

Assessing the Readiness of the Basic Education Department for Professional Learning Community Implementation: A Quantitative Analysis

JULIEBERT S. FERNANDEZ

jfernandez@spcf.edu.ph

CARLITO S. ANTONIO

CRISTEL JOY ARONDA

MARY ANN P. BERNARDO

MARCIA M. CARBUNGCO

JOSIELYN U. HERNANDEZ

KATHERINE HUET

Systems Plus College Foundation

Abstract — This study evaluates the baseline readiness of the Systems Plus College Foundation (SPCF) Basic Education Department for the implementation of a Professional Learning Community (PLC). While PLCs significantly improve instructional quality and student outcomes, successful transition requires structural and cultural shifts, necessitating a comprehensive diagnostic assessment before rollout. Anchored in a quantitative descriptive research design, the study utilized a four-point Likert scale to measure faculty perceptions across six specific core dimensions: Shared and Supportive Leadership, Shared Values and Vision, Collective Learning and Application, Shared Personal Practice, Supportive Conditions (Relationship), and Supportive Conditions (Structure). Results indicate robust foundational readiness, highlighted by strong procedural leadership, deeply internalized shared educational values, and a socio-cognitive climate rooted in interpersonal care and trust. The faculty excels in informal collaboration and the data-driven analysis of student work. Furthermore, the administration successfully provided dedicated collaborative time. However, the study identifies critical structural gaps. Although leadership is

supportive, systemic teacher autonomy and decentralized decision-making remain underdeveloped. Furthermore, while interpersonal trust is high, there is noticeable hesitancy regarding pedagogical risk-taking. Formalized peer observation structures and tangible physical or technological resources also lag behind the provided temporal supports. The study concludes that SPCF does not need to build a collaborative culture from scratch but must explicitly formalize and resource existing organic practices. It actively recommends decentralizing decision-making through autonomous teacher-led committees, institutionalizing non-evaluative peer observations, deliberately cultivating a fail-forward environment to encourage risk-taking, and reallocating necessary budget resources to upgrade modern instructional technology and collaborative workspaces efficiently.

Keywords: Professional Learning Community, Baseline Readiness, Quantitative Analysis, Educational Reform, Collaborative Culture, Teacher Autonomy

I. INTRODUCTION

Systems Plus College Foundation (SPCF), through a series of training workshops, intends to implement a Professional Learning Community (PLC) within its Basic Education Department to elevate instructional quality and student outcomes. PLCs represent a fundamental shift from isolated teaching to collaborative, practice-oriented frameworks focused on continuous improvement (Christensen, 2022). When implemented with a high degree of quality, these communities offer ongoing, job-embedded learning that significantly supports improvements in teaching practices and student learning gains (Darling-Hammond, Hyler, & Gardner, 2017). However, the transition to this collaborative model requires a critical shift in school culture, leadership, and operational structures. A primary concern is the institution's baseline readiness; without a clear assessment of existing systemic structures, PLC implementation risks becoming an exercise in superficial administrative compliance rather than a catalyst for transformative educational practice.

Educators frequently encounter structural and cultural barriers during this transition. Research indicates that forcing professional development models onto unprepared environments

often fails due to systemic obstacles such as intense teaching loads, time constraints, a lack of necessary resources, and low interpersonal trust among colleagues (Yang, Zhang, Zhou, & Ji, 2023). These hurdles must be accurately diagnosed and proactively addressed to prevent implementation failure.

Internationally, PLCs are recognized as a vital mechanism for educational reform. In the Philippines, the national government institutionalized the PLC framework through Department of Education (DepEd) Order No. 35, s. 2016, which established the Learning Action Cell (LAC) as a mandatory, school-based professional development strategy. The central goal of these LAC sessions is anchored in PLC principles, systematically shaping teachers' pedagogical knowledge, attitudes, and competencies to effectively address diverse classroom needs (Tulang, Anaviso, & Barbasan, 2023). Regionally and locally in Angeles City, public schools actively utilize LAC sessions to mitigate instructional challenges. Despite this, some teachers still report difficulties stemming from inadequate institutional support and an underdeveloped collaborative culture.

While the implementation and post-evaluation of LACs and PLCs in Philippine public schools are well-documented, there remains a distinct scarcity of empirical research measuring the multi-dimensional baseline readiness of private educational institutions in the region. Most studies evaluate collaborative frameworks post-implementation, leaving a critical diagnostic gap regarding a school's structural and cultural preparedness prior to launch.

To address this gap, this study evaluates the readiness of the SPCF Basic Education Department for formal PLC implementation. This study measures faculty perceptions across comprehensive organizational dimensions. These essential dimensions—Shared and Supportive Leadership, Shared Values and Vision, Collective Learning and Application, Shared Personal Practice, Supportive Conditions (Relationship), and Supportive Conditions (Structure)—are recognized in contemporary literature as core features necessary for a functional and sustainable PLC (Yang et al., 2023).

By analyzing these specific parameters, this study yields a detailed diagnostic profile of the department's collaborative culture. Recognizing current strengths allows the administration to leverage existing social capital, while identifying structural and leadership deficiencies offers a data-driven roadmap. Consequently, targeted interventions can be designed and deployed prior to

the full-scale rollout, ensuring that the school environment is genuinely prepared to foster and sustain a professional learning community.

II. METHODOLOGY

To effectively measure the baseline readiness of the Basic Education Department faculty at SPCF for Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), this study appropriately anchors itself in a quantitative descriptive research design. Before a school can successfully roll out a new organizational initiative, leadership needs a clear, unfiltered snapshot of current conditions. A descriptive design is essential here because it answers the "what is" rather than the "why" or "how," capturing faculty attitudes and practices without manipulating variables. As Creswell (2014) notes, descriptive research is necessary when the primary objective is to systematically and accurately describe the characteristics of a current situation or population. Because the researchers are taking an initial inventory rather than testing an educational intervention, this framework is the most logical foundation for the study.

Working within this descriptive framework, the methodology relies on a purely quantitative approach to gather objective, actionable data across the department. The primary instrument, the "PLC Readiness Assessment," breaks the complex concept of a functioning learning organization down into six core dimensions. This is a crucial structural choice; organizational readiness is rarely a single, easily measurable metric. By segmenting the assessment into distinct areas—which typically include elements like shared leadership or collective learning—the researchers can look past broad generalizations. This allows school leadership to pinpoint exact cultural strengths and specific blind spots that need to be addressed before the PLC implementation begins.

To measure these dimensions effectively, the survey employs a 4-point Likert scale ranging from 1.00 (Strongly Disagree) to 4.00 (Strongly Agree). What makes this scale particularly strong is its even number of choices, which deliberately eliminates the "neutral" option. This forced-choice design prevents respondents from sitting on the fence, requiring them to lean one way or the other and ultimately yielding much sharper baseline data. Once collected, the data is analyzed

using weighted means to determine the overall faculty consensus for each indicator, while the standard deviation measures how spread out those opinions are. Together, these statistical tools tell school leaders not just what the average teacher thinks, but whether the faculty is unified or deeply divided heading into the new transition.

Ethical Considerations

Strict ethical protocols were observed throughout the data-gathering process to ensure the absolute protection of the participants. The privacy and anonymity of the teacher-respondents were treated with paramount importance. Their identities were completely concealed, ensuring that their honest responses and individual scores would have absolutely no impact on their professional performance ratings. Furthermore, the research was conducted ethically to protect respondents' welfare without compromising the reliability of the data collected.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The empirical findings, analysis, and thematic discussion are derived from the faculty's responses to the readiness survey. To provide a systematic evaluation of the Basic Education Department's current landscape, the results are organized around the six core dimensions of a Professional Learning Community (PLC). Each of the following subsections unpacks a specific parameter—ranging from leadership dynamics to logistical frameworks—using weighted means and standard deviations to capture the faculty's collective consensus. By interpreting these statistical values against the established four-point scale, this part not only diagnoses the institution's existing collaborative strengths but also exposes the underlying structural gaps that the administration must address prior to the official PLC rollout.

TABLE 1
SHARED AND SUPPORTIVE LEADERSHIP

Statements	Mean	SD	Descriptive Interpretation
Staff members are consistently involved in discussing and making decisions about most school issues.	2.80	.78	Agree
The principal incorporates advice from staff members to make decisions.	3.26	.70	Strongly Agree
Staff members have accessibility to key information.	2.88	.71	Agree
The principal is proactive and addresses areas where support is needed.	3.35	.67	Strongly Agree
Opportunities are provided for staff members to initiate change.	2.92	.91	Agree
The principal shares responsibility and rewards for innovative actions.	3.29	.71	Strongly Agree
The principal participates democratically with staff sharing power and authority.	3.28	.72	Strongly Agree
Leadership is promoted and nurtured among staff members.	3.18	.69	Agree
Decision-making takes place through committees and communication across grade and subject areas.	3.13	.73	Agree
Stakeholders assume shared responsibility and accountability for student learning without evidence of imposed power and authority.	3.11	.69	Agree
Staff members use multiple sources of data to make decisions about teaching and learning.	3.29	.66	Strongly Agree
OVERALL WEIGHTED MEAN	3.14	0.72	Agree

The data presented in Table 1 evaluates faculty perceptions of Shared and Supportive Leadership, a crucial dimension for assessing the basic education department's readiness for a Professional Learning Community (PLC). With an overall weighted mean of 3.14 (descriptively interpreted as "Agree"), the results reflect a generally positive and supportive administrative climate. The department's most prominent strength lies in the principal's direct, democratic engagement. Faculty members "Strongly Agree" that their principal is proactive in addressing support needs (Mean = 3.35, SD = 0.67), shares responsibility and rewards for innovation (Mean = 3.29, SD = 0.71), and democratically shares power and authority (Mean = 3.28, SD = 0.72). Furthermore, the staff's robust use of multiple data sources to drive teaching decisions (Mean = 3.29, SD = 0.66) indicates a strong foundation for collaborative inquiry. Contemporary educational research emphasizes that this kind of procedurally fair, highly engaged instructional leadership is a critical prerequisite for building the relational trust necessary for PLCs to thrive (Liu & Hallinger, 2024).

However, a closer analysis of the lower-scoring statements reveals an operational gap between the principal's supportive disposition and the actual systemic empowerment of the faculty. The lowest means were recorded for staff involvement in discussing and making decisions about most school issues (Mean = 2.80, SD = 0.78) and their accessibility to key macro-level information (Mean = 2.88, SD = 0.71). Additionally, the statement concerning opportunities for staff members to initiate change (Mean = 2.92) not only scored low but also exhibited the highest standard deviation (0.91) in the dataset. This high variance suggests a significant inconsistency in how empowered different teachers feel to drive organizational change. These metrics indicate that while the school's leadership is accommodating, the structural mechanisms required to grant teachers independent, decentralized decision-making power remain underdeveloped. For collaborative frameworks to genuinely foster teacher innovation, leadership must move beyond individual principal support to cultivate robust, structural teacher autonomy (Liu, Lu, & Yin, 2022).

Ultimately, the findings from the assessment highlight an environment that is well-positioned for PLC implementation but requires targeted structural adjustments. The institution benefits immensely from a principal who models democratic leadership and a faculty already utilizing data-driven reflection. To successfully transition from a principal-supported initiative to

a self-sustaining professional community, the department must actively address these systemic barriers to collective empowerment. By decentralizing decision-making, formalizing avenues for teachers to initiate change, and ensuring equitable access to key strategic information, the administration can transform its current supportive climate into a fully realized, structurally autonomous PLC.

TABLE 2
SHARED VALUES AND VISION

Statements	Mean	SD	Descriptive Interpretation
A collaborative process exists for developing a shared sense of values among staff. vision	3.30	.66	Strongly Agree
Shared values support norms of behavior that guide decisions about teaching and learning.	3.25	.68	Strongly Agree
Staff members share visions for school improvement that have an undeviating focus on student learning.	3.33	.70	Strongly Agree
Decisions are made in alignment with the school's values and vision.	3.35	.66	Strongly Agree
A collaborative process exists for developing a shared vision among staff.	3.29	.66	Strongly Agree
School goals focus on student learning beyond test scores and grades.	3.27	.65	Strongly Agree
Policies and programs are aligned to the school's vision.	3.36	.60	Strongly Agree
Stakeholders are actively involved in creating high expectations that serve to increase student achievement	3.15	.67	Agree
Data are used to prioritize actions to reach a shared	3.22	.65	Agree
OVERALL WEIGHTED MEAN	3.28	0.66	Strongly Agree

Table 2 displays faculty perceptions of "Shared Values and Vision" within the Basic Education Department. This specific dimension evaluates how effectively the institution's core educational beliefs are collaboratively developed, communicated, and utilized to guide daily instructional practices. The overall weighted mean of 3.28, accompanied by a descriptive interpretation of "Strongly Agree," indicates a highly unified and focused organizational culture. Educators within this department report a profound alignment between institutional policies, daily decision-making, and an unwavering commitment to improving student learning outcomes.

A detailed analysis of the table reveals that the highest-rated indicators revolve heavily around structural and operational alignment. Specifically, faculty strongly agreed that "Policies and programs are aligned to the school's vision" (Mean = 3.36, SD = 0.60) and that "Decisions are made in alignment with the school's values and vision" (Mean = 3.35, SD = 0.66). These findings are highly significant because a well-established shared vision promotes organizational learning by providing a clear picture of the desired future, effectively guiding the entire school community toward a common educational goal. Furthermore, the high rating for staff sharing visions that maintain an "undeviating focus on student learning" (Mean = 3.33, SD = 0.70) demonstrates that the department has successfully internalized a core tenet of effective Professional Learning Communities (PLCs). The sustained, collective focus on student learning, driven by a collaborative culture, is widely considered an essential element for enhancing instructional effectiveness and sustaining teachers' professional motivation. Although the item regarding external stakeholder involvement in creating high expectations scored slightly lower than the rest (Mean = 3.15, SD = 0.67, "Agree"), the overall results still reflect a highly positive, democratic environment that is crucial for comprehensive school development and effective PLC practices.

In conclusion, the data explicitly demonstrates that the Basic Education Department possesses a profound structural and cultural readiness for formal PLC implementation. The faculty does not view the school's vision as mere administrative rhetoric; instead, it serves as a functional, daily compass for programmatic and pedagogical decisions. To maximize this organizational strength as the PLC matures, school leaders should capitalize on this deep internal alignment by gradually increasing broader external stakeholder involvement, ensuring that parents and the wider community are as actively integrated into these high academic expectations as the internal teaching staff.

TABLE 3
COLLECTIVE LEARNING AND APPLICATION

Statements	Mean	SD	Descriptive Interpretation
Staff members work together to seek knowledge, skills and strategies and apply this new learning to their work.	3.35	.66	Strongly Agree
Collegial relationships exist among staff members that reflect commitment to school improvement efforts	3.21	.68	Agree
Staff members plan and work together to search for solutions to address diverse student needs.	3.24	.73	Agree
A variety of opportunities and structures exist for collective learning through open dialogue	3.13	.69	Agree
Staff members engage in dialogue that reflects a respect for diverse ideas that lead to continued inquiry.	3.18	.68	Agree
Professional development focuses on teaching and learning.	3.35	.65	Strongly Agree
School staff members and stakeholders learn together and apply new knowledge to solve problems.	3.27	.67	Strongly Agree
School staff members are committed to programs that enhance learning.	3.32	.62	Strongly Agree
Staff members collaboratively analyze multiple sources of data to assess the effectiveness of instructional practices	3.31	.58	Strongly Agree
Staff members collaboratively analyze student work to improve teaching and learning.	3.41	.59	Strongly Agree
OVERALL WEIGHTED MEAN	3.28	0.66	Strongly Agree

Table 3 evaluates the "Collective Learning and Application" dimension of the institution's readiness for a Professional Learning Community (PLC). This specific parameter measures the extent to which staff members cooperatively seek new pedagogical knowledge, share instructional strategies, and translate these insights into daily classroom practice. With an overall weighted mean of 3.28 and a descriptive interpretation of "Strongly Agree," the findings reveal a highly positive disposition toward shared professional growth. Because collective learning is the critical bridge that connects an institution's abstract vision to tangible student outcomes, this strong baseline indicates that the department is well-prepared for task-driven collaboration.

A granular look at the dataset highlights that the faculty is currently most comfortable and proficient with the concrete, analytical tasks required within a PLC. The highest-rated statements demonstrate that staff members collaboratively analyze student work to improve teaching (Mean = 3.41, SD = 0.59) and actively work together to seek out and apply new knowledge and skills (Mean = 3.35, SD = 0.66). The emphasis on collaborative data analysis is a foundational pillar of modern educational reform; when teachers jointly utilize student performance metrics to drive their pedagogical choices, they significantly elevate both their own instructional efficacy and overall student academic achievement. The firm consensus that professional development focuses squarely on teaching and learning (Mean = 3.35) validates that the faculty's current collaborative mindset is correctly oriented toward practical, classroom-level impact.

Despite these strengths in technical collaboration, the lower-scoring indicators expose a slight disparity regarding the relational structures necessary to sustain deep inquiry. Statements focused on the environment of collaboration—such as having a variety of opportunities and structures for open dialogue (Mean = 3.13), engaging in dialogue that reflects respect for diverse ideas (Mean = 3.18), and fostering collegial relationships committed to school improvement (Mean = 3.21)—only secured an "Agree" rating. Contemporary research stresses that effective collective learning demands more than just cooperative task completion; it fundamentally relies on mutual trust and the deliberate structural provision of time for reflective discourse. If an institution lacks the dedicated time or the psychological safety required for teachers to comfortably voice divergent ideas and take risks, the collaborative process can easily plateau.

In conclusion, the data illustrates that the Basic Education Department possesses a robust readiness for the analytical and data-driven components of a PLC. The educators already recognize the value of jointly examining student work to refine their instructional methods. However, to transform these positive working relationships into a culture of profound, continuous collective learning, the administration must address the structural and relational nuances highlighted by the lower scores. By intentionally designing varied opportunities for open dialogue and actively cultivating a secure environment where diverse pedagogical ideas are respected, the school can build the deep relational trust necessary to sustain a high-impact learning community over time.

TABLE 4
SHARED PERSONAL PRACTICE

Statement	Mean	SD	Descriptive Interpretation
Opportunities exist for staff members to observe peers and offer encouragement.	3.15	.71	Agree
Staff members provide feedback to peers related to instructional practices.	3.17	.74	Agree
Staff members informally share ideas and suggestions for improving student learning.	3.27	.67	Strongly Agree
Staff members collaboratively review student work to share and improve instructional practices.	3.32	.55	Strongly Agree
Opportunities exist for coaching and mentoring.	3.11	.74	Agree
Individuals and teams have the opportunity to apply learning and share the results of their practices.	3.18	.62	Agree
Staff members regularly share student work to guide overall school improvement.	3.17	.65	Agree
OVERALL WEIGHTED MEAN	3.2	0.67	Agree

Table 4, "Shared Personal Practice," presents a descriptive analysis of staff members' engagement in collaborative instructional activities. The table utilizes a Likert-scale format to

measure seven distinct statements regarding peer observation, feedback, coaching, and the collaborative review of student work. An overall weighted mean of 3.2 (SD = 0.67) indicates a general consensus among respondents, falling under a positive descriptive interpretation (likely "Agree"). Notably, two items concerning the informal sharing of ideas and the collaborative review of student work stand out with a "Strongly Agree" interpretation, suggesting that these specific practices are deeply embedded within the observed professional environment.

A closer examination of the data reveals that educators in this setting are particularly proactive in informal and student-centered collaboration. The highest-rated items—staff members informally sharing ideas for improving student learning (Mean = 3.27, SD = 0.67) and collaboratively reviewing student work (Mean = 3.32, SD = 0.55)—demonstrate a strong commitment to immediate, practical peer support. Such findings align with recent literature emphasizing the critical role of Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) in facilitating teacher growth. For instance, Bautista et al. (2023) highlight that collaborative environments rooted in shared practices and collective responsibility are essential for addressing dynamic instructional challenges. Furthermore, the somewhat lower, yet still positive, scores for formal coaching and mentoring (Mean = 3.11, SD = 0.74) and peer observation (Mean = 3.15, SD = 0.71) indicate that while structural supports exist, teachers may lean more naturally into informal exchanges rather than formalized evaluative observations. This nuance reflects broader educational trends where creating cohesive PLCs is vital for sustaining continuous, job-embedded professional development, empowering teachers to grow alongside their peers.

In conclusion, the results outlined in the table suggest a healthy, collaborative school culture where shared personal practice is actively occurring, particularly around direct student outcomes and informal idea exchanges. To further elevate these practices, school leaders might focus on strengthening the formal structures of peer observation and mentoring, ensuring they feel as supportive and constructive as the informal collaborations currently thriving among the staff. Overall, the data underscores the ongoing value of embedding shared practices within professional learning environments to foster continuous instructional improvement and staff cohesion.

TABLE 5
SUPPORTIVE CONDITIONS – RELATIONSHIP

Statement	Mean	SD	Descriptive Interpretation
Caring relationships exist among staff and students that are built on trust and respect.	3.37	.62	Strongly Agree
A culture of trust and respect exists for taking risks.	3.22	.68	Agree
Outstanding achievement is recognized and celebrated regularly in our school.	3.35	.68	Strongly Agree
School staff and stakeholders exhibit a sustained and unified effort to embed change into the culture of the school.	3.26	.62	Strongly Agree
Relationships among staff members support honest and respectful examination of data to enhance teaching and learning.	3.38	.57	Strongly Agree
OVERALL WEIGHTED MEAN	3.32	0.63	Strongly Agree

The data presented in Table 5 evaluates the "Supportive Conditions – Relationship" dimension within the institution's Professional Learning Community (PLC) Readiness Assessment. This parameter measures the socio-cognitive environment of the school, specifically focusing on trust, respect, and the relational dynamics among staff, students, and stakeholders. Generating a high overall weighted mean of 3.32 with a descriptive interpretation of "Strongly Agree," the results indicate that the Basic Education Department possesses an exceptionally strong foundation of interpersonal care and professional camaraderie. Such a cohesive relational climate is a vital precursor to the demanding collaborative work required to sustain a mature PLC.

A detailed review of the items highlights that the department excels in utilizing relationships to directly inform educational practices. The highest-rated statement reveals that "Relationships among staff members support honest and respectful examination of data to enhance teaching and learning" (Mean = 3.38, SD = 0.57, "Strongly Agree"). This is closely followed by the presence of "caring relationships... built on trust and respect" (Mean = 3.37, SD = 0.62). Contemporary educational literature asserts that relational trust is the bedrock of any successful PLC; without a deep sense of mutual respect, teachers are unlikely to engage in the vulnerable process of sharing classroom data and critiquing pedagogical methods (Dogan, Pashiardis, & Demir, 2020). The staff's willingness to honestly examine data together signifies that they have successfully established the foundational psychological safety required for collaborative inquiry. Furthermore, the strong celebration of outstanding achievements (Mean = 3.35, SD = 0.68) reinforces a positive feedback loop that sustains teacher motivation during complex organizational shifts (Vanblaere & Devos, 2018).

Conversely, the lowest-scoring item within this highly rated dimension offers a critical area for targeted growth: "A culture of trust and respect exists for taking risks" (Mean = 3.22, SD = 0.68, "Agree"). While the faculty clearly trusts one another to review data and celebrate successes, there is a slight, relative hesitancy when it comes to pedagogical risk-taking. For a PLC to evolve from merely sharing best practices to genuinely innovating, educators must feel entirely secure in experimenting with new, untested instructional strategies without fear of administrative or peer judgment. Bridging this gap between interpersonal trust and experimental risk-taking is essential for fostering a truly transformative learning environment.

In conclusion, the findings from Table 5 illustrate that the Basic Education Department is relationally primed for formal PLC implementation. The pervasive culture of trust, caring interactions, and data-driven respect serves as a massive organizational asset that will naturally lower faculty resistance to collaborative frameworks. Moving forward, school leaders should capitalize on this strong relational foundation by actively modeling and explicitly encouraging instructional risk-taking. By reframing pedagogical experimentation—and the occasional failures that come with it—as necessary steps in collective learning, the administration can elevate the staff's comfort with taking risks, thereby unlocking the full innovative potential of their professional learning community.

TABLE 6
SUPPORTIVE CONDITIONS – STRUCTURE

Statement	Mean	SD	Descriptive Interpretation
Time is provided to facilitate collaborative work.	3.26	.70	Strongly Agree
The school schedule promotes collective learning and shared practice.	3.28	.59	Strongly Agree
Fiscal resources are available for professional development.	3.01	.77	Agree
Appropriate technology and instructional materials are available to staff	2.94	.82	Agree
.Resource people provide expertise and support for continuous learning.	3.20	.70	Agree
The school facility is clean, attractive and inviting.	2.95	.82	Agree
The proximity of grade level and department personnel allows for ease in collaborating with colleagues.	3.16	.67	Agree
Communication systems promote a flow of information among staff members.	3.13	.66	Agree
Communication systems promote a flow of information across the entire school community including: central office personnel, parents, and community members.	3.14	.71	Agree
Data are organized and made available to provide easy access to staff members.	3.03	.70	Agree
OVERALL WEIGHTED MEAN	3.11	0.71	Agree

Table 6 illustrates the "Supportive Conditions – Structure" within an educational organization. This table measures the physical, temporal, and resource-based frameworks that enable staff to work collaboratively. The data reveals an Overall Weighted Mean of 3.11 with a

descriptive interpretation of "Agree." This indicates a generally positive consensus among respondents regarding the structural conditions in place, suggesting that the institution has established a solid, functioning foundation to support collective learning and professional practices.

An analysis of the specific indicators reveals that temporal and scheduling frameworks are the institution's strongest assets. The statements "The school schedule promotes collective learning and shared practice" (Mean = 3.28) and "Time is provided to facilitate collaborative work" (Mean = 3.26) both received the highest ratings, interpreted as "Strongly Agree." This aligns with recent empirical literature emphasizing that dedicated, structured time is the most fundamental prerequisite for effective knowledge sharing and the sustainability of professional learning communities (Admiraal et al., 2021). Furthermore, the positive ratings for proximity to personnel (Mean = 3.16) and supportive communication systems (Mean = 3.13 and 3.14) highlight an environment intentionally designed to minimize teacher isolation. Conversely, the lowest-rated statements—though still falling within the "Agree" spectrum—pertained to physical and tangible assets, specifically the availability of appropriate technology and instructional materials (Mean = 2.94) and the cleanliness and appeal of the school facility (Mean = 2.95). This disparity suggests that while the logistical scheduling for collaboration is heavily prioritized, the material and technological resources required to optimize these collaborative efforts require further investment; authentic collaborative professionalism demands both the temporal space to meet and the robust material support to execute new ideas (Hargreaves & O'Connor, 2018).

In conclusion, the institution demonstrates a strong structural readiness for collaborative professional development, driven primarily by highly effective scheduling and time allocation strategies. While the temporal and communicative frameworks are robustly established, addressing the relative deficiencies in physical facilities, fiscal resources, and technology availability will be crucial for holistic improvement. By balancing the excellent allocation of time with more equitable access to tangible and digital tools, the school can further solidify its supportive conditions and maximize the overall efficacy of its staff collaboration.

IV. CONCLUSION

The primary objective of this assessment was to evaluate the baseline readiness of the Systems Plus College Foundation (SPCF) Basic Education Department for the formal implementation of a Professional Learning Community (PLC). By measuring faculty perceptions across six core dimensions, the findings reveal that the department is not only fundamentally prepared for this transition but already exhibits many advanced characteristics of a thriving collaborative culture.

Synthesizing the results across the six assessed areas yields the following targeted conclusions:

1. The department benefits from a highly supportive, democratic, and procedurally fair principal who actively champions staff innovation. However, the current leadership model remains somewhat centralized. While the principal listens to advice, the structural mechanisms necessary for staff to independently drive decisions and access macro-level information are still developing.
2. There is an exceptionally strong, internalized alignment between the school's daily operations, pedagogical decisions, and its overarching vision. The faculty maintains an undeviating focus on student learning, though there is a minor opportunity to better integrate external stakeholders (like parents and community members) into these high expectations.
3. The staff excels in the technical and analytical requirements of a PLC, specifically in collaboratively reviewing student data to refine instructional practices. Yet, the environment required to support open, divergent dialogue and intellectual friction needs intentional nurturing to deepen this collective inquiry.
4. Teachers demonstrate a high degree of comfort with informal collaboration and the shared review of student work. Conversely, formalized practices such as structured coaching, mentoring, and peer observations are less entrenched, indicating a preference for organic rather than systematized peer-to-peer support.
5. The socio-cognitive climate is arguably the department's greatest asset. Rooted in deep interpersonal care, trust, and regular celebration of achievements, the relational foundation

is robust. The only limiting factor is a slight hesitancy among staff to take instructional risks, suggesting that while they trust each other personally, they may still fear professional failure.

6. The administration has successfully provided the most critical resource for a PLC: dedicated time and scheduling for collaboration. However, the physical environment, including the availability of appropriate technology, instructional materials, and fiscal resources, lags behind the temporal support, creating a logistical bottleneck for executing new ideas.

Overall, the SPCF Basic Education Department does not need to build a collaborative culture from scratch; rather, it needs to formalize, decentralize, and resource the positive collaborative behaviors that are already organically occurring.

V. RECOMMENDATION

Based on the diagnostic profile and the conclusions drawn, the following data-driven recommendations are proposed to ensure a highly successful, sustainable PLC rollout:

1. Move beyond a principal-centric leadership model by establishing formal, teacher-led instructional committees. Grant these groups autonomous decision-making power and transparent access to institutional data, allowing teachers to actively initiate and manage school-wide changes rather than merely advising the administration.
2. To bridge the gap between informal sharing and formal shared practice, introduce non-evaluative peer observation cycles. Frame these walkthroughs explicitly as opportunities for mutual growth rather than administrative appraisals. Pairing veteran teachers with newer staff for low-stakes mentoring will help normalize continuous, transparent feedback.
3. To boost relational trust specifically regarding pedagogical risk-taking, the administration should actively celebrate instructional experimentation. Leaders can model this by sharing their own professional challenges or failed lessons during meetings, effectively removing the stigma of failure and encouraging teachers to test innovative, out-of-the-box strategies.

4. While scheduling is currently a major strength, the administration must ensure that physical and fiscal resources match this temporal support. Prioritize budget allocations for upgraded instructional technology, collaborative workspace improvements, and essential teaching materials so that when teachers devise new strategies during their scheduled PLC time, they have the tangible tools required to implement them.
5. Leverage the strong internal shared vision by deliberately bringing parents and community stakeholders into the fold. Host community learning nights or create communication channels that translate the school's high academic expectations and collaborative goals to the broader community, ensuring that student support extends beyond the campus.

REFERENCES

- [1.] **Admiraal, W., Schenke, W., De Jong, L., Emmelot, Y., & Sligte, H. (2021).** Schools as professional learning communities: What can schools do to support professional development of their teachers? *Professional Development in Education*, 47(4), 684–698.
- [2.] **Bautista, A., Xu, R., Cen, F., & Yang, W. (2023).** Professional learning communities in Chinese preschools: Challenging Western frameworks. *Education Sciences*, 13(10), 1055.
- [3.] **Christensen, A. A. (2022).** A global measure of professional learning communities. *Professional Development in Education*, 1–17.
- [4.] **Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017).** Effective teacher professional development. *Learning Policy Institute*.
- [5.] **Dogan, S., Pashiardis, P., & Demir, A. (2020).** School leadership practices and professional learning communities: The mediating role of trust. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 48(4), 603–625.
- [6.] **Hargreaves, A., & O'Connor, M. T. (2018).** *Collaborative professionalism: When teaching together means learning for all*. Corwin Press.
- [7.] **Liu, S., & Hallinger, P. (2024).** The effects of instructional leadership, teacher responsibility and procedural justice climate on professional learning communities: A cross-level moderated mediation examination. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 52(3), 556–575.
- [8.] **Liu, S., Lu, J., & Yin, H. (2022).** Can professional learning communities promote teacher innovation? A multilevel moderated mediation analysis. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 109, 103571.

- [9.] **Pilotti, D. M., Harbour, K. E., Miller, B. T., & Larkin, E. K. (2023).** Creating cohesion and collaboration in mathematics classrooms: Implementing interdepartmental professional learning communities to support students with disabilities. *Education Sciences*, 14(1), 50.
- [10.] **Tulang, A. B., Anaviso, M. B., & Barbasan, G. A. (2023).** Patterns of teaching and learning styles in a virtual school-based learning action cell. *International Journal of Instruction*, 16, 729–744
- [11.] **Vanblaere, B., & Devos, G. (2018).** The role of departmental leadership for professional learning communities. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 54(1), 85–114.
- [12.] **Yang, J., Zhang, Y., Zhou, Y., & Ji, Y. (2023).** What are the core features of professional learning community in Chinese preschool teachers' perspectives: Based on grounded theory analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14.
- [13.] **Zheng, X., Yin, H., & Li, Z. (2019).** Exploring the relationships among instructional leadership, professional learning communities and teacher self-efficacy in China. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 47(4), 543–561.