropriate. Overall, teachers rated the evaluation of learning resources by 3.83 which means Often.

Mean scores on parents' supervision of learning resources

Item 1 "Counts the number of modules received from teachers" got a weighted mean of 4.10 which means Often. It means that they count the number of modules received from the teachers. Through this, they check if the number of modules matches the number of subjects offered. One module per subject was expected to receive during module distribution as learning materials for modular distance learning.

Item 2 "Ensures received modules are in good quality; pages are complete" got a weighted mean of 4.08 which means Often. It means that parents ensured that the modules received were of good quality with complete pages. The quality of modules affects the learning experiences of the students. Modules with missing pages and poor readability produced poor learning on the side of students. So, it was important to check the modules after receiving them.

Item 3 "Maintains neatness of learning answer sheets and ensures there are adequate sheets per subject" got a weighted mean of 3.95 which means Often. It means that parents maintain the learning activity sheets complete and clean after receiving them during the distribution. They scanned the content of the activity sheets provided by the teachers. The completeness and neatness influence the learning experience of the students. So, it is important to check them before leaving the distribution area.

Item 4 "Organizes learning activity sheets in envelopes and/or folders" got a weighted mean of 4.13 which means Often. It means that the parents organized the learning activity sheets using a folder or envelope to ensure safety while bringing them home. This ensured the proper handling of learning activity sheets so that they were delivered to their children in an organized manner.

Item 5 "Controls "screen time" use of tablets" got a weighted mean of 3.88 which means Often. It means that parents monitor and limit the screen time of their children while using tablets provided to them. This ensured the mental and physical health of their children while studying at home. The eyes of the students must go away from the screen every twenty minutes as prescribed by the American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) and the World Health Organization (WHO).

Item 6 "Sets and implement strictly ground rules in using tablets" got a weighted mean of 3.89 which means Often. It means that parents set and implemented strict grounds for using tablets in distance learning. They ensured that less screen time for their children and that screen time was used only for learning not for entertainment. Parents needed to control the use of tablets to ensure that the said device was used for education not for other purposes. Overall, parents rated the supervision of learning resources by 4.01 which means Often.

Mean scores on parents' monitoring of learning resources.

Item 1 "Ensures that activities indicated in the modules are accomplished promptly" got a weighted mean of 4.21 which means Always. It means that parents monitor the work of their children by ensuring that module activities were accomplished timely so that they beat the deadline or submission date. Since the students were studying at home, it was the responsibility of the parents that the students complied with the learning outputs needed to submit.

Item 2 "Checks the completeness of activities accomplished before submission" got a weighted mean of 4.14 which means Often. It means that parents checked the completeness of the activities of their children before submission. The parents were responsible to check

the outputs needed to submit before they proceed to the retrieval area in school. This ensured untoward incidents of missing activities.

Item 3 “Checks the completeness and quality of learning activity sheets” got a weighted mean of 4.05 which means Often. It means that parents checked the completion and quality of learning activity sheets once they received them from the teacher. Learning activity sheets were important for the students, so the parents needed to check them properly.

Item 4 “Ensures that print in learning activity sheets is readable” got a weighted mean of 4.02 which means Often. It means that parents check the readability of the learning activity sheets by scanning the pages to see if they were printed clearly. The readability of learning activity sheets influences the learning experiences of the students. If the activity sheets were not readable, it causes frustration and loss of learning interest in the students.

Item 5 “Tracks and maintains data usage and connection when using the tablet” got a weighted mean of 3.93 which means Often. Parents tracked and maintained the data usage and connection of the tablet of their children to ensure that the data connection was used for learning. The data connection for the tablet was used for communication with the teachers and educational purposes needed by the students.

Item 6 “Ensures that the tablet is used during synchronous and asynchronous activities only” got a weighted mean of 3.89 which means Often. It means that parents ensured that the tablet was used for synchronous and asynchronous activities only to limit the screen time of their children. Also, tablets were distributed for educational purposes only, so the parents need to ensure that the tablets were used for the education of their children. Overall, parents rated the monitoring of learning resources with a 4.04 weighted mean which means Often.

Mean scores on parents' evaluation of learning resources

Item 1 “Checks the completeness of content and activities in each module” got a weighted mean of 4.10 interpreted as Often. It means that parents often check the completeness of module content including the activities after receiving them from the teacher. The completeness of module content affects the learning of the students and as parents, they want to give the best learning materials for their children.

Item 2 “Checks the readability of modules and reports missing pages and/or activities” got a weighted mean of 4.03 interpreted as Often. It means that parents used to check the readability of module content and report to the teacher if missing pages or activities were found. This was a good character of the parents if they want the best education for their children in distance learning through the provision of quality learning materials. Hence, the readability of printed materials influences the comprehension of the students. So, the parents needed to ensure that the learning materials they received were readable and complete.

Item 3 “Scans the content of learning activity sheets for completeness” got a weighted mean of 3.97 interpreted as Often. It means that the parents after receiving the learning activity sheets, scan them to check their completeness. This was a good effort by the parents to check the completeness to ensure that the best learning materials will be given to their children.

Item 4 “Checks the readability of learning activity sheets and reports missing pages” got a weighted mean of 3.92 interpreted as Often. Aside from the completeness of learning activity sheets, readability was also checked by scanning pages. If ever, there

was a missing page, the parents reported it immediately to the teacher to replace it with complete parts and readable. As parents who received the learning activity sheets during the distribution, they need to ensure that the best learning materials they get from the school so that their children were able to continue self-paced learning at home.

Item 5 “Checks tablet for damages regularly and report it to the concerned teachers” got the weighted mean of 4.05 interpreted as Often. Parents often checked the received tablet if it

has damage or defects and report it to the concerned teacher for proper action. The tablets were just lent to their children as learning devices for communication and education purposes only. However, it was the responsibility of the parents if unnecessary incidents happened. Parents were liable for the borrowed tablet, so they need to check if the tablet was in good condition. If not, proper reporting must be done immediately.

Item 6 “Ensures that all parts and accessories are complete (e.g. charger, earphone, etc.” got a weighted mean of 3.98 interpreted as Often. It shows that parents after receiving the tablet checked the parts and accessories for completeness like charger, earphone, pin, etc. Since the parents were liable for the tablet they received, they have to check first if the borrowed tablet has complete parts with accessories and work properly. Tablets used to be highly operational if it has complete parts with accessories. Overall, the mean score on parents’ evaluation of learning resources got 4.01 interpreted as Often.

Mean scores on students’ supervision of learning resources

Item 1 “Follow the week/day allotted schedule in the module” got the weighted mean of 4.02 interpreted as Often. It shows that students followed the allotted schedule in the module in accomplishing the learning activities. They used to be guided by the schedule given by the teachers to have smooth learning. They can communicate with their teachers based on the schedule.

Item 2 “Accomplishes and returns complete set of modules promptly” got the weighted mean of 4.18 interpreted as Often. It means that the students accomplish the assigned activities by the teachers and returned the modules on time. This was done to avoid bombarded work given by the teachers. Weekly activities or tasks were given by the teachers that the students need to accomplish. After two weeks, the modules together with the outputs must be returned to school. So, the students need to do whatever the week tasks assigned to them.

Item 3 “Maintains neatness of learning answer sheets and ensures there are adequate sheets per subject” got a weighted mean of 3.91 which means Often. It means that the students maintained the neatness of learning answer sheets and they ensured the completeness of sheets per subject. The neatness of answer sheets influences the content readability and the adequacy influences the completeness that eventually gave better learning outcomes. So, as responsible students, it is a must to check the adequacy of the submitted outputs and maintain their neatness.

Item 4 “Organizes learning activity sheets in envelopes and/or folders” got a weighted mean of 4.01 interpreted as Often. It shows that the students organized the learning activity sheets using envelopes before submitting them to school. This ensured the intact and secured outputs before giving them to their respective teachers to avoid missing or misplacement. Organizing students’ outputs lessen the work of teachers and avoid the unnecessary incident.

Item 5 “Follow “screen time” use of tablets” got a weighted mean of 4.30 which means Always. It can be gleaned from the table that the students strictly followed the screen time in using the tablets. This avoids the overexposure of students’ eyes on screen that might be caused blurred vision. Tablets were distributed to the students as learning devices, but the students must not abuse or use them. Screen time must be short and necessary for studying school lessons, not for entertainment or socialization.

Item 6 “Strictly obey ground rules in using tablets” got a weighted mean of 4.39 interpreted as Always. It means that the students always obey the strict rules in using the tablets. They were kept in mind that the tablets were borrowed only for their studying. Whatever happens to the tablet was their responsibility. So, they have to obey ground rules in using borrowed tablets to avoid untoward incidents. Hence, the rules of using tablets were

made for the benefit of the students, if these were properly obeyed, these resulted in a better learning experience. Overall, the students rated the supervision of learning resources as 4.14 interpreted as Often.

Mean scores on students' monitoring of learning resources

The students rated the monitoring process of learning resources based on their experiences during distance learning.

Item 1 "Ensures that modules have complete pages and clearly print" got 4.37 interpreted as Always. It means that the students check the completeness of modules page by page and its readability. They scan the content if it was printed with complete pages. The completeness of pages and readability of the content might affect the learning experience. So, they carefully scan the modules and the content after receiving them.

Item 2 "Checks the completeness of activities accomplished before submission" got the weighted mean of 4.34 interpreted as Always. It means that the students checked the completeness of their outputs before submission to ensure that they will submit the complete set of activities required by their teachers. They seriously checked the number of outputs needed to submit to avoid incidents of unsubmitted outputs that caused them to be anxious. This was a good character of responsible students since their outputs reflect their character towards work.

Item 3 "Checks the completeness and quality of learning activity sheets" got the weighted mean of 4.08 interpreted as Often. The students often checked the completeness and quality of learning activity sheets after receiving them. They scan the pages to check each page and the quality of the text to ensure that they received good learning materials.

Item 4 "Checks for instructions given in each activity" got a weighted mean of 4.07 interpreted as Often. It means that the students checked the given instructions by the teachers in each activity. They used to seek instruction from their teachers in doing each activity so that they become guided in accomplishing tasks. The teacher's instructions enlightened their minds on how to accomplish the activity.

Item 5 "Maintains data usage and connection when using the tablet" got a weighted mean of 3.93 interpreted as Often. It means that the students often maintained data usage and connectivity while using the tablet. Getting connected while using the tablet able them to get instructions from the teachers, clarify their ideas, communicate with others, and search for additional information. Internet connection nowadays was very important, especially for distance learning with less interaction with the teachers. The only way they have to communicate was through the device they have with an internet connection.

Item 6 "Use tablet during synchronous and asynchronous activities only" got a weighted mean of 3.98 interpreted as Often. It means that the students used the tablet for synchronous and asynchronous activities only which was expected of them. The tablets were lent to them for educational purposes only. Overall. The students rate the monitoring process of learning resources s 4.13 interpreted as Often.

Mean scores on students' evaluation of learning resources

Item 1 "Checks the completeness of content and activities in each module" got the weighted mean of 4.06 interpreted as Often. It means that students often checked the completeness of module content and activities after receiving them from the teachers. As responsible students, they need to scan the content and activities presented in the modules to ensure that they did not miss any part of them.

Item 2 "Checks the readability of modules and reports missing pages and/or activities" got a weighted mean of 4.09 interpreted as Often. It means that the students checked the readability of modules by scanning the pages and reported to the concerned teacher if there

were missing pages or activities. The readability of printed materials affects the learning experience, so a student, see if the text in the modules were readable enough.

Item 3 “Scans the content of learning activity sheets for completeness” got the weighted mean of 4.12 interpreted as Often. It means that the students scan the completeness of the learning activity sheets after receiving them. They needed to ensure that the learning activity sheets were complete and received enough numbers. The student’s learning in distance learning heavily depended on the learning materials given by the teachers.

Item 4 “Checks the readability of learning activity sheets and reports missing pages” got the weighted mean of 3.97 interpreted as Often. It means that the students the student often checked the readability of learning activity sheets and if they found missing pages or blurred, they report it to the concerned teacher. The readability of printed learning materials affects the learning experiences. So, the students ensured that the learning materials they received were readable enough so that they have a better learning experience.

Item 5 “Checks tablet for damages regularly and report it to the concerned teachers” got the weighted mean of 4.06 interpreted as Often. It means that the students checked the tablets for damages regularly and reported it to the concerned teacher. The borrowed tablets were under the responsibility of the students once they received them, so they must take care of and be liable for using them. Students used to see the condition of their tablets and if they see damages, they reported it immediately to the teacher.

Item 6 “Ensures that all parts and accessories are complete (e.g. charger, earphone, etc.)” got the weighted mean of 4.07 interpreted as Often. It means that the students ensured the parts and accessories of tablets are intact and complete particularly the charger, earphones, and other parts. They were liable for any parts of the borrowed tablets, so they need to take care of them. Overall, the students rated the evaluation of learning resources as 4.06 interpreted as Often.

Summary of mean scores on the management of learning resources

Teachers rated the supervision by 4.33 weighted mean, 4.01 weighted by the parents, and 4.14 weighted mean by the students. Overall, 4.16 is interpreted as Often. Among the three groups of respondents, the teachers have the highest weighted mean. It means they perceived the supervision of the management of learning resources since they were the ones who prepared, distributed, and received them.

On the other hand, students gave a 4.13 weighted mean for monitoring, followed by a 4.04 weighted mean from both parents and teachers. It means that students perceived more of the monitoring process of learning resources since they were the ones who received follow-ups and communications with their teachers. Overall, monitoring got a 4.07 weighted mean interpreted as Often. Similarly, under evaluation, students gave a weighted mean of 4.06, while the parents gave a 4.01 weighted mean and teachers gave a 3.83 weighted mean. It means that the students perceived the evaluation of the learning resources since they were the end users of the materials. The true value of learning resources can be highly judged by the students than the teachers or parents. Overall, the evaluation got 4.07 interpreted as Often.

Significant difference in the management process of learning resources

The significant difference suing Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) in the management process of learning resources. It can be gleaned from the table that the computed value for supervision of 0.768, monitoring of 0.218, and evaluation of 0.279 did not exceed the critical

value of 3.05. It means no significant difference exists in the management process of learning resources in terms of supervision, monitoring, and evaluation. Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted.

Significant relationship between the teachers' age and the management process of learning resources

The significant relationship between teachers' age and the management process of learning resources. It can be gleaned from that teachers' age and supervision were lowly correlated having an r-value of 0.48. Similarly, teachers' age and monitoring were moderately correlated having an r-value of 0.54. Also, teachers' age and evaluation were very highly correlated having an r-value of 0.76. It means that the r-values for monitoring and supervision were significant to reject the null hypothesis. It means that the teachers' age was correlated with the management process of learning resources in terms of monitoring and evaluation. It means that teachers' age is a factor in the management process of learning resources in terms of evaluation, but a moderator for monitoring.

Significant relationship between teachers' sex and the management process of learning resources

The significant relationship between teachers' sex and the management process of learning resources. It can be gleaned from the table that teachers' sex and supervision were low correlated having an r-value of 0.41. Similarly, teachers' sex and monitoring were low correlated having an r-value of 0.33. Also, teachers' sex and evaluation were very low correlated having an r-value of 0.49. It means that the r-values were not significant to reject the null hypothesis. It means that the teachers' sex was not correlated with the management process of learning resources in terms of supervision, monitoring, and evaluation. It means that teachers' sex is not a factor in the management process of learning resources in terms of supervision, monitoring, and evaluation.

Significant relationship between teachers' highest educational attainment and the management process of learning resources

The significant relationship between teachers' highest educational attainment and the management process of learning resources. It can be gleaned from the table that teachers' highest educational attainment and supervision were highly correlated having an r-value of 0.89. Similarly, teachers' highest educational attainment and monitoring were highly correlated having an r-value of 0.75. Also, teachers' highest educational attainment and evaluation were very highly correlated having an r-value of 0.84. It means that the r-values were significant to reject the null hypothesis. It means that the teachers' highest educational attainment was highly correlated with the management process of learning resources in terms of supervision, monitoring, and evaluation. It means that teachers' highest educational attainment is a factor in the management process of learning resources in terms of supervision, monitoring, and evaluation.

Significant relationship between teachers' length of service and the management process of learning resources

The significant relationship between teachers' length of service and the management process of learning resources. It can be gleaned from the table that teachers' length of service and

supervision were highly correlated having an r-value of 0.79. Similarly, teachers' length of service and monitoring were highly correlated having an r-value of 0.87. Also, teachers' length of service and evaluation were very highly correlated having an r-value of 0.91. It means that the r-values were significant to reject the null hypothesis. It means that the teachers' length of service was highly correlated with the management process of learning resources in terms of supervision, monitoring, and evaluation. It means that teachers' length of service is a factor in the management process of learning resources in terms of supervision, monitoring, and evaluation.

Significant relationship between parents' age and the management process of learning resources

The significant relationship between parents' age and the management process of learning resources. It can be gleaned from the table that parents' age and supervision were highly correlated having an r-value of 0.82. Similarly, parents' age and monitoring were highly correlated having an r-value of 0.81. Also, parents' age and evaluation were highly correlated having an r-value of 0.81. It means that the r-values were significant to reject the null hypothesis. It means that the parent's age was correlated with the management process of learning resources in terms of supervision, monitoring, and evaluation. It means that parents' age is a factor in the management process of learning resources in terms of supervision, monitoring, and evaluation.

Significant relationship between parents' sex and the management process of learning resources

The significant relationship between parents' sex and the management process of learning resources. It can be gleaned from the table that parents' sex and supervision were moderately correlated having an r-value of 0.54. Similarly, parents' sex and monitoring were moderately correlated having an r-value of 0.53. Also, parents' sex and evaluation were moderately correlated having an r-value of 0.54. It means that the r-values were significant to reject the null hypothesis. It means that the parent's sex was correlated with the management process of learning resources in terms of supervision, monitoring, and evaluation. It means that parents' sex is a moderator in the management process of learning resources in terms of supervision, monitoring, and evaluation.

Significant relationship between parents' highest educational attainment and the management process of learning resources

The significant relationship between parents' highest educational attainment and the management process of learning resources. That parents' highest educational attainment and supervision were moderately correlated having an r-value of 0.70. Similarly, parents' highest educational attainment and monitoring were highly correlated having an r-value of 0.71. Also, parents' highest educational attainment and evaluation were highly correlated having an r-value of 0.71. It means that the r-values were significant to reject the null hypothesis. It means that the parent's highest educational attainment was correlated with the management process of learning resources in terms of supervision, monitoring, and evaluation. It means that parents' highest educational attainment is a moderator in the management process of learning resources in terms of supervision, while a factor for monitoring and evaluation.

Significant relationship between parents' employment status and the management process of learning resources

The significant relationship between parents' employment status and the management process of learning resources. It can be gleaned from that parents' employment and supervision got 0.59 interpreted as a moderate correlation, while employment and monitoring got 0.59 interpreted as a moderate correlation. Also, employment and evaluation got 0.62 interpreted as a moderate correlation. It means that the r-values were significant to reject the null hypothesis. It means that the parent's employment status was correlated with the management process of learning resources in terms of supervision, monitoring, and evaluation. It means that parents' employment status is a moderator in the management process of learning resources in terms of supervision, monitoring, and evaluation.

Significant relationship between students' age and the management process of learning resources

the significant relationship between students' age and the management process of learning resources. It can be gleaned from the table that students' age and supervision got 0.76 r-value interpreted as highly correlated, while age and monitoring got 0.75 r-value interpreted as highly correlated. Similarly, age and evaluation got 0.72 r-value interpreted as highly correlated. The r-values were significant to reject the null hypothesis. It means that students' age was correlated with the management process of learning resources in terms of supervision, monitoring, and evaluation. It means that students' age is a factor in the management process of learning resources in terms of supervision, monitoring, and evaluation.

Significant relationship between students' sex and the management process of learning resources

The significant relationship between students' sex and the management process of learning resources. The sex and supervision got a 0.55 correlation value signifies a moderate correlation. Similarly, sex and evaluation got a 0.61 correlation value signifies a moderate correlation. However, the monitoring and sex have a low correlation of 0.50. It means sex is a moderator for supervision and evaluation processes of management of learning resources. The Pearson's r-values were significant to reject the null hypothesis. It means that students' sex was correlated with the management process of learning resources in terms of supervision, monitoring, and evaluation.

Significant relationship between students' grade level and the management process of learning resources

The results of Pearson's r for a significant relationship between students' grade level and the management process of learning resources. The r-value of 0.61 between the grade level and supervision tells the existence of a moderate correlation. Also, the grade level and monitoring got 0.54 of Pearson's r signifies the existence of a moderate correlation. In terms of evaluation and grade level, Pearson's r of 0.65 signifies the existence of a moderate correlation. The grade level of the respondents was significantly related to supervision, monitoring, and evaluation. It implies that grade level is a moderator for the management process of learning resources. The Pearson's r-values were significant to reject the null

hypothesis. It means that grade level was correlated with the management process of learning resources in terms of supervision, monitoring, and evaluation.

Significant relationship between students' track/strand and the management process of learning resources

The significant relationship between students' track/strand and the management process of learning resources. It can be gleaned from the table that Pearson's r value for supervision of 0.6 signifies the moderate correlation between supervision and track/strand. Similarly, monitoring got 0.56 which means a moderate correlation, while evaluation got 0.65 which means a moderate correlation. It means that the students' track/strand was correlated with the management process of learning resources in terms of supervision, monitoring, and evaluation. It implies that the track/strand is a moderator of the management process of learning resources. The Pearson's r -values were significant to reject the null hypothesis. It means that track/strand was correlated with the management process of learning resources in terms of supervision, monitoring, and evaluation.

Challenges in the management of learning resources

Challenges in the management of learning resources in terms of supervision

The challenges experienced by students, parents, and teachers in the management of learning resources when it comes to supervision. It can be gleaned from the table that the students experienced difficulties in accomplishing the assigned tasks and activities given by their teachers. They were preoccupied with lots of household activities that consumed their time while staying at home. They needed ample time to finish all the activities on their own since they received less assistance from the teacher in distance learning. Also, they experienced difficulty in going to school since the quarantine was implemented by the local government. They received the teacher's assistance through devices only for a limited time.

On the other hand, parents also experienced difficulty like going to school was not easy due to COVID-19 restrictions imposed by the law. Also, they admitted that they cannot monitor their children in doing the learning activities at home since they have job to do. Hence, they cannot found hard to assist their children in self-paced leaning at home since the subjects for senior high school were advanced subjects, and they were not capable of teaching their children.

The teachers also experienced difficulties in the management of learning resources. They experienced insufficient learning resources from the concerned authorities similar to the findings of (Adali & Uzoma, 2016). They received the copies of modules not on time and sometimes late. Also, some subjects have no provided modules, so they need to create modules for shorter periods.

Resource capacity is very important to produce learning resources Resource capacity concerns sourcing available resources and managing them effectively to deliver a task within the time and budget constraints (Pales, 2017). During the preparation, teachers find it hard to reproduce and organize the modules due to less manpower in school. They needed to find ways of producing the learning materials on their capacity and means.

Teachers need training in the development and preparation of learning resources like supervisors in the time of pandemic similar to the findings of Brock et al. (2021), and Al-Kiyumi and Hammda (2020).

Another problem experienced by the teachers was difficulty in communicating with the parents and students. Teachers were not provided with devices for communication. They used their own money to buy devices and internet connections to reach their

students. Also, they experienced the problems in retrieval of outputs wherein some students failed to return the modules and submit outputs on time. Despite the problem they experienced, they need support from their supervisors. Supervisors need to give regular and adequate support to teachers on professional and curriculum development and it is better to focus on academic tasks by delegating administrative tasks to other personnel (Terra, 2019). Similarly, Weerakoon (2017) said that the instructional supervision process should be implemented regularly and systematically. It is very important to identify issues encountered by supervisors and teachers in line with the school-based instructional process.

Challenges in the management of learning resources in terms of monitoring

The challenges in the management of learning resources in terms of monitoring. The students experienced less parental assistance in accomplishing their assigned learning tasks because their parents were busy with their work to support their families. Also, they experienced learning content that was hard to understand by reading only. They need someone who will teach and explain to them the learning content of the modules. Hence, they experienced some text that was not printed clearly and was hard to read. On the other hand, the parents also experienced difficulty in assisting their children to do self-paced learning because of their tight schedules to earn for leaving.

They have limited time to assist their children even though the teachers gave less assistance. The teachers experienced challenges in choosing the right topic to be included in the teacher-made learning materials appropriate to the level of understanding of the students that correspond to various learning styles. They needed to consider the diversity of the students in crafting the learning materials to make materials suitable for students with various learning needs. Also, they experienced unreturned modules from the students who failed to continue the distance learning. Unreturned modules caused allocating resources without taking account of their set will not only make tasks less efficient but can lead to frustration and confusion (Pales, 2017). However, Fahmi (2020) suggested that communication is the key to meeting the needs of the stakeholders. The schools need to consider the connectivity needed to communicate with stakeholders that the teachers may use. The teachers used to communicate with the parents and students despite limited internet capability. Monitoring is an ongoing process by which stakeholders obtain regular feedback on the progress being made toward goals and objectives. Monitoring is an important step for evaluation (Clark, 2020).

Challenges in the management of learning resources in terms of evaluation

The challenges in the management of learning resources in terms of evaluation. The students experienced challenges like hard to evaluate the learning content due to blurred print of text and pictures. Upon reading the modules, they found some missing pages that affect the continuity of their learning. Also, they experienced limited time to finish the learning activities given by the teachers because they have things to do inside their houses. On the other hand, parents also experienced challenges like receiving too many modules with some text blurred and hard-to-understand learning content for their children. Receiving too many modules produces anxiety to the student and tension especially if they cannot understand the content.

The teachers experienced a scarcity of references similar to the findings of Belizan et al. (2019) and time in preparing the modules and other learning materials. Time and resources are the common problems encountered in the management of learning resources (Bresciani, 2021). They exhausted sources to find good references in crafting the learning materials,

particularly for those subjects with no issued models from the DepEd. They felt a lack of expertise in preparing the modules since they failed to receive training in module development similar to the findings of Zhang et al. (2020). Also, they experienced the poor comprehension level of the students as shown in the submitted outputs. Students failed to follow correctly the directions or what was asked of them to accomplish.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION

The study concluded that out of the eight participating teachers, two were male and six were female, with varying levels of experience and educational attainment, ranging from bachelor's to master's degrees. The parents involved included twenty-four males and thirty-seven females, with educational backgrounds from elementary to bachelor's degrees, and the majority were unemployed. Among the students, forty-eight were male and forty-one were female, with most being from grades 11 and 12 and different educational strands. Teachers supervised learning resources by scheduling tasks, providing clear instructions, and communicating distribution and retrieval schedules. They also monitored resources through inventory management and communicated priority areas for learning activities, while evaluation was done by setting criteria, proofreading materials, and surveying students. Parents participated by organizing learning sheets, ensuring module quality, and monitoring tablet usage, while students strictly followed rules for tablet use, completed assigned tasks, and maintained module organization and quality.

Teachers' age was moderately correlated with monitoring and highly correlated with evaluation, while their educational attainment and length of service were strongly related to all management processes. Students rated monitoring and evaluation processes higher than teachers and parents. The study found no significant difference in the assessments across the three groups in terms of supervision, monitoring, and evaluation, but factors such as parents' age, sex, education, and employment status showed varying degrees of correlation with resource management.

Additionally, students' age, sex, grade level, and track/strand were moderately correlated with resource management. Challenges identified included difficulty in attending school, insufficient teacher assistance, and a lack of time to complete tasks due to restrictions during the pandemic. Parents faced challenges in supervising their children's learning, while teachers struggled with a lack of resources and communication difficulties. Monitoring challenges included limited parental assistance, hard-to-understand content, and unreturned modules, while evaluation issues involved blurred texts, missing pages, and students' poor comprehension. Teachers also faced challenges in preparing materials due to time constraints and a lack of expertise in quality assurance.

Based on the study's conclusions, several recommendations were proposed. First, the DepEd Bureau of Curriculum Delivery should ensure that learning resources are delivered ahead of time to allow teachers ample time to reproduce, critique, and evaluate their suitability for students' understanding. School administrators must also make these resources available well in advance, ideally a month or more before reproduction, to give teachers sufficient time for evaluation.

Teachers are advised to assess both prescribed and teacher-made learning resources to ensure their appropriateness for learners, while also maintaining constant communication with parents and students for better assistance. Weekly communication between teachers and students is encouraged to address any challenges during self-paced learning, utilizing technology such as social media for effective interaction. Teachers should also oversee the proper use and retrieval of learning resources to maximize their utilization. Parents are urged to allocate time to monitor their children's learning progress despite busy schedules, and they

should inspect the learning materials they receive, reporting any missing pages or blurred text to the teachers.

Parents should also contact teachers for assistance if they find the content difficult to understand. Students, on the other hand, should feel confident in reaching out to teachers through various communication platforms for help with learning difficulties. Additionally, students should check the completeness and readability of their learning resources and report any issues to the teachers. They are also reminded to be responsible for the tablets distributed for educational purposes, ensuring their proper use during synchronous and asynchronous activities. Lastly, future researchers are encouraged to replicate the study in other settings, such as elementary or junior high schools, and explore additional variables like user satisfaction, expert evaluations, and the development of learning resources to extend the scope of the research.

REFERENCES

- Acharya, S. (2022). Supervision. Economics Discussion. Retrieved from <https://www.economicdiscussion.net>
- Barik, S.K. (2020). Educational management: Concept, importance, scope, and types of management. Educational Management and Policy.
- Bashir, M. (2019). Concept of educational management.
- Belizan, M., et al. (2020). Barriers and facilitators for the implementation and evaluation of community-based interventions to promote physical activity and healthy diet: A mixed method study in Argentina. Environmental Research and Public Health International Journal.
- Bhasin, H. (2019). Controlling in management - meaning, process and examples. Marketing91.
- Bukoye, R.O. (2019). Utilization of instructional materials as tools for effective academic performance of students: Implications for counseling. Proceedings. Retrieved from <https://www.mdpi.com/journal/proceedings>
- Canas, W.P. (2017). Definition, nature, and functions of supervision. Retrieved June 16, 2019, from <https://www.pressreader.com>
- Clark, T. (2020). Quality assurance: Monitoring and evaluation to inform practice and leadership. Transformation Framework. Microsoft.
- Cook, J. (2020). Evaluating learning technology resources. Retrieved from <https://www.alt.ac.uk>
- Department of Education. (2003). DepEd Order No. 25, s. 2003: Resolving losses of textbooks. April 4, 2003.
- Department of Education. (2012). DepEd Order No. 14, s. 2012: Policy and guidelines on the proper distribution, care, recording, retrieval, and disposal of textbooks with the teacher's manuals and other instructional materials. February 10, 2012.
- Department of Education. (2015). DepEd Order No. 32, s. 2015: Adopting the Indigenous Peoples' Education Curriculum Framework. July 29, 2015.
- Department of Education. (n.d.). Learning resource portal. Retrieved March 2019, from www.lrmds.deped.gov.ph
- Dillon, N., & Sundberg, A. (2019). Back to the drawing board: How to improve monitoring of outcomes. ALNAP Paper. London: ODI/ALNAP.
- Ewegbenro, E. (2021). Concept of educational management. Retrieved from <https://www.academic.edu>
- Ezekwinsili, O. (2017). Reinventing education. Vanguard Newspaper. Retrieved June 24, 2020.
- Fahmi, S. (2020). The challenges of monitoring and evaluation in the workplace (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). American University.
- Fisher. (2018). Educational administration - theory research and practice. New York: Random House.

Management for learning resources for Senior High School in an integrated high school: basis for management handbook

- Flynn, A. (2019). What is non-print? Retrieved from <https://www.greenhead.net>
- Glasgow Education Services. (2018). Monitoring of teaching and learning. Retrieved from <https://www.snct.org.uk>
- Guru, D. (2021). Management process: Definition, features, and functions. UpGrad. Retrieved from <https://www.upgrad.com>
- Hansen, B. (2018). What is resource management and why is it important? Wrike Inc.
- Ijaduola, K. (2017). Decision-making strategies for effective crisis management among Nigerian school principals (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Ibadan.
- Kashap, D. (2021). Educational management: Meaning, definition, and types. Your Article Library.
- Macadatar, A.P. (2020). Six leadership qualities to improve school management. Retrieved from <https://www.caraga.deped.gov>
- Mansighka, A., & Negi, S. (2021). What is resource management and its importance? Saviom.
- Melesse, Z. (2017). The practices and challenges of instructional supervision in primary schools of Lideta Subcity, Addis Ababa City Administration (Unpublished master's thesis). Addis Ababa University.
- Ngole, D.M., & Mkulu, D.G. (2021). The role of school head's supervision in improving quality of teaching and learning: A case of public secondary schools in Ilemela District, Mwanza, Tanzania. *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences*, 6(1).
- Oke, E.B. (2016). Influence of early childhood instructional supervision on caregivers' effectiveness in Federal Capital Territory centers, Abuja, Nigeria. *International Journal for Cross-Disciplinary Subjects in Education*, 7(1), 2682-2692.
- Osakwe, R.N. (2016). Principal's quality assurance techniques for enhancing secondary school quality education in the 21st century. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Educational Research and Policy Studies*, 7(2), 176-180.
- Otieno, F.A. (2019). The roles of monitoring and evaluation in projects.
- Pales, S. (2017). The biggest challenges you need to solve for effective resource management. *Tempus Resources*.
- Panchal, M. (2021). The benefits and importance of resource management. Retrieved from <https://www.quickscrum.com>
- Pattar, V. (2021). What is monitoring? *M&E Studies*.
- Rice, M.F., & Ortiz, K.R. (2021). Evaluating digital instructional materials for K to 12 online and blended learning. *TechTrends*, 65, 977-992.
- Sari, I., Ulgu, S., & Unal, S. (2022). Materials evaluation and development: Syllabus, setting, and learner needs. *International Journal of Teaching and Education*, 2(2).
- Saskatchewan Ministry of Education. (2020). Learning resources evaluation guidelines.
- Sattler, C., et al. (2021). Scaling barriers to ensure program evaluation.
- Sooksomchitra, A. (2020). Supervision state of professional experience practice in faculty of education, Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University. In *International Academic Multidisciplinary Research Conference in Cape Town, South Africa* (pp. 35-39).
- Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization Regional Center for Educational Innovation and Technology. (n.d.). e-IMPACT implementation guidebook.
- St. Olaf College. (2020). Reviewing instructional materials: Peer reviews of teaching.
- Stinchfield, T.A., Hill, N.R., & Bowers, R. (2019). Integrative reflective model of group supervision: Practicum student's experiences. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 58(2), 141-157.

Suleiman, Y., Ijaya, N.Y.S., Ishola, M.A., & Okwara, U.J. (2020). Issues and challenges facing supervision of secondary education in Nigeria in the 21st century. *Journal of Educational Leadership in Action*, 7(1).

Townsend, S. (2022). What is resource management and why is it important? Retrieved from <https://www.planreview.com>

Websites