International Journal of Scientific Multidisciplinary Research (IJSMR)
Vol.1, No.4, 2023: 331-346

Expediting Sustainable Implementation of Safety Measures and Risk Reduction Management

Edwin Jo M. Jardin[1*], Jennifer B. Carillo[2]
[1]Consolatrix College of Toledo City, Inc, Toledo City, Cebu
[2]Department of Math and Sciences College of Arts, Sciences and Education, Cebu Technological University Barili Campus
Corresponding Author: Edwin Jo M. Jardin edjoyjardin87@gmail.com

A R T I C L E I N F O

Keywords: Administration and Supervision, Descriptive Research, Safety Management Systems, Safety First, Toledo City

Received : 12 March
Revised : 20 April
Accepted: 25 May

A B S T R A C T

This study assessed the implementation of safety measures and risk reduction management in Consolatrix College of Toledo City, Inc., Cebu. This study determined the respondents' age, gender, highest educational attainment, length of years of involvement in CCTC, safety trainings attended.This study assessed the implementation of safety measures, provision of safety facilities and trainings. This study also analyzed the attitude of the respondents towards the school's implementation of safety management. The findings were taken from 75 respondents composed of 5 administrators, 10 teachers, employees, parents and 40 students. A descriptive research design was used. This study revealed that most of the respondents were adults, female, have at least baccalaureate degree, have been connected to CCTC for more than 5 years and have attended safety trainings. Safety measures were implemented. However, the giving of penalties for breaking safety rules was observed to have less extent. Safety facilities were available and safety trainings were also provided. Still, the provision of adequate budget for safety education was in less extent. The respondents have positive attitude towards the implementation of safety management systems

DOI: https://doi.org/10.55927/ijsmr.v1i4.3474
E-ISSN: 2986-5042
https://journal.formosapublisher.org/index.php/ijsmr

INTRODUCTION

Schools are considered the second homes for students in the absence of their parents and are meant to be the safest place (Delos Reyes, 2019). Schools are zones of peace where the safety and well-being of students, teachers, and personnel are of utmost importance (DepEd, 2014). However, since before, schools encountered a wide variety of hazards every day (Herdman, 1995), risks that might cause damage to health, life, property, or any other interest of value. In fact, at this moment, the whole world is facing the COVID-19 pandemic, and the establishments, including schools, according to (Bailey, 2002) should implement comprehensive safety measures and risk reduction management. Thus, it is necessary to have safe school environments with safety measures (Glariana et al., 2015).

With the implementation of comprehensive safety measures and risk reduction management in every establishment, the ISO 45001 or the so-called "The Occupational Health and Safety Standard" mandated every workplace, including schools to establish measures on safety because it enables the institution to manage and improve their safety risks and performance (Draft, 2018).

The Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030 outlines an action to prevent new and reduce existing disaster risks, strengthening disaster risk governance to manage disaster risk, investing in disaster reduction for resilience and enhancing disaster preparedness for effective response in order to achieve reduction of disaster risk and losses in lives, livelihoods and health of communities and countries over the next 15 years (UN Sendai, 2015)

The ultimate aim of this research is to study the implementation on safety measures and risk reduction management in Consolatrix College of Toledo City, Inc. It focuses on the definitions and understanding of school safety measures and risk reduction management. It also includes the assessment of the overall impact of safety measures in the school. Lastly, this study is beneficial to schools because emergencies can happen at any time and by implementing safety measures it can safe guard the lives and properties of the institutions.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Historically, there were some legal bases that focused in safeguarding the lives and properties of every institution such as schools in the Philippines. Specifically, Section 7 of PD 1566 dated June 1978 which aim is to strengthen and to adopt measures, plans and programs for Philippine disaster control capability and preparedness. Also, in EO No. 159 s 1968 it was mandated that all educational institutions must establish their respective disaster control organization. Also, it was stated in the 1987 Philippine Constitution Article 2 s.13 that it is the ultimate responsibility of the government to recognize the role of youth in nation-building and shall promote and protect their physical, moral, spiritual and social well-being. In this sense, providing a safe school is both a legal and moral responsibility of the Department of Education (Delos Reyes, 2019). The Philippine Department of Education (DepEd) through their Educational Facilities Manual 2010 always ensure that safety equipment is present and functioning properly in every school (Department of Education,

2010). Also, DepEd has started to mainstream disaster risk reduction into the education sector in both public and private educational institutions (DO No 55 Series of 2007.(DRRM in School System And Implementation of Programs and Relative Therefor, 2007). Eventually, in the year 2010 DepEd continue to strongly prioritize the safety of the school and created the so called Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Office (DRRMO) as the focal point in planning, implementing, coordinating and monitoring activities related to the occurrence of any incident or accidents happen in the school premises (DRRMS Strategic Plan & Achievements, n.d.).

Accordingly, the Republic Act No. 10121, entitled "Philippine Disaster Risk Reduction and Management (DRRM) Act of 2010 and the DO 50, S. 2011, "Creation of Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Office (DRRMO)" that mandates all schools both private and public to institutionalize the culture of safety at all levels, to recommend policy actions, and propose programs/projects, which will mitigate and reduce the impact of disasters or accidents to schools, learners and properties.

The DepEd Order No. 55 of 2007 a.k.a. "Prioritizing the Mainstreaming of Disaster Risk Reduction Management in the School System" wherein building schools, nations and communities resilient to disaster and implementation of Safe Schools Programs relative to disaster risk reduction efforts is one of the objectives such as the conduct of Earthquake Drill and up-to-date monitoring and usage of safety facilities and equipment (DO No 55 Series of 2007.(DRRM in School System And Implementation of Programs and Relative Therefor, 2007).

The DepEd Memorandum No. 96 of 2019 from Lapu-Lapu City, Cebu Division entitled "Ensuring Children Safety in Schools" mandates that all safety measures that the schools deem necessary to achieve the purpose of this Memorandum shall be implemented such as installation of CCTV in school premises, and if possible the schools are to request from their respective barangays an augmentation of police or tanod visibility in the area for safety.

It is important to implement a safety policies and regulations such as the provision of safety measures that covers the physical as well as emotional safety of the people in the institution (Vallinkoski & Koirikivi, 2020). However, according to Valonen, (2012) that safety management systems in schools are not beneficial if they remain unfulfilled in the everyday practices of the schools.

School safety is a complicated matter (McKenna, 2019). Every schools has guidelines that govern safety and risk reduction, but effective implementation takes time and careful planning. In safety, we need to look at our facilities and equipment. We need to collaborate with law enforcement and emergency responders, and we need to train our constituents on how to run drills and implement safety and security protocols (Joe McKenna, 2019).

This study focused on the school safety and one of the strategies that schools have used to prevent the potential risk is the implementation of a variety of school safety measures (Fisher et al., 2019). The effective implementation of risk and accident prevention techniques such as the provision of safety measures and risk reduction management is necessary to meet and ensure the safety and development of the personnel and the institution (Afkinich & Klumpner, 2018).

Thus, in order to ensure safety and security in schools safety measures and risk reduction management must be met (Fagihi, 2018).

By adopting a comprehensive approach to addressing school safety focusing on prevention, intervention, and response, schools can increase the safety and security of students and the institution at large (Bailey, 2002).

In this manner, the schools in the Philippines where mandated by the DepEd to ensure that safety measures and risk reduction management should apply at all times. Numerous policies implemented by DepEd such as the Republic Act No. 10121, entitled "Philippine Disaster Risk Reduction and Management (DRRM) Act of 2010 and the DO 50, S. 2011, "Creation of Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Office (DRRMO)" that mandates all schools both private and public to institutionalize the culture of safety at all levels (DRRMS Strategic Plan & Achievements, n.d.), the DepEd Order No. 55 of 2007 a.k.a. "Prioritizing the Mainstreaming of Disaster Risk Reduction Management in the School System" wherein building schools should be resilient to all disasters and implementation of Safe Schools Programs (DO No 55 Series of 2007.(DRRM in School System And Implementation of Programs and Relative Therefor, 2007), and lastly the DepEd Memorandum No. 96 of 2019 from Lapu-Lapu City, Cebu Division entitled "Ensuring Children Safety in Schools" mandates that all safety measures that the schools deem necessary to achieve through the enforcement of safety facilities and programs.

METHODOLOGY

Design

The researcher used descriptive research design and quantitative method, through on-line and face-to-face survey. The data from the survey were tallied and analyzed using weighted mean and percentage as basis for interpretations and conclusions.

Flow of the Study

The flow of the study followed the I-P-O model composed of the three major parts which were the input, process, and output as shown in Figure 2.

The first box was the input part which includes the profile of school administrators, teachers, staff and maintenance employees, parents, and students. This part also includes the assessment and attitude of the respondents towards the implementation of safety measures and risk reduction management in CCTC. The second box includes the processes involve in the study. This includes the approval of transmittal letter to the head of the school and the respondents, gathering, tabulation, presentation, analysis of data and interpretation of results. Lastly, the third box represents the output of this study which was the development of enhanced safety measures and risk management plan to prevent and mitigate the possible occurrence of accidents in the school.

Environment

The research environment of the study was in the Consolatrix College of Toledo City, Inc. (CCTC) located in Magsaysay Hills, Poblacion Toledo City, Cebu, Philippines 6038. It was located 54 kilometers south of Cebu City. It was a Catholic institution owned and managed by the Congregation of the Augustinian Recollect (AR) Sisters. The Consolatrix College of Toledo City, Inc. formerly

known as Consolatrix Academy started to operate in 1960. It was a sectarian institution that offers the following curricular programs: Nursery, Elementary Education, Junior High School, Senior High School and Tertiary Level offering Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEED), Bachelor of Secondary Education (BSED) major in Mathematics, Science and English, Bachelor of Science in Computer Science (BSCS), Bachelor of Science in Information Technology (BSIT), Bachelor of Science in Entrepreneurship (BS Entrep), Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management (BSHM) and Associate in Computer Technology (ACT).

The school had granted a Level 2 accreditation by the Philippine Accrediting Association of Schools Colleges and Universities (PAASCU). Lastly, CCTC was one of the prestigious private Christian schools in Toledo City, Cebu with an active membership of CHED, DepEd, PEAC, CESSPA, PAASCU and the like.

Respondents

The respondents of this study were the school administrators, teachers, parents, students, staff and maintenance employees of Consolatrix College of Toledo City Inc. a.k.a. Consolatricians. The data collected were necessary for the pursuit of the research project. The purposive sampling technique was used because the respondents selected based on their purpose of the study. The distribution of the respondents is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Respondents of the Study

Respondents		Number of Respondents	Percent
School Administrators		5	7%
Teachers		10	13%
Staff and Maintenance Employees		10	13%
Parents		10	13%
Students	Elementary	10	54%
	Junior High School	10	
	Senior High School	10	
	College	10	
Total Number of Respondents		**75**	**100%**

Instruments

The research instrument used in this study was an adopted and modified survey questionnaire anchored on the objectives of the study. Survey instrument on the implementation of safety measures and risk reduction management was composed of:

Profile of the Respondents: This part is about the profile of the respondents that includes their age, gender, highest educational attainment, length of years of involvement in CCTC and safety trainings, seminars and workshops attended.

Part 1: Implementation of safety measures, policies and protocols: This part refers to the manner in which the school (CCTC) demonstrates its safety measures, policies and protocols to ensure the safety management systems of the said school.

Part 2: Availability of safety facilities and equipment: This part refers to the manner on readiness of the school (CCTC) when it comes to its safety facilities and equipment.

Part 3: Provision of safety trainings, seminars and workshops: This part refers to the manner on awareness, trainings, seminars and workshops acquired of the school (CCTC) to ensure the readiness in every risk encounter.

Part 4: Status of the availability and condition of safety facilities, equipment and manpower in CCTC. This part refers on the availability, inventory and condition of the safety facilities, equipment and manpower in CCTC.

Part 5: Attitude towards the implementation of safety measures and risk reduction management: This part refers to the respondents' attitude towards the implementation of safety measures and risk reduction management in CCTC.

Data Gathering Procedure

The researcher requested a permission and approval from the school administrators, teachers, staff, parents, and students through a letter of approval. After the letter was approved, the researcher explained the purpose of the survey before it was distributed and filled up. Also, the researcher see to it that the Parents/Guardians Consent were distributed to the students' respondents for legal permission purposes. Within a reasonable period of time, the completed questionnaires were gathered, tallied, summarized and interpreted.

Statistical Treatment of Data

The data gathered was treated and analyzed using frequency counts, percentage and weighted mean. The weighted mean and percentage were used to describe the respondents' profile, assessment and attitude towards the implementation of safety measures and risk reduction management of CCTC.

Scoring Procedure

The average weighted mean was used to describe the evaluated item. Thus, the parametric scale below was utilized for each response category.

Table 2. Implementation of Safety Measures and Risk Reduction Management Rating Scale

Weight	Range	Level of Implementation	Qualitative Descriptions
3	2.35- 3.00	Implemented	The school's safety measure and risk reduction management is implemented and has shown a continuous improvement.
2	1.68 - 2.34	Partially Implemented	The school's safety measure and risk reduction management is partially implemented.
1	1.00 - 1.67	Not Implemented	The school's safety measure and risk reduction management is not implemented.

Table 3. Availability of Safety Facilities and Equipment Rating Scale

Weight	Range	Level of Availability	Qualitative Descriptions
3	2.35 - 3.00	Available	The safety facilities and equipment are available.
2	1.68 - 2.34	Partially Available	The safety facilities and equipment are partially available.
1	1.00 - 1.67	Not Available	The safety facilities and equipment are not available.

Table 4. Provision of Trainings, Seminars and Workshops on Safety Measures and Risk Reduction Management Rating Scale

Weight	Range	Level of Provision	Qualitative Descriptions
3	2.35 - 3.00	Provided	The safety trainings, seminars and workshops are provided by the school.
2	1.68 - 2.34	Partially Provided	The safety trainings, seminars and workshops are partially provided by the school.
1	1.00 - 1.67	Not Provided	The safety trainings, seminars and workshops are not provided by the school.

Table 5. Performance of Safety Facilities and Equipment Rating Scale

Weight	Range	Level of Performance	Qualitative Descriptions
3	2.35 - 3.00	Excellent	The safety facilities, equipment and manpower performs excellently in the school.
2	1.68 - 2.34	Satisfactory	The safety facilities, equipment and manpower performs satisfactorily in the school.
1	1.00 - 1.67	Fair	The safety facilities, equipment and manpower performs fairly in the school.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The age of the respondents is significant to gain valuable details for the analysis of their assessment in the implementation of the safety measures and risk reduction management in CCTC. Age entails the maturity of the respondents and their knowledge about the school's safety policies. The respondents' age was investigated in the study, and specific data about the age of the respondents is presented in Table 7.

Table 7. Age

Age Range	Administrators		Teachers		Staff and Maintenance Employees		Parents		Students	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Above 59 years old	3	60%	1	10%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%
50-59 years old	2	40%	1	10%	3	30%	2	20%	0	0%
40-49 years old	0	0%	2	20%	1	10%	3	30%	0	0%
30-49 years old	0	0%	2	20%	2	20%	4	40%	0	0%
20-29 years old	0	0%	3	30%	3	30%	1	10%	10	25%
16-19 years old	0	0%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	10	25%
10-15 years old	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	20	50%
TOTAL	5	100%	10	100%	10	100%	10	100%	40	100%

Table 7 shows the age range of the respondents who took part in the completion of the questionnaires of this study. The majority or 60% of the school administrators belong to the older age group that is 60 years old and above, while the minority or 40% of them belong to the age group 50-59 years old. This means that school administrators were represented mainly by senior citizens, indicating that senior citizens are the least victimized and exhibit the most fear of accident. Older people tend to experience fewer workplace injuries than their younger colleagues, and this may be because of experience gathered from years in the workplace or factors such as increased caution and awareness of relative physical limitations (National Institute for Occupational, Safety and Health, 2015). As people grow older, their chances of being victims of accidents and risks decrease dramatically (City of Maple Valley, 1997).

Table 7, also shows that 30% or most of the teachers belong to age group 20-29 years old, 20% of them belong to age group 30-39 years old, 20% of them belong to age group 40-49 years old, 10% of them belong to age group 50-59 years old, 10% belong to age 19 years old and below, and 10% belong to age 60 years old and above. It is clear that the teachers in CCTC were represented mainly by people who are in their prime working lives or refers to us as a working age population (OECD Data, 2021). They tend to have awareness and follow the safety measures in the said institution. In this sense, they are not vulnerable for any possible risks because they are mindful on the implications in following institutional safety measures.

As shown in Table 7, 30% of the staff and employees belong to the age group 20-29 years old, 30% of them are 50-59 years old. This is followed by age group 30-39 years old with 20%, age group of 40-49 years old and 60 years old and above with only 10%, and none is employed with the age of 19 years old and below. This

means that some of them belong to those in their young adulthood age (Erikson, 2020). Thus, the potential of exposure to accidents is high, had riskier attitudes, and had significantly lower cognitive risk perceptions, they also had lower affective risk perceptions (i.e., they were less worried) and comparatively optimistic about their risk (Probst et.al, 2019). Hence, as for safety, they should always be mindful in all their doings to prevent from potential occurrence of accidents since this age group are vulnerable in risk.

In Table 7, age group 30-39 years old dominates the portion of parents with 40% followed by the age 40-49 years old with 30%, 20% were from age 50-59 years old and 10% from age 20-29 years old respectively. It is clear that most of the parents in CCTC are in early middle age (M L Medley, 1980). Furthermore, they are aware on the importance of following the school's safety measures since at this ages they already know the impact of safety management in the area.

Lastly, Table 7 shows that a large number or 45% of students belong to age group 16-19 years old because this is the age group for both senior high schools and some from college students, while 30% belong to age group 20-29 years old and 25% of students belong to age group 10-15 years old. No student more than 29 years old. This implies that the CCTC student population is mostly represented by students in their adolescent period (Cherry, 2021) and this age group consider in those just enter the labour market. Thus, some of these students have knowledge about the safety measures and policies in the said institution and can follow these safety measures.

Gender

The gender of the respondents is essential because it enables the researcher to ensure that all gender types are represented and can assess the implementation of the safety measures and risk reduction management in CCTC. Thus, recognizing diversity, including gender differences, in the workforce such as schools is vital in ensuring the safety and health of both men and women individual. For safety policies and prevention strategies to be effective for both women and men this dimension needs to be taken into account and such policies must be based on more accurate information about the relationship between health and gender roles (International Labour Office, 2013). Specific data about the gender of the respondents are presented in Table 8.

Table 8. Gender

Gender	Administrators		Teachers		Staff and Maintenance Employees		Parents		Students	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Female	4	80%	5	50%	5	50%	8	80%	30	75%
Male	1	20%	5	50%	5	50%	2	20%	10	25%
TOTAL	5	100%	10	100%	10	100%	10	100%	40	100%

Table 8 shows that more female school administrators comprise 80% of them than male school administrators comprising only 20% of them. This implies that the school administrators in CCTC were mostly represented by female

wherein they are often presumed to be lighter, safer and less hazardous to occupational injuries as well as illness compare to male (International Labour Office, 2013). In general, women are more concerned about their safety and take more safety precautions than men (Logan et.al, 2017). Moreover, when it comes to safety, it is important to recognize the implication of safety management in all tasks that we do regardless of individual gender identities and sexual preferences.

This table shows that there is an equal number of men and women among teachers, staff, and employees who took part in this study. Both gender are exposed to different workplace environments and different types of risks in their respective areas (European Agency for Safety and Health at Work, 2003). Therefore, both women and men can face significant risks at work if they take for granted the importance of safety management.

Table 8 also shows that a large portion of parents and students who took part in this study are female. As for safety, people who have been more experienced safety and health professionals tended to be male (NSC Safety and Heath, 2016). In addition, women are more at risk of workplace accident than men, according to data from both ASSP and the National Safety Council (NSC). In this sense, the best way to protect every individual in the schools for instance, is to create a safety management systems that empowers both women and men to be ready and prepared in any hazards, participate in regular safety training and adhere to institution safety regulations.

Highest Educational Attainment

The highest educational attainment of the respondents is essential to this study to examine their learning abilities, characteristics, and educational background as they assess the implementation of the safety measures and risk reduction management in CCTC. Specific data about respondents' educational background are presented in Table 9.

Table 9. Highest Educational Attainment

Educational Level	**Administrators**		**Teachers**		**Staff and Maintenance Employees**		**Parents**	
	F	**%**	**F**	**%**	**F**	**%**	**F**	**%**
Doctorate Degree	2	40%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Doctorate Degree *(with units)*	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Educational Specialist	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Master's Degree	0	0%	2	20%	0	0%	0	0%
Master's Degree *(with units)*	2	40%	2	20%	1	10%	0	0%
Bachelor's Degree	1	20%	6	60%	9	90%	6	60%
College Level	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	40%
TOTAL	5	100%	10	100%	10	100%	10	100%

Table 9 shows that 40% of the school administrators attained Doctorate Degree, 40% of them obtained some units in a Master's Degree, and 20% of them earned Bachelor's Degree. This means that the school is managed and administered by highly qualified, competent and educated administrators. Most of them are capable of doing the best practices on safety and possesses the most compliant behavior with safety procedures because they can understand easily the importance of safety in the schools (Salminen, 2009). In this table, it also shows that 60% or most of the teachers attained Bachelor's Degree, 20% of them attained Master's Degree and 20% of them obtained some units in Master's Degree. Also, majority of the staff and employees earned Bachelor's Degree with 90% and 10% of them attained few units in Master's Degree. Also, 60% of the parents attained Bachelor's Degree and 40% of the parents attained College Level. This also indicates that teachers and parents are educated and can understand the impact of having safety management systems in the schools, that may result and benefit eventually to a safer environment.

Safety Trainings, Seminars and Workshops Attended

The respondents' trainings, seminars and workshops related to safety awareness and policies is also important in this study to determine if the respondents possess knowledge and skills in safety education so that they can objectively assess the implementation of the safety measures and risk reduction management in CCTC. The respondents' trainings, seminars and workshops on these topics is presented in Table 10.

Table 10. Safety Trainings, Seminars and Workshops Attended

Safety Trainings, Seminars and Workshops	**Adminis-trators**		**Teachers**		**Staff and Maintenance Employees**		**Parents**		**Students**	
	F	**%**	**F**	**%**	**F**	**%**	**F**	**%**	**F**	**%**
Attended	4	80%	8	80%	7	70%	6	60%	18	45%
Not Attended	1	20%	2	20%	3	30%	4	40%	22	55%
TOTAL	5	100%	10	100%	10	100%	10	100%	40	100%

Table 10 shows that most school administrators, teachers, non-teaching employees, and parents attended various safety trainings, seminars, and workshops such as Basic First Aid and Fire & Earthquake Drill. This means that they were acquired safety knowledge and skills that can result to improved problem-solving and analytical skills, and enhanced hazard awareness (Clarke and Flitcroft, 2013). Therefore, the majority of them were considered as knowledgeable, well-trained and prepared on safety and risk management. Also, this serves as one of the requirements for those persons holding positions, employees, or safety providers to undergo specific safety training. However, only 20% - 40% of them have no engagement on these safety activities. On the other hand, most of the students didn't have a chance to participate any safety related trainings, seminars and workshops such as Fire and Earthquake Drill. This implies that only few student have awareness on safety measures. Lack of awareness on

safety measures may affect individuals' safety and security in the institution (Serpe, 2011). In addition, safety trainings, seminars and workshops can have a significant long term impact to the schools' safety culture, when implemented in line with best practices that the schools can provide.

As to school administrators' profile, 60% of them are more than 58 years old, 80% of them are female, 40% of them already attained Doctorate Degree and 40% have few units in Master's Degree, and 80% of the school administrators have attended various safety trainings, seminars and workshops. As to teachers' profile, 30% of them belong to the age group 20 -29 years old, 50% of them were female and male respectively, 60% of them attained Bachelor's Degree and 80% of them already attended various safety trainings, seminars and workshops. As to staff and maintenance employees' profile, 30% of them belong to the age group 20-29 years old and 50-59 years old respectively, 50% of them were female and male, 90% of them attained Bachelor's Degree, and 70% of them already attended various safety trainings, seminars and workshops. As to parents' profile, 40% of them belong to the age range of 30-39 years old, 80% of them were female, 60% of them attained Bachelor's Degree, 60% of them already attended various safety training/s, seminars and workshops. In addition, when it comes to the parent's occupational profession 60% of them were teachers and 40% of them involved in the school as an active parents for 11-15 years. Lastly, as to students' profile, majority with 45% of them belong to the age range of 16-19 years old, 75% of them were female, 60% of them did not attended yet various safety trainings, seminars and workshops, and 40% of them were studying in the school for 11-15 years.

All the respondents believed that the school implemented the orientation on safety protocols before the start of classes, safety policies and regulations, and a policy of zero tolerance for unsafe acts. All the respondents, except the parents, perceived that school gives rewards for individual that possess good practices on safety management. All the respondents, except the students, perceived that school partially implemented the penalties for breaking a safety rule and was observed as the least extend in this category.

All of them also believed that CCTV cameras, security personnel, safety signages and cautions, fire extinguishers, building's emergency evacuation plan fence around the school premises, and secured gates were available. However, all the respondents, except the students, said that safety facilities and equipment were partially available, updated and meet all safety standards were available.

Moreover, all respondents believed that the school provided up-to-date training on how to handle emergency situations, knowledge of safety hazards, health/safety education, emergency preparedness plan, and adequate budget for safety trainings, seminars, workshops. All the respondents, except the staff and maintenance employees, perceived that the school the provision of knowledge of safety hazards, health/safety education and adequate safety budget for trainings were partially provided. Also, the parents and students perceived that the provision of up-to-date training on how to handle emergency situations were partially provided respectively and was observed as the least extend in this category.

All school administrators, teachers, and non-teaching employees observed that the school has excellent safety facilities, equipment and manpower. Most of the parents' perceived that some the safety facilities and resources were excellent except for the medical kit, safety PPE's, emergency vehicle, and safety cabinet/room. On the other hand, students observed that some of these safety facilities and equipment were satisfactorily available such as anti-slip tape and emergency vehicle and considered as the least extend in this category.

Lastly, all respondents' strongly agreed that the school implemented the safety measures and risk reduction management, such as effective implementation of safety measures and its importance, obeying CCTC safety measures, practicing safety work habits, safety as top priority in school, awareness of safety issues/violations, commitment in following safety regulations, knowledge in using the safety facilities/equipment and having a strong safety management in the school.

CONCLUSIONS

Successful implementation of safety measures and risk reduction plans are determined by the institution's implementation of safety measures, availability of safety facilities and equipment, and provision of safety trainings, seminars and workshops. Safety management systems, safety resources, as well as the performance and commitment of the people, are important in keeping the safety and security of people in the school. The strict implementation of safety measures and risk reduction management can prevent accidents, illness and losses. Thus, effective and well-implemented safety and risk management is not only an asset of the school but an integral obligation in promoting a safe and comfortable learning environment.

REFERENCES

Ackland, I. (2010). The ABC ' s of Safety – for Safety Management Systems.

Afkinich, J. L., & Klumpner, S. (2018). Violence prevention strategies and school safety. Journal of the Society for Social Work and Research, 9(4), 637–650. https://doi.org/10.1086/700656

Avdija, A. (2020). SCHOOL VIOLENCE : EXAMINING THE EFFECTS OF SOCIO- ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS AND SCHOOL SECURITY MEASURES ON VIOLENT AND NON-VIOLENT SCHOOL VIOLENCE : EXAMINING THE EFFECTS OF SOCIO- ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS AND SCHOOL SECURITY MEASURES ON VIOLENT AND NON-VIOLENT. February 2014.

Bailey, K. A. (2002). Safe and Secure: Guides to Creating Safer Schools.

Basabe, P. (2013). Hyogo Framework for Action 2005–2015. In Encyclopedia of Earth Sciences Series (Issue January 2005, pp. 508–516). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-4399-4_180

Bastidas, P., & Petal, M. (2012). Assessing school safety from disasters. A global baseline report. ISDR Thematic Platform for Knowledge and Education, 103.

DeAngelis et al. (2019). and School Climates in Indiana Working Paper 2019-2 ARE CHOICE SCHOOLS SAFE SCHOOLS ? A Cross-Sector Analysis of K – 12 Safety Policies and School Climates in Indiana. April.

Delos Reyes, Z. M. A. (2019). Assessment of School Critical Safety Concerns. Ioer International Multidisciplinary Research Journal (Iimrj), 25(1), 25–35. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.2595226

Department of Education. (2010). Educational Facilities Manual - Handbook on Educational Facilities - Integrating Disaster Risk Reduction in School Construction. In Physical Facilities and Schools' Engineering Division.

DRRMS Strategic Plan & Achievements, (testimony of DepEd).

DO No 55 Series of 2007.(DRRM in School System And Implementation of Programs and Relative Therefor, 1 (2007) (testimony of DepED).

Draft, F. (2018). Update on the new standard ISO 45001. February 2016.

Fagihi, Y. A. (2018). The Level of Awareness of Safety Measures Practiced in School Laboratories among Pre-Service Science Teachers at Najran University. Journal of Educational Issues, 4(1), 107. https://doi.org/10.5296/jei.v4i1.12908

Feng, Y. (2013). Effect of safety investments on safety performance of building projects. Safety Science, 59(July), 28–45. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2013.04.004

Fisher, B. W., Mowen, T. J., & Green, B. (2019). Adolescents ' Experiences of Victimization. 47(6), 1221–1237. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-018-0818-5.School

Glariana, C. E., Nick, &, & Solar, J. B. (2015). Status of School Safety and Security among Elementary Schools in the Fifth Class Municipality. Part I Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, 3(5), 10–18.

Herdman, 1995. (1995). Risks to Students in School. Risks to Students in SChool, September.http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=ED399669&lang=ja&site=ehost-live

Hosseinian, S. S., & Torghabeh, Z. J. (2012). Major Theories of Construction Accident Causation Models: a Literature Review. International Journal of

Advances in Engineering & Technology, 4(2), 2231–1963.

Perumean-Chaney, S. E., & Sutton, L. M. (2013). Students and Perceived School Safety: The Impact of School Security Measures. American Journal of Criminal Justice, 38(4), 570–588. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-012-9182-2

UN Sendai, J. (2015). Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030. In UN Sendai, Japan.

Vallinkoski, K. K., & Koirikivi, P. M. (2020). Enhancing Finnish basic education schools' safety culture through comprehensive safety and security management. Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy, 6(2), 103–115. https://doi.org/10.1080/20020317.2020.1720069

Scholastic Parent Staff. 6 Rules for School Safety, 2021, https://www.scholastic.com/parents/school-success/school-involvement/6-rules-school-safety.html. Accessed 4 May 2021.

National Center for Educational Statistics. Safety and Security Practices at Public Schools. https://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/ind_19.asp. Accessed 4 May 2021.

Inquirer.net. PH ranks last in Global Finance's list of world's 134 safest countries. https://globalnation.inquirer.net/197590/ph-ranks-last-in-global-finances-list-of-worlds-134-safest-countries. Accessed 15 July 2021.