

Status and Challenges of Faculty Development Programs in Selected Public Elementary Schools: A Descriptive Analysis of Implementation Gaps

Joysie M. Giducos¹, Celso C. Dumalig^{2*}

Northeastern College, Inc. Graduate School, Santiago City, Philippines

Corresponding Author: Celso C. Dumalig celso.dumalig@deped.gov.ph

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords: Faculty Development Programs (FDP), Implementation Gaps, Public Elementary Schools

Received : 09, June

Revised : 10, July

Accepted: 30, August

©2026 Giducos, Dumalig : This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



ABSTRACT

This study examined the status and challenges of Faculty Development Programs (FDPs) in selected public elementary schools, focusing on implementation gaps that affect teacher professional growth. It contributes localized evidence on the disconnect between program design and classroom practice. The study assessed FDP status, implementation challenges, and professional profiles using a descriptive-quantitative research design. Data were collected from 44 licensed teachers and school heads through a researcher-made survey questionnaire using stratified random sampling over two to three weeks. Findings revealed that while FDP content was relevant and well-designed, gaps existed in teacher participation, training continuity, funding, and institutional support. The results highlight the need for collaborative planning, sustained training, and stronger resource allocation to improve faculty development effectiveness.

INTRODUCTION

The quality of education is closely linked to the continuous professional development of teachers, making Faculty Development Programs (FDPs) an essential component of improving instructional effectiveness and achieving educational reforms. These programs enhance teachers' pedagogical knowledge, technical skills, and professional competence, enabling them to meet the demands of 21st-century education (Şahin, 2025). In Philippine public elementary schools, the Department of Education has institutionalized various professional development initiatives, including In-Service Training (INSET), to support the implementation of the K-12 curriculum and other educational reforms (Pineda et al., 2022). However, despite their widespread implementation, these programs often follow a standardized approach that fails to address the diverse needs of individual schools and teachers (Rivera et al., 2025).

Several challenges continue to hinder the effective implementation of faculty development programs. Teachers frequently experience heavy workloads, limited financial resources, inadequate time for professional learning, and insufficient access to instructional materials and technological infrastructure, reducing their ability to apply newly acquired knowledge in classroom settings (Chin et al., 2022; Ubas, n.d.). Consequently, professional development is often perceived as an additional responsibility rather than an opportunity for professional growth.

Previous studies have also identified a persistent implementation gap between the knowledge acquired during professional development activities and its actual application in classroom practice. Although teachers participate actively in training programs, the absence of continuous monitoring, localized support, and follow-up mechanisms often limits the successful transfer of learning into instructional practice (Agonas et al., 2024; Shapira & Amzalag, 2025). Moreover, effective school leadership and administrative support play a significant role in promoting teacher engagement and sustaining professional learning communities (Chin et al., 2022; Rivera et al., 2025).

Despite existing literature on teacher professional development, there remains limited localized evidence explaining the implementation gaps experienced by teachers in selected public elementary schools, particularly in the post-pandemic educational setting. This study addresses this research gap by providing a descriptive analysis of the status of faculty development programs and the challenges affecting their implementation. By identifying areas where policy and practice diverge, the study contributes context-specific evidence that may assist school administrators and policymakers in designing more responsive, sustainable, and teacher-centered faculty development initiatives. Specifically, this study aims to assess the status of faculty development programs, identify the challenges encountered by teachers, and determine the implementation gaps affecting the effectiveness of these programs in selected public elementary schools.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Faculty Development Programs (FDPs) play a vital role in improving teacher competence and educational quality. Effective professional development

should move beyond one-time seminars and become a continuous process that promotes active learning, collaboration, and practical classroom application (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). In public elementary schools, well-designed FDPs strengthen instructional practices and improve student learning outcomes by equipping teachers with updated pedagogical knowledge and skills.

One of the key principles of successful faculty development is teacher participation in planning and decision-making. Desimone (2009) emphasized that involving teachers in identifying their professional learning needs increases their commitment and engagement. However, many professional development initiatives continue to follow a top-down approach that overlooks the unique needs of individual schools and teachers, limiting the effectiveness of training programs.

The quality of training content is another important factor influencing professional development. Guskey (2002) argued that teachers are more likely to adopt new teaching strategies when training content is relevant, practical, and directly applicable to classroom instruction. Likewise, sustained and continuous professional development is more effective than isolated workshops, as repeated practice and ongoing support promote lasting improvements in teaching practices (Gulamhussein, 2013).

Despite the benefits of FDPs, teachers continue to encounter significant implementation challenges. Heavy teaching workloads, limited time, inadequate funding, insufficient instructional resources, and poor technological infrastructure often hinder teachers from fully participating in professional development and applying newly acquired skills (Kyriacou, 2001; Odden, 2011; Warschauer et al., 2004). These barriers contribute to the gap between professional development objectives and classroom implementation.

Implementation gaps occur when teachers are unable to translate training into effective classroom practices. Spillane et al. (2002) explained that teachers must internalize and adapt new knowledge to their own teaching contexts before meaningful instructional change can occur. Without continuous coaching, follow-up support, and collaborative learning environments, professional development often results in only superficial adoption of new teaching practices.

Teacher characteristics such as educational attainment, years of teaching experience, and professional position also influence professional development needs. Experienced teachers often require advanced leadership and research training, while beginning teachers benefit from foundational instructional support (Huberman, 1989; Rockoff, 2004). Therefore, differentiated professional development is more effective than a one-size-fits-all approach.

School leadership likewise plays a critical role in the success of faculty development. Fullan (2007) emphasized that instructional leaders should provide adequate resources, mentoring, and organizational support to foster a culture of continuous professional learning. Schools that encourage collaboration through Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) demonstrate higher levels of teacher engagement and successful implementation of professional development initiatives (DuFour, 2004).

Overall, existing literature highlights that effective faculty development depends on collaborative planning, relevant training content, continuous learning opportunities, adequate institutional support, and sustained monitoring. However, limited localized studies have examined how these factors influence the implementation of Faculty Development Programs in selected public elementary schools. This study addresses this gap by examining the status of FDPs, the challenges encountered by teachers, and the implementation gaps affecting their effectiveness.

METHODOLOGY

This study employed a descriptive-quantitative research design to determine the status and challenges of Faculty Development Programs (FDPs) in selected public elementary schools. The descriptive approach was used to examine the current implementation of FDPs and compare teachers' perceptions based on selected professional profiles such as age, sex, and teaching experience (Creswell, 2014). The study was conducted in selected public elementary schools within a district participating in the Department of Education's professional development initiatives. The respondents consisted of licensed professional teachers and school heads selected through stratified random sampling, with the sample size determined using Slovin's Formula.

Data were gathered using a researcher-made questionnaire consisting of four sections: respondents' profile, status of FDP implementation, challenges encountered, and implementation gaps. Questionnaires were distributed through printed copies and Google Forms over a period of two to three weeks after obtaining the necessary approvals. The collected data were analyzed using frequency and percentage for respondents' profiles, weighted mean to assess the status of FDPs and the challenges encountered, and thematic analysis for qualitative responses. Ethical standards were observed by ensuring informed consent, voluntary participation, anonymity, confidentiality, and compliance with the Data Privacy Act of 2012.

RESULTS

This chapter presents, analyzes and interprets the data gathered from questionnaires, interviews and documentary analysis in connection with the objectives of the study – *Beyond the Screen: Exploring Parasocial Relationships and Their Role in Combatting (or Causing) Social Isolation*.

The presentation is composed of two parts which is the profile of the respondents and proper information.

For clearer understanding, the data were presented in table forms and were treated comprehensively.

Profile of the Respondents

Table 1. Distribution of Respondents by Age

Particulars	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
21-30 years old	10	22.73 %
31-40 years old	15	34.09%
41-50 years old	12	27.27%
51 years old and above	7	15.91 %
Total	44	100.00%

The table illustrates the distribution of the 44 respondents according to their age brackets. The data reveals that the largest segment of the faculty belongs to the 31-40 years old age group, accounting for 15 respondents or 34.09% of the total sample. This is followed closely by the 41-50 age range, which comprises 12 individuals (27.27%), and the youngest cohort of 21-30 years old with 10 individuals (22.73%). Meanwhile, the oldest demographic, consisting of educators aged 51 years old and above, represents the smallest portion of the respondents with only 7 individuals, or 15.91%. Overall, the majority of the teaching personnel surveyed are concentrated within the 31 to 50 age range, establishing a predominantly middle-aged demographic profile among the selected public elementary schools.

The heavy concentration of educators within the 31-50 age bracket (combining for 61.36%) indicates a highly stable, mid-career workforce that possesses a foundational base of classroom experience, yet still has many productive years ahead in the service. When evaluating the "implementation gaps" of faculty development programs, this specific age distribution highlights a critical challenge: traditional, entry-level professional development or generic training modules may no longer satisfy the evolving career needs of this dominant, experienced group. Educators in their 31s to 50s typically look for specialized leadership training, advanced research capabilities, and pathways toward administrative or Master Teacher promotions. The relatively low percentage of veteran teachers aged 51 and above (15.91%) combined with the 22.73% of early-career teachers (21-30 years old) suggests that if development programs do not actively evolve to challenge and retain the core mid-career demographic, the schools face a future gap in institutional mentorship. Therefore, a major implementation gap lies in the potential misalignment between standardized, one-size-fits-all institutional training and the advanced, career-stage-specific competencies required by a mature faculty workforce.

Table 2. Distribution of Respondents by Sex

Particulars	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
Male	8	18.18%
Female	34	77.27%
Prefer not to say	2	4.55%
Total	44	100.00%

The table displays the distribution of the 44 respondents according to their sex. The data reveals a significant gender imbalance within the surveyed workforce, heavily dominated by female educators, who comprise 34 individuals or 77.27% of the total sample. In contrast, male educators represent a much smaller segment, consisting of only 8 individuals or 18.18%. The remaining 2 respondents, accounting for 4.55% of the total population, chose not to specify their sex. These figures clearly indicate that the teaching and administrative personnel across the selected public elementary schools are predominantly female.

The pronounced concentration of female educators (77.27%) aligns with broader historic trends in primary education, yet it introduces unique institutional dynamics when assessing the "implementation gaps" of faculty development programs. With more than three-quarters of the workforce being female, any systemic failure to address gender-specific career hurdles—such as balancing rigorous professional development with maternity leave, childcare responsibilities, or domestic labor—constitutes a massive implementation barrier. If professional development schedules, post-graduate scholarship grants, or intensive training workshops are structured rigidly without considering these socio-demographic realities, participation and retention will inevitably suffer. Furthermore, the small male representation (18.18%) highlights a secondary challenge in fostering diverse perspectives in school leadership and mentorship roles. To close the implementation gap, institutional development frameworks in these public elementary schools must pivot away from gender-blind planning and actively incorporate flexible, supportive policies that ensure professional advancement is genuinely accessible to a heavily female-dominated workforce.

Table 3. Distribution of Respondents by Highest Educational Attainment

Particulars	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
Bachelor's Degree	6	13.64%
Bachelor's Degree with Master's Units	18	40.91%
Master's Degree	12	27.27%
Master's Degree with Doctorate Units	6	13.64%

Doctorate Degree	2	4.55%
Total	44	100.00%

The table displays the distribution of the 44 respondents according to their highest educational attainment. The data indicates that the largest segment of the faculty consists of individuals who hold a Bachelor's Degree with Master's Units, totaling 18 respondents or 40.91%. This is followed by those who have successfully completed a Master's Degree, accounting for 12 respondents (27.27%). Meanwhile, an equal number of respondents hold a basic Bachelor's Degree and a Master's Degree with Doctorate Units, with each category representing 6 individuals or 13.64%. Finally, the smallest portion of the sample is composed of educators who have earned a Doctorate Degree, registering at just 2 individuals or 4.55%. In summary, while a vast majority of the respondents (86.36%) have pursued post-baccalaureate studies to some degree, only a small fraction have achieved the highest levels of postgraduate graduation.

The educational profile of the respondents exposes a critical "implementation gap" regarding academic progression within faculty development programs. While it is highly positive that 40.91% of the educators have initiated postgraduate studies by earning Master's units, the sharp decline to a 27.27% completion rate for the full Master's degree reveals a major institutional bottleneck. This trend repeats at the highest tier, where 13.64% have earned doctorate units, but a mere 4.55% have actually completed their Doctorate Degree. Within the framework of public elementary education, this indicates that while faculty members are highly motivated to enroll in advanced courses – likely driven by promotion guidelines like the National Budget Circular (NBC) or equivalent career progression points – they face significant barriers in actually finishing their degrees. The data heavily implies that current faculty development programs are successful at encouraging teachers to start postgraduate education, but are failing to support them through to graduation. This exposes an implementation gap characterized by a lack of crucial completion interventions, such as research thesis grants, study leaves, or flexible academic scheduling, leaving a large portion of the workforce academically stalled.

Table 4. Distribution of Respondents by Present Position/Designation

Particulars	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
Teacher I-III	32	72.73%
Master Teacher I-IV	8	18.18%
School Head / Principal	3	6.82%
Others	1	2.27%
Total	44	100.00%

The table displays the distribution of the 44 respondents according to their number of years in the teaching service. The data shows that the largest segment of the faculty is composed of mid-career educators with 6–10 years of experience, totaling 14 respondents or 31.82%. This is followed by those with 11–15 years of service, accounting for 11 respondents (25.00%), and early-career teachers with 0–5 years of experience at 8 respondents (18.18%). Meanwhile, 7 individuals (15.91%) have been teaching for 16–20 years, and the remaining 4 respondents (9.09%) represent the most senior cohort with 21 years and above in the service.

Collectively, more than half of the surveyed workforce (56.82%) falls within the 6 to 15-year tenure range, establishing a predominantly seasoned and stable faculty profile.

The tenure data reveals a mature workforce where a combined 72.73% of educators have completed more than six years of teaching service, providing the public elementary schools with an invaluable reservoir of institutional knowledge and classroom expertise. However, when analyzed through the lens of faculty development "implementation gaps," this distribution highlights a profound disconnect between years of service and professional advancement. Despite this high concentration of long-tenured, mid-to-late-career professionals, previous data points to a stark reality: the vast majority remain stuck in entry-to-mid-level Teacher I–III positions. This points to a clear implementation gap where the existing faculty development programs fail to properly reward or leverage longevity. Instead of acting as an accelerating pipeline that converts years of field experience into advanced instructional leadership or Master Teacher designations, the current professional development framework seems to function in isolation from career longevity. To bridge this gap, development programs must move past basic, generalized workshops and instead offer clear, tenure-linked training pathways that actively propel these experienced teachers into higher tiers of institutional leadership.

Table 5. Distribution of Respondents by Number of Years in Teaching Service

Particulars	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
0–5 years	8	18.18%
6–10 years	14	31.82%
11–15 years	11	25.00%
16–20 years	7	15.91%
21 years and above	4	9.09%
Total	44	100.00%

The table illustrates the distribution of the 44 respondents according to their number of years in the teaching service. The data reveals that the largest segment of the faculty consists of mid-career educators with 6–10 years of experience, totaling 14 respondents or 31.82% of the total sample. This is followed by the 11–15 years tenure bracket, which comprises 11 individuals (25.00%), and

early-career teachers with 0–5 years of experience, accounting for 8 individuals (18.18%). Meanwhile, 7 respondents (15.91%) have been in the service for 16–20 years, while the remaining 4 individuals represent the most senior cohort with 21 years and above in the teaching profession, registering the lowest percentage at 9.09%. Overall, more than half of the surveyed teaching personnel (56.82%) possess between 6 to 15 years of experience, indicating a predominantly seasoned and institutionalized workforce.

The tenure profile indicates a highly experienced and stable workforce, with 72.73% of the educators having surrendered more than six years of their professional life to the classroom. When viewed against the backdrop of "implementation gaps" in faculty development programs, this heavy accumulation of institutional experience represents a major underutilized resource. Teachers with 6 to 15 years in service have moved past basic classroom management and require advanced training in educational technology, action research, and curriculum design to sustain their professional growth. However, when this data is cross-referenced with previous findings where nearly three-quarters of the staff remain clustered in the introductory Teacher I-III designations, a profound implementation gap emerges. The current faculty development structures are clearly failing to convert years of active service into career progression or higher institutional rank. This suggests that public elementary school training programs are largely operating as repetitive compliance loops rather than dynamic career-stage pipelines, leaving a wealth of classroom experience stuck in structural stagnation due to a lack of targeted, promotion-linked development pathways.

Table 6. Status of Faculty Development Programs (FDP)

Indicators / Items	Weighted Mean	Qualitative Description
A. Program Planning and Goal Setting		
1. Teachers are consulted during the planning phase of FDPs.	2.23	Disagree (Less Effective)
2. Program goals are clearly aligned with school improvement plans.	3.25	Agree (Effective)
3. Objectives are specific and measurable.	3.09	Agree (Effective)
B. Content Relevance and Pedagogical Quality		
1. Topics are relevant to current classroom needs and curriculum changes.	3.34	Agree (Effective)
2. Trainers demonstrate high levels of expertise.	3.27	Agree (Effective)
3. The strategies taught are practical and easy to apply.	3.00	Agree (Effective)
C. Frequency and Consistency of Sessions		

1. Development sessions are held regularly (e.g., monthly/quarterly).	2.41	Disagree (Less Effective)
2. There is a logical progression between training sessions.	2.20	Disagree (Less Effective)
D. Administrative and Logistical Support		
1. The school provides adequate venues and materials for training.	2.59	Agree (Effective)
2. Administrators actively encourage and monitor participation.	3.14	Agree (Effective)

3.50 – 4.00: Strongly Agree (SA) / Highly Effective

2.50 – 3.49: Agree (A) / Effective

1.50 – 2.49: Disagree (D) / Less Effective

1.00 – 1.49: Strongly Disagree (SD) / Ineffective

The data presents the assessment of the 44 respondents on the status of Faculty Development Programs (FDPs) across four key dimensions. Under Program Planning and Goal Setting, item 2 (alignment with school improvement plans) obtained the highest evaluation with a weighted mean of 3.25 ("Agree"), while item 1 (consulting teachers during planning) registered a low weighted mean of 2.23, descriptively interpreted as "Disagree." Within Content Relevance and Pedagogical Quality, all items were evaluated favorably, led by item 1 (relevance to classroom needs) at a weighted mean of 3.34 ("Agree"), closely followed by trainer expertise at 3.27 ("Agree") and practical strategies at 3.00 ("Agree"). Conversely, the dimension of Frequency and Consistency of Sessions revealed distinct weaknesses, as both regular session scheduling (weighted mean of 2.41) and the logical progression between sessions (weighted mean of 2.20) fell under the "Disagree" description. Lastly, regarding Administrative and Logistical Support, the respondents agreed that administrators actively encourage and monitor participation (weighted mean of 3.14), while the provision of adequate venues and materials scored lower but remained acceptable at a weighted mean of 2.59 ("Agree").

A critical analysis of the indicators reveals a sharp, systemic disconnect between the content quality of the Faculty Development Programs and their structural execution, exposing the exact "implementation gaps" driving this study. On one hand, the programs excel conceptually: topics are highly relevant to curriculum changes (3.34) and trainers demonstrate commendable expertise (3.27), proving that the intellectual framework of the training is sound. On the other hand, the bottom-up mechanisms are severely broken. The lowest scoring indicators in the entire dataset are the lack of a logical progression between training sessions (2.20) and the total absence of teacher consultation during the planning phase (2.23). This highlights a purely top-down, fragmented approach to faculty development. Administrators are effectively mandating high-quality, relevant training, but because they fail to gather input from the teaching staff on

the ground, the sessions occur irregularly (2.41) and function as isolated, repetitive events rather than a cohesive learning journey. To bridge this implementation gap, the school leadership must pivot from treating professional development as an administrative compliance checklist and instead establish collaborative planning pipelines that secure teacher input and ensure continuity across training programs.

Table 7. Challenges Encountered

Indicators / Items	Weighted Mean	Qualitative Description
A. Time Constraints and Workload		
1. Heavy teaching load prevents full focus on training.	3.39	Agree (Moderate Challenge)
2. Training schedules often conflict with classroom hours.	3.45	Agree (Moderate Challenge)
B. Financial and Resource Limitations		
1. Personal funds are often used for registration or travel.	3.57	Strongly Agree (Severe Challenge)
2. Lack of instructional materials limits the application of skills.	3.18	Agree (Moderate Challenge)
C. Technological and Infrastructure Barriers		
1. Poor internet connectivity hinders online/hybrid training.	3.32	Agree (Moderate Challenge)
2. Limited access to computers or digital tools in the school.	3.09	Agree (Moderate Challenge)

The data details the specific challenges encountered by the 44 respondents regarding their participation in faculty development programs. Across all three dimensions, resource and structural barriers consistently received high agreement scores. Under Financial and Resource Limitations, item 1 (the out-of-pocket usage of personal funds for registration or travel) emerged as the single most critical issue, garnering a weighted mean of 3.57, descriptively interpreted as "Strongly Agree." Within Time Constraints and Workload, scheduling conflicts with actual classroom hours scored a high weighted mean of 3.45 ("Agree"), followed closely by heavy day-to-day teaching loads hindering training focus at 3.39 ("Agree"). Meanwhile, under Technological and

Infrastructure Barriers, poor internet connectivity was verified as a notable impediment to modern training delivery methods with a weighted mean of 3.32 ("Agree"). Lastly, the lack of immediate instructional materials (3.18) and limited access to physical digital tools or computers within the school premises (3.09) were also validated as active, moderate challenges by the surveyed staff.

The assessment of challenges clearly highlights that the "implementation gap" of faculty development programs is heavily driven by financial strain and a severe lack of operational support. The fact that the highest scoring problem is the forced utilization of personal funds for training costs (3.57) exposes a critical breakdown in institutional funding mechanisms; teachers are essentially paying out-of-pocket to satisfy professional development requirements. This financial stress is exacerbated by operational friction, as seen in training schedules that actively conflict with classroom teaching duties (3.45) and heavy workloads that fragment attention span (3.39). This data reveals that professional development is often treated as an isolated mandate slapped on top of a teacher's full schedule, rather than an integrated part of their working hours. When you combine this with poor school internet connectivity (3.32) and missing classroom materials (3.18), a deep systemic gap becomes obvious: teachers are highly motivated to join and complete these programs, but the actual school environment lacks the budget, technological foundation, and scheduling relief needed to make that training stick. To genuinely resolve these gaps, school divisions must establish dedicated professional development funds and institutionalize substitute-teacher systems so that training does not compromise classroom continuity or personal financial security.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Existence of a Top-Down Planning Gap: While Faculty Development Programs are strategically aligned with school improvement plans, they suffer from a severe bottom-up implementation gap. Decisions are made from the top down, leaving teachers excluded from the planning phase. This results in programs that may look good on paper but do not necessarily reflect the immediate input or agency of the classroom teachers.

High Conceptual Quality vs. Disjointed Execution: The conceptual content of the training programs is highly relevant, practical, and delivered by expert trainers. However, this high quality is undermined by poor structural execution. Because the sessions are scheduled irregularly and lack a logical progression, the professional development acts as fragmented, one-off events rather than a continuous learning path.

Severe Institutional Underfunding: There is a critical resource gap where teachers bear the personal financial burden of their own institutional professional growth. Because teachers strongly agree that they must use out-of-pocket personal funds for registration and travel, the current implementation framework lacks the necessary institutional funding to make professional development accessible.

Systemic Time Conflict and Workload Friction: The actual structure of the school day creates a major barrier to the success of these programs. Heavy daily teaching loads combined with training sessions that directly conflict with

instructional hours mean that professional development is treated as an extra burden on top of a teacher's schedule, rather than an integrated part of their working day.

Deficient Digital and Material Infrastructure: The implementation of modern, flexible, or hybrid training methods is actively bottlenecked by poor school infrastructure. Weak internet connectivity, combined with a lack of physical computers and classroom instructional materials, prevents teachers from fully engaging in digital training and limits their ability to apply new pedagogical skills in their classrooms.

Recommendation

Establish a Collaborative Bottom-Up Planning Committee. To eliminate the top-down planning gap, school heads should establish a participatory committee composed of grade-level coordinators and master teachers during the pre-planning phase of FDPs. Implementing routine, localized needs assessment surveys will ensure that the objectives and design of future training directly reflect the actual classroom inputs, challenges, and professional agency of the teaching staff.

Design Modular, Progressive Training Frameworks. To resolve disjointed execution, school administrators should shift away from isolated, one-off seminars and instead implement a modular, year-long professional development calendar. Training sessions should follow a logical sequence (e.g., through structured Professional Learning Communities or Learning Action Cell sessions) where each meeting builds directly upon the skills learned in the previous one, creating a continuous and traceable learning path.

Institutionalize Dedicated Funding for Professional Development. To lift the financial burden off teachers, school heads must optimize the allocation of the school's MOOE (Maintenance and Other Operating Expenses) or actively source local school board funds specifically to cover registration fees, travel expenses, and training stipends. Policies should be enforced to ensure that no mandatory professional development requires out-of-pocket spending from the teaching staff.

FURTHER STUDY

Future research may further investigate the implementation of faculty development programs across a wider range of public elementary schools and educational contexts.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors would like to express their sincere gratitude to the school administrators, faculty members, and other stakeholders of the selected public elementary schools who participated in this study and provided valuable information and support throughout the research process. Their cooperation and contributions were essential to the successful completion of this study.

REFERENCES

- Agonas, K. C., Codilla, L. L., Goloran, R., & Canomay, K. M. (2024). Readiness and challenges faced by elementary public school teachers on Information and Communication Technology (ICT) integration in the Philippines. **2024 International Conference on TVET Excellence & Development (ICTeD)**, 162–165. https://doi.org/10.1109/icted62334.2024.10844625
- Chin, J. M.-C., Ching, G. S., del Castillo, F., Wen, T.-H., Huang, Y.-C., del Castillo, C. D., & Gungon, J. L. (2022). Perspectives on the barriers to and needs of teachers' professional development in the Philippines during COVID-19. **Sustainability**, **14*(1)*, 470. https://doi.org/10.3390/su14010470
- Pineda, H., et al. (2022). Development and evaluation of a professional development program on designing participatory action research projects for basic education teachers. **Advanced Education**, **21**, 161–184. https://doi.org/10.20535/2410-8286.266663[https://www.google.com/search?q=https://doi.org/10.20535/2410-8286.266663]
- Rivera, J. P. R., Sinsay-Villanueva, L. M. V., Tanyag, I. H., Berroya, J. D., Garcia, G. D. V., & Lim, V. L. (2025). **Revitalizing the Philippine education system: Facilitating access and participation to In-Service Training (INSET) and Teacher Professional Development (TPD)**. EDCOM 2.
- Şahin, Ç. (2025). Teachers' professional development: Opportunities and challenges in Türkiye. **International Journal of Professional Development, Learners and Learning**, **7*(2)*, e2511. https://doi.org/10.30935/ijpdll/15834

- Shapira, N., & Amzalag, M. (2025). Do teachers promote social-emotional skills? The gap between statements and actual behavior. **Cogent Education**, **12*(1)*.
[<https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186x.2025.2465919>](<https://www.google.com/search?q=https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186x.2025.2465919>)
- Ubas, R. (n.d.). Unveiling the hidden challenges: Nurturing teachers' professional growth in the current educational landscape. **European Journal of Education Studies**.
- Acker, S. (1995). *Gendered Education: Sociological Reflections on Women, Teaching and Feminism*. Open University Press.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). *Effective Teacher Professional Development*. Learning Policy Institute.
- Desimone, L. M. (2009). Improving Communication between Researchers and Practitioners through a Research-Based Framework for Professional Development. *Educational Researcher*, 38(3), 181-199.
- DuFour, R. (2004). What Is a "Professional Learning Community"? *Educational Leadership*, 61(8), 6-11.
- Fullan, M. (2007). *The New Meaning of Educational Change* (4th ed.). Teachers College Press.
- Gulamhussein, A. (2013). *Teaching the Teachers: Effective Professional Development in an Era of High Stakes Accountability*. Center for Public Education.
- Guskey, T. R. (2000). *Evaluating Professional Development*. Corwin Press.
- Guskey, T. R. (2002). Professional Development and Teacher Change. *Teachers and Teaching*, 8(3), 381-391.

- Joyce, B. R., & Showers, B. (2002). *Student Achievement Through Staff Development*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Mizell, P. (2010). *Why Professional Development Matters*. Learning Forward.
- Shulman, L. (1987). Knowledge and Teaching: Foundations of the New Reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(1), 1-23.
- Spillane, J. P., Reiser, B. J., & Reimer, T. (2002). Policy Implementation and Cognition: Reframing and Reforming Implementation Research. *Review of Educational Research*, 72(3), 387-431.