Teachers' Preparedness in Teaching K to 12 Secondary Science Curriculum

Ekmar J. Sakib and Mario R. Obra, Jr. (MST-Bio, EdD)
Isabela City Schools Division, R-IX, Department of Education;
Western Mindanao State University, Zamboanga City
ekmarsakib@gmail.com; obramario@yahoo.com

Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research
Vol. 7 No.2, 123-132
May 2019
P-ISSN 2350-7756
E-ISSN 2350-8442
www.apjmr.com
CHED Recognized Journal
ASEAN Citation Index

Date Received: October 15, 2018; Date Revised: April 30, 2019

Abstract *–This study inquired into the preparedness of teachers in teaching K to 12 Secondary Science Curriculum (SSC) through finding out their extent of understanding on K to 12 SSC in terms of instructional contents integrated with science process skills/competencies, curriculum design, and teaching and learning approaches; the challenges encountered by teachers as to the curriculum, instructional methods, instructional materials, learning environment, and assessment/evaluation of learning; the extent of support of school head to teachers in teaching K to 12 SSC on the aspects of supervision, professional training and monitoring and evaluation. Through the researcher-made Science Teachers Preparedness Survey (STPS) Questionnaire utilized in gathering data from 62 totally enumerated respondents in a schools division, it revealed that teachers were generally well prepared and has substantial understanding on instructional contents integrated with science process skills/competencies, curriculum design, and teaching and learning approaches. However, contents involving abstract ideas and mathematical calculations, formulating models, experimenting, presenting challenges and asking students to innovate or design solutions, constructing GRASPS (Goal, Role, Audience, Situation, Performance, Standards), involving parents and families in student learning, inquiry based approach, multidisciplinary teaching, and experiential learning were least scored. On instructional materials, availability and accessibility of educational technologies were perceived as very close to being a serious problem despite the good support extended by the school head. Furthermore, minor problems were perceived on other aspects of challenges. Hence, teachers must be continuously provided with enhancement trainings on the least understood contents and providing or consulting them in the requisition of instructional materials.*

Keywords *–teachers preparedness, K to 12 secondary science curriculum, instructional contents, instructional materials, teachers' challenges, school head support*

INTRODUCTION

Filipino students' poor achievement levels in science have been one of the critical areas of concern for several years in the Philippine education. In the 2005 National Achievement Test (NAT), 4th year high school students obtained a mean score of 39.5% and only 1.8% of the students attained mastery levels of science curriculum goals [1]. This has further dropped to 37.98% in 2006, ranking last in 2012 among other learning areas with the mean score of 40.53%. This can be associated to the difficulties encountered by teachers in teaching science concepts [2], especially on in-depth concepts [3] because the pedagogical aspects of teachers' preparedness do matter both for their effects on teaching practice and for their ultimate impact on student achievement [4].

Similarly, preparedness of teachers is a major factor for the realization of the country's educational goals. The effects of education policies and programs [5] such as the newly implemented K to 12 Enhanced Basic Education Curriculum (EBEC) largely depend on teachers. In the Philippines, basic education curriculum has been enhanced through the K to 12 programs which could address the issues on the low achievement scores of Filipino students and the insufficient preparation of high school graduates who are too young to enter the labor force [6].

Science curriculum has a big role to play in achieving the K to 12 EBEC vision in holistically developing learners with 21st century skills [7]. Likewise, it has also been viewed as venue for honing students' talents obtained through various learning activities [8].To cope with the reform, it has been the mandate for teachers to keep themselves abreast of the fast changing and dynamic activities in teaching [9] and understand the current rationale of the K to 12 Program and its implication in order to be prepared in its implementation [7]. This paradigm shift in teaching science has posed challenge to every Filipino science educator. Thus, improving teachers' knowledge and

pedagogical skills is the most direct and effective way to raise the instructional quality [10].

Teachers' knowledge on the content, pedagogy and curriculum are fundamental elements for teachers' preparedness in order to teach effectively (Shulman, 1986 &Kalande, 2006) and to be more successful with students (Darling-Hammond, 1997).

Stronger learning gains among students are implications from prepared teachers [11]. However, it has been identified that the competence of teachers as one of the issues and challenges facing the implementation of Grades 1-10 curriculum for succeeding school years [12]. For instance, it was emphasized that one of the challenges and difficulties elementary teachers encountered in implementing the K to 12 Curriculum is the lack of training for teachers [13] because the time spent for the training is not enough [14]. Additionally, reports showed that although teachers expressed enthusiasm for the new curriculum approaches, they do not have adequate understanding or support to implement the curriculum as intended, so new practices were specified which were then not well implemented because the approach was not understood and did not mesh with the teachers' overall strategies [15].

The preparedness of teachers, specifically in Isabela City, Basilan, as indicated by extent of understanding of the curriculum content, pedagogy and framework has not yet been explored and studied. In comparison to the National Achievement level, the secondary students of Isabela City Schools Division also performed poorly in science with average NAT result of 48.90% in the year 2012.

Hence, Cabansag, et.al (2014) and Arazo (2013) suggested that close monitoring of the program implementation is needed and continuous professional trainings and workshops should be provided for teachers to fully grasp facets of the new Curriculum

Hence, it is suggested that close monitoring of the program implementation is needed and continuous professional trainings and workshops should be provided for teachers to fully grasp facets of the new Curriculum and to clear areas of misinterpretations such as on the content, design of the curriculum and teaching and learning approaches [8][13]. In view of these findings, the researcher found it imperative to conduct a study that will look into the preparedness of teachers in teaching K to 12 Secondary Science Curriculum. It is hoped to unfold and fill the gaps on the aspect of teaching and learning process in the K to 12 EBEC scenarios which might significantly contribute to raising the quality of teaching and improve learning gains.

Thus, this study is grounded on the theory of Pedagogical Content Knowledge (PCK) which is the blending of content and pedagogy into an understanding of how particular aspects of subject matter are organized, adapted, and represented for instruction together with the knowledge on curriculum which serves as the point of departure in planning for teaching because it positively influence teacher effectiveness [16].

Thus, this study is grounded on the theory of Pedagogical Content Knowledge (PCK) which is the blending of content and pedagogy into an understanding of how particular aspects of subject matter are organized, adapted, and represented for instruction.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

This study aimed to document teachers' preparedness in teaching K to 12 Secondary Science Curriculum (SSC) in one of the schools' divisions in region nine (9) by exploring teachers' understanding on K to 12 SSC in terms of instructional contents integrated with science process skills/competencies, curriculum design, teaching and learning approaches. Likewise, it is sought to explore the challenges encountered by teachers in teaching K to 12 SSC as to the curriculum, instructional method, instructional materials, learning environment, and assessment/evaluation of learning including the extent of support school heads, specifically on the aspects of supervision, professional training, and monitoring and evaluation, which contributed to the preparedness of teachers in teaching K to 12 SSC.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study applied the descriptive evaluative research design and quantitative approach to describe the preparedness of teachers in teaching K to 12 SSC. The researcher-made Science Teachers Preparedness Survey (STPS) Questionnaire was used to gather data from 62 totally enumerated science teachers of the 10 public secondary schools.

STPS was validated by experts on science teaching, curriculum and instruction, and educational administration obtaining the Fleiss Kappa (*K*) values from the five (5) raters to be within the range of 0.01 to 0.09, interpreted as *slight agreement* [17] against all the criteria adopted from *Survey/Interview Validation Rubric for Expert Panel (VREP)* [18]. It was then pilot

tested in the five (5) secondary schools of the nearby division which was found out to be highly reliable (α 0.849-0.988) employing Cronbach's alpha reliability test procedure.

The respondents were oriented on the purpose of the study and, that their anonymity was kept for the purpose of confidentiality. Completion of the survey questionnaire by the respondents meant their voluntary participation. Permission to conduct the research study was requested from the Schools Division Superintendent of the Schools Division followed by the school heads' authorization in every secondary school. Similar procedure was done before gathering data for research instrument pilot testing. The respondents were oriented on the pur- pose of the study and, that their anonymity was kept for the purpose of confidentiality. Completion of the survey questionnaire by the respondents meant their voluntary participation in the study.

Frequency count, percentage distribution and mean score were used to determine the preparedness of teachers through the following components which include the extent of understanding on K to 12 SSC, challenges encountered, and support extended by the school administrators. The following formula was used to determine level of preparedness.

$$(U + SE) - C = LP$$

Legend:

U - K to 12 SSC Understanding
SE - Support Extended by School Heads
C - Challenges encountered
LP - Level of Preparedness

The given scale was used to interpret the mean score on the extent of understanding of teachers on K 10 12 SSC: 1.00 – 1.75: No understanding; 1.76 – 2.50: Limited understanding; 2.51 –3.25: Substantial understanding; 3.26 – 4.00: Extensive understanding

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

After thorough analysis of the data gathered, the following findings on the extent of understanding of teachers in teaching K to 12 SSC are revealed as follow.

As observed in table 1, secondary school science teachers perceived to have substantial understanding on the K to 12 SSC in terms of instructional contents which are also integrated with scientific process skills/competencies, curriculum design, and teaching and learning approaches.

It can be gleaned from the table that there is apprehensive percentage of science teachers who still have limited understanding on the overall components of K to 12 Secondary Science Curriculum. A teacher may have understood the contents (2.99) across the curriculum but understanding on the integration of science process skills/competencies (2.83) in their classes is least scored. Likewise, more teachers perceived to have extensively understood the contents and relatively few of them indicate the same extent of understanding on pedagogy.

Breaking down each component of the K to 12 SSC and from the given percentage in table 1 who said that they have limited understanding on some components, the relatively least scored statements are revealed in

Specifically, concepts and topics related to physical sciences (physics and chemistry) mostly dealing with abstract ideas and involving mathematical calculations were relatively least understood under instructional contents such as characteristics of sound and its various frequencies, relationship of hierarchy of colors to energy, the relationship between the angle of release and the height and range of the projectile, and the major categories of biological molecules [2].

Constructing performance-based assessment called GRASPS, understanding backward design and involving parents and families in students' learning were indicated to be the least among others for curriculum design. On the component of teaching and learning approaches, multi/interdisciplinary teaching approach, inquiry-based teaching, and experiential learning in classroom instructions composed the bottom three (3) as self-rated by teachers refuting the idea [3] that these were teachers' most preferred used instructional strategies.

Given the low NAT performance of the students together with the aforementioned low scored concepts strengthens the idea that teachers' pedagogical content knowledge and of the curriculum influence learning gains and teachers' effectiveness. Teachers' preparedness can be associated to their knowledge on the content, pedagogy and curriculum which can also be the predictor variables for student achievement [19].

In terms of the challenges encountered by teachers in the K to 12 SSC implementation presented in Table 3, instructional materials are considered to be the most challenging to science teachers especially on the utilization of digital tools in teaching and the accessibility of learning facilities for the learners.

Table 1. Mean Scores on the Extent Understanding of Teachers on K to 12 SSC

K to 12 SSC Components	Limited	Substantial	Extensive	Mean	Adjectival Rating
Instructional Contents	12.9%	58.1%	29%	2.99	Substantial Understanding
Scientific Process Skills/ Competencies	24.2%	56.5%	17.7%	2.83	Substantial Understanding
Curriculum Design	19.4%	66.1%	14.5%	2.85	Substantial Understanding
Teaching & Learning Approaches	19.4%	64.5%	16.1%	2.88	Substantial Understanding
Average				2.89	Substantial Understanding

Table 2. Relatively Least Scored areas of the K to 12 SCC

Instructional Content	Mean	SD
Grade 7		
1. Characteristics of sound and its various frequencies.	2.74	.562
2. Sound production in the human voice box and how it varies from one person to another.	2.74	.653
3. Different types of charging processes.	2.79	.631
Grade 8		
1. Relationship of hierarchy of colors to energy.	2.78	.671
2. Functions of circuit breakers, fuses, earthing, double insulation, and other safety devices in the home.	2.78	.671
3. How to use periodic table to predict the chemical behavior of an element.	2.83	.650
Grade 9		
1. Relationship between the angle of release and the height and range of the projectile.	2.53	.841
2. Characteristics and arrangement of stars (constellation).	2.56	.616
3. Generation, transmission, and distribution of electrical energy	2.58	.692
Grade 10		
1. Major categories of biological molecules.	2.71	.588
2. Factors affecting chemical reactions and its practical applications.	2.75	.683
3. Process of protein production using information from DNA.	2.82	.636
Science Process Skills/Competencies		
1. Formulating models.	2.70	.587
2. Experimenting.	2.72	.609
3. Presenting challenges and asking students to design solutions or work on/suggest/present an innovation.	2.75	.596
Curriculum Design		
1. Constructing performance-based assessment called GRASPS (Goal, Result, Audience, Situation, Performance, Standards).	2.59	.588
2. Backward design in which lessons are planned by identifying desired results (objectives) first followed by determining acceptable evidence (assessment) before designing learning experiences/activities (teaching strategies).	2.69	.561
3. Involving parents and families in students' learning.	2.73	.518
Teaching and Learning Approaches		
1. Designing activities which link science topics to other subjects (Multi-disciplinary teaching).	2.68	.594
2. Engaging students to conduct scientific investigations, connect evidence to knowledge and share findings (Inquiry-based teaching).	2.79	.661
3. Letting students experience, discover and experiment with knowledge themselves instead of reading or hearing experiences of others (Experiential learning).	2.84	.578

Meanwhile, minor problems were encountered in terms of the learning environment, curriculum, instructional methods, and assessment/evaluation of learning. Specifically, the following were scored very low among others which include adhering to the proposed time allotment, organizing the activities as suggested in the Teaching Guides, use of differentiated activities to provide varied adequate learning experiences for students, providing remedial instruction to slow learners, the utilization of digital tools in teaching such as web 2.0 applications, operation of ICT such as audio-visual facilities and setting up computers for students, the number of rooms/school buildings, lighting facilities, class size, and classroom space, and students' proper handling of laboratory apparatuses and equipment/instruments.

Table 3 Mean Scores on Challenges encountered by the Science Teachers in teaching K to 12 SSC

Curriculum	Mean	Adjectival Rating
1. Adhering to proposed time allotment.	2.57	Minor problem
2. Diagnosing/Determining students' learning needs.	2.43	Minor problem
3. Organizing the activities based on the Teaching Guides	2.54	Minor problem
4. Using differentiated activities to provide varied learning experiences for students.	2.49	Minor problem
5. Providing essential information about student concerns and interests.	2.23	Minor problem
6. Integrating values into the subject matter being discussed.	2.00	Minor problem
Average	2.38	Minor problem
Instructional Method		
1. Helping students to accomplish the established learning tasks.	2.10	Minor problem
2. Identifying situations where students can apply the new knowledge or skills learned.	2.26	Minor problem
3. Providing remedial instruction to slow learners.	2.62	Moderate problem
4. Providing enrichment activities for those who already meet expectations.	2.18	Minor problem
Average	2.29	Minor problem
Instructional Materials		
1. Making facilities and equipment accessible to students.	3.05	Moderate problem
2. Gaining access to duplicating machines, such as mimeograph and "Xerox" machines in the production of students' activity sheets.	2.95	Moderate problem
3. Operating/Using of Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) such as audio-visual facilities and setting up computers for students.	3.03	Moderate problem
4. Utilizing digital tools in teaching (e.g., web 2.0 applications).	3.36	Moderate problem
5. Acquiring appropriate textbooks, manuals and instructional materials.	2.72	Moderate problem
Average	3.02	Moderate problem
Learning Environment		
1. The room is not spacious enough to accommodate the number of students.	2.43	Minor problem
2. Large classes (more than 50 students in a class).	2.46	Minor problem
3. Poor lighting facilities of classroom.	2.55	Minor problem
4. Inadequate number of rooms/school buildings to accommodate the whole population of the students.	2.56	Minor problem
Average	2.50	Minor problem
Assessment/Evaluation of Learning		
1. Doing assessment of learning outcomes against learning competencies.	2.22	Minor problem
2. Checking the skills development of students using portfolio or any evidence of performance submitted.	2.20	Minor problem
3. Constructing the appropriate and effective tests/ examinations.	2.33	Minor problem
4. Evaluating students' proper handling of laboratory apparatuses and equipment/instruments.	2.64	Moderate problem
5. Evaluating students' performances in class objectively and accurately.	2.31	Minor problem
6. Giving students the grades they deserve.	2.08	Minor problem
Average	2.30	Minor problem
Total	2.51	Minor problem

Scale: 1.00 - 1.80 = Not a problem at all 2.61 – 3.40 = Moderate problem 4.21 – 5.00 = Very serious problem
1.81 – 2.60 = Minor problem 3.41 – 4.20 = Serious problem

In line with one of the K to 12 Science Curriculum visions, that is, the development of *technologically literate* members of the society [20], the result does not reflect the idea that, if teachers commit to a vision of 21st century knowledge and skills for the students, technologies must be aligned with content and pedagogy followed by developing the ability to creatively use technologies to meet specific learning needs [21] in a conducive and appropriate learning spaces. Such technologies include those utilized which help students laboratory works acquire a better understanding of concepts and principles as a result of

concrete experiences [23]. Likewise, it validates the issues that teachers face barriers that inhibit them from implementing technology no matter what type of school environment they are in. Others include the lack of time and access [24].

As far as the goal of the K to 12 program is concern, the result does not reflect the idea that, if we commit to a vision of 21st century knowledge and skills for the students, technologies must be aligned with content and pedagogy followed by developing

Hence, it is imperative for the K to 12 school administrators to identify its roles and attributes which are critical to the 21st century education so that they may influence the teachers to deliberately perform their functions [21]. The necessity of administrative support for a successful curriculum implementation must also be given emphasis [29]. Indicated on the table below is the overall support of the secondary school heads for teachers in teaching K to 12 SSC, as rated by teachers themselves.

Table 4 Relatively Least Scored areas of the K to 12 SCC

	Mean	Description
Supervision		
1. Disseminating circulars or memoranda about teaching-learning policies in the school.	3.18	Good
2. Reviewing grade-level quarterly examinations.	3.35	Good
3. Reviewing lesson plans and test questions.	3.47	Very Good
4. Conducting classroom observation and post observation conferences.	3.27	Good
Average	**3.32**	**Good**
Professional Training		
1. Sending teachers to trainings, seminars, and workshops related to K to 12 Science.	3.30	Good
2. Organizing in-service trainings related to the K to 12 Curriculum.	3.17	Good
3. Allowing peer collaboration.	3.18	Good
4. Providing technical assistance to teachers on teaching-learning process.	3.15	Good
5. Initiating showcase of best practices.	3.13	Good
Average	**3.19**	**Good**

Table 4. (cont.) Relatively Least Scored areas of the K to 12 SCC

Monitoring and Evaluation	Mean	Decription
1. Monitoring of K to 12 program policies implementation in the classroom.	3.21	Good
2. Consulting with teachers on requisition of instructional materials.	3.14	Good
3. Monitoring mentoring program among teachers and between school head and teachers to address teaching problems.	3.20	Good
Average	3.18	Good
Total	3.23	Good

Scale: Poor: 1.00-1.80: Fair: 1.81-2.60; Good: 2.61-3.40; Very Good: 3.41-4.20; Excellent: 4.21-5.00

Table 4 shows the data on the extent of support from the school head to teachers teaching K to 12 SSC as indicated by the science teachers themselves. Generally, teachers perceived that they received good support from their school head when it comes to teaching the K to 12 Science in terms of supervisory support, providing opportunities for professional trainings and monitoring and evaluation.

This proved that there were more school heads executing their duties and functions satisfactorily as perceived by their teachers. Some of these functions were on reviewing the lesson plans, test questions of teachers as well as their quarterly examinations, sending teachers to trainings, seminars, and workshops related to K to 12 Science, and conducting classroom observation and post observation conferences.

On the other hand, school heads were highly rated in terms supervisory functions while scored comparably low when it comes to monitoring and evaluation.

Table 5 Overall Preparedness Level of Teachers in teaching K to 12 SCC

	Level of Understanding	Challenges encountered	School Head Support	Total Cumulative Score
Highest Score	4.00	1.00	5.00	8.00
Lowest Score	1.00	5.00	1.00	-3.00
Ave. Mean	2.89	2.51	3.19	3.58

	Min.	Max.	Mean	SD	Description
Overall Score	-0.14	6.05	**3.58**	1.41	Well Prepared

However, comparing the mean scores, this finding suggests that there were still areas which need enhancement since these were relatively low in mean scores as observed on Table 4, such as *initiating and encouraging teachers in showcasing best practices* to promote innovativeness and creativity within the organization. Based from the result, it would also be better that school heads should *consult with their teachers on the requisition of materials* to become more efficient as well as effective in the use of available resources. *Providing technical assistance to teachers on teaching-learning process* was also relatively low which suggest that this must be given the attention by the school head and thereby intensifying the conduct of classroom observation.

Criteria for level of preparedness

-3 to -1	*-3.00*	*-1.99*	*NOT PREPARED*
0 to 2	*0.00*	*2.99*	*SOMEWHAT PREPARED*
3 to 5	*3.00*	*5.99*	*WELL PREPARED*
6 to 8	*6.00*	*8.00*	*VERY WELL PREPARED*

A solid body of empirical research support that mentoring by veteran teachers has a positive effects on beginning teachers' quality of instruction, retention, and capacity to improve their students' academic achievements [25] in as much as the helpfulness of the school head [26].

The preparedness level of teachers in teaching K to 12 SSC is may be influence by their extent of understanding [7] [3] on K to 12 SSC, the challenges encountered [23] and the support they received from their school head [22]. Table 5 gives the overview of the overall preparedness of teachers in teaching K to 12 SSC in terms of the three (3) possible factors.

Table 5 reveals highest mean score on the level of support given by school head to their K to 12 science teachers which largely contributed to the teachers' preparedness. While the challenges encountered faced by the teachers were comparably low increasing the preparedness level to being *"Well Prepared"* in teaching K to 12 SSC.

This implies that school heads have extended adequate support to science teachers in their teaching endeavour while teachers substantially understood "What" and "How" to teach K to 12 SSC. Eventually, the challenges faced in teaching K to 12 SSC have been minimized to being indicated as minor problems" refuting the findings of [13] before that teachers have been experiencing great extent of challenges during the K to 12 programs implementation.

This further implies that the gradual efforts put forth by the Department of Education are effective towards the successful national implementation of said program.

CONCLUSION

From the study findings presented, the following conclusions are arrived at:

At classroom level, science teachers have substantial understanding on what (content) to teach to their students and how (pedagogy) to teach them. However, some found it quite hard teaching some physical sciences related competencies involving abstract concepts and mathematical calculations.

Integrating few science process skills in their class activities and in applying some K to 12 SSC recommended teaching and learning approaches specifically multi/interdisciplinary teaching approach, inquiry-based teaching and experiential learning tantamount to what they have least understood in terms of curriculum design were also limitedly understood by some science teachers which means that this skills and approaches were not may be applied by teachers during instruction or may be incorrectly employed. Instructional strategies and methodologies have direct impact on student performance [28]. This might be affected further by the extent of problem found out in terms of instructional materials that were seen more challenging than any other areas [29]. Hence, achievement of K to 12 program educational goals primarily at classroom level largely depends on these factors.

Challenges on instructional materials were comparably higher (from moderate to very serious problem) and continuously to impede teachers from giving utmost quality of teaching to their learners, as observed from previous studies [13].

School heads have good extent of support for teachers teaching K to 12 SSC. They were executing their duties and functions satisfactorily might as well in terms of governing structural policies and instructional guidelines per Republic Act 9155 (Governance Basic Education Act of 2001) mandates. However, enhancements are still needed in initiating and encouraging teachers in showcasing best practices, consulting with their teachers on the requisition of materials, and in providing technical assistance to teachers on teaching-learning process.

In addition, despite the nationwide full implementation of K to 12 programs, teachers have seen the need for improvement on the following, aside from what has been discussed above and call for appropriate interventions: teachers' attitude in the

delivery of the service; allotment for mentoring time between expert teachers to novice teachers; teachers' readiness before getting into the classroom; providing science teachers with scholarship grants to pursue their post graduate studies; and school heads' conduct of classroom observation.

RECOMMENDATION

Based from the results analyses presented and conclusions postulated, this study recommends the enhancement of teachers' understanding on K to 12 SSC as well as to increase preparedness level, the Department of Education should provide teachers with extensive and enhancement trainings and seminars with the focus on physical sciences related competencies especially when it involves abstract ideas and mathematical calculations; the "how" of integrating science process skills/competencies in class activities like experimenting, formulating models, asking students present challenges and design solutions or work on/suggest/present an innovation; constructing performance-based assessment called GRASPS, concepts on backward design and involving parents and families in students' learning; various technical applications of multi/interdisciplinary teaching approach, inquiry-based teaching, and experiential learning in classroom instructions.

Adequate and reasonable instructional materials should be provided to teachers especially on educational technological facilities as revealed in the study such as interactive instructional materials (Digital tools) and audio-visual facilities (computers, LCD projectors, etc.). This is following the K to 12 SSC directives that rather than relying solely on textbooks, varied hands-on, minds-on, and hearts-on activities will be used to develop students' interest making them active learners. Hence DepEd's system on procurement and requisition of instructional materials shall be closely monitored and enhanced as deem necessary, highly responsive to the instructional needs of teachers which must be basically aligned with the curriculum.

School head, in coordination with their immediate superiors, should intensify the conduct of classroom observations; provide more technical assistance to teachers on teaching-learning process; and likewise consult with their teachers on the requisition of materials. More importantly, DepEd should formalized program for regular showcasing of best practices among teachers through formulation of coordination and monitoring teams at national, regional, division and school level who will look after such programs and provide meritorious recognitions and apposite incentives to deserving teachers. This is to promote instructional excellence, culture of sharing and encouragement among teachers in support of DepEd's VMGO (Vision, Mission, Goals and Objectives).

REFERENCES

[1] Bernardo, Limjap, Roleda, (2008). *Students' Perception of Science Classes in the Philippines*, Education Research Institute, Vol. 9, No. 3, (pp. 285-295) Retrieved from www.files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ835201.pdf

[2] Chavan, R. (2014)**.** *"Difficulties Encountered by Science Teachers during Teaching Concepts of Science"*. Research Gate Organization, Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/259772342_Difficulties_Encountered_by_Science_Teachers_during_Teaching_Conecpts_of _Science

[3] Ressureccion, J. &Adanza, J.(2015). *"Spiral Progression Approach in Teaching Science in Selected Private and Public Schools in Cavite"* Retrieved from http://www.dlsu.edu.ph/conferences/dlsu_research_congress_/2015/proceedings/LLI/017LLI_Ressureccion_GF.pdf

[4] National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, 2015. *"What Makes A Teacher Effective?: a summary of key research findings on teacher preparation*", Retrieved from http://www.ncate.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=JFRrmWqa1jU=

[5] Cohen, D. & Ball, D. (1990). *Policy and Practices: An Overview*, Retrieved from http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.121.9151&rep=rep1&type=pdf

[6] Padre, J. 2010. *The Enhanced K+12 Basic Education Program Rationale*, Philippine Education Research Journal, Retrieved from https://perj.wordpress.com/2010/12/07/the-enhanced-k12-basic-education-program-rationale/

[7] *K to 12 Toolkit: Resource Guide for Teacher Educators, School, Administrators and Teachers*, ISBN 978-971-0487-58-5, SEAMEO-INNOTECH, 2012. Retrieved from https://www.seameo-innotech.org/eNews/Kto12Toolkit_ao17july2012.pdf

[8] Cabansag, M. (2014)**.** '*Impact Statements on the K-12 Science Program in the Enhanced Basic Education Curriculum in Provincial Schools"*. Researchers World -Journal of Arts, Science & Commerce. Vol.– V, Issue–2, April 2014 [29], E-ISSN 2229-4686, ISSN 2231-4172Retrieved from www.researchersworld.com

[9] *Republic Act No. 7836 - "Philippine Teachers Professionalization Act of 1994"*, Professional Regulation Commission Retrieved from

https://www.prc.gov.ph/uploaded/documents/PROFESSIONAL%20TEACHERS-LAW1.PDF.

[10] Machina, M. (2012). *Prospective Teachers' Preparedness to facilitate Chemistry Instruction at Secondary School Level in Nairobi Teaching Practice Zone- Kenya*, Kenyata University, E55/CE/11523/08, Retrieved from http://ir-library.ku.ac.ke/bitstream/handle/123456789/6887/MIHESO%20JOSEPHAT%20MACHINA.pdf;sequence=1

[11] Darling-Hammond, L., 2003. *"Wanted: A National Teacher Supply Policy for Education: The Right Way to Meet the "Highly Qualified Teacher" Challenge"*, Education Policy Analysis Archives Journal, Volume 11 Number 33 ISSN 1068-2341,. Retrieved from http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/article/viewFile/261/387

[12] Quijano, Y. (2012). K To 12 Updates: Outcomes, Issues, Challenges and Next Steps, Retrieved from http://ceap.org.ph/upload/download/201210/11111845626_1.pdf

[13] Arazo, V. (2014). "*Perceptions of Grade I Teachers in The K To 12 Curriculum*". Department of Education, Philippines. Retrieved from http://www.eras.org.sg/2013fullpaper/1404%20Perceptions%20Of%20Grade%20I%20Teachers....pdf

[14] Viray, P. & Umil, A. (2012). *Rushed trainings, lack of materials mar implementation of K to 12*, bULATlat Journalism for the People, Retrieved from http://bulatlat.com/main/2012/05/30/rushed-trainings-lack-of-materials-mar-implementation-of-k-to-12/

[15] Westbrook J, Durrani N, Brown R, Orr D, Pryor J, Boddy J, Salvi F (2013). *Pedagogy, Curriculum, Teaching Practices and Teacher Education in Developing Countries. Final Report. Education Rigorous Literature Review*. EPPI-Centre, Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education, University of London, ISBN: 978-1-907345-64-7, Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/20727174/Pedagogy_curriculum_teaching_practices_and_teacher_education_in_developing_countries?auto=download

[16] Zuvovsky, R. (2003). *Teachers' Qualifications and Their Impact on Student Achievement Findings*, TIMSS-Israel, Retrieved from https://www.iea.nl/sites/default/files/irc//IRC2008_Zuzovsky2.pdf

[17] Hartling L, Hamm M, Milne A, et al. (2012). *Validity and Inter-Rater Reliability Testing of Quality Assessment Instruments*, National Center for Biotechnology Information, Bookshelf ID: NBK92299, Retrieved from https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK92299/

[18] Simon, M. & White, J. (2011). *Survey/Interview Validation Rubric for Expert Panel (VREP)*, Retrieved from http://dissertationrecipes.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/04/Expert-Validation-v3.pdf

[19] Kalande, W. (2006)**.** "*The Influence of Science Teacher Preparation Programs on Instructional Practices of Beginning Primary School Teachers in Malawi*". Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia. Retrieved from www.scholar.lib.vt.edu/theses/available/etd.../Wotchiwe-DissFinal.pdf

[20] Department of Education, (2013). "*K to 12 Curriculum Guide Science (Grade 3 to Grade 10)*"**,** DepEd, Philippines.

[21] American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, (2010)."*21st Century Knowledge and Skills in Educator Preparation*". Retrieved from www.p21.org/storage/documents/aacte_p21_whitepaper2010.pdf

[22] Almekhlafi, A. G., & Almeqdadi, F. A. (2010). *Teachers' Perceptions of Technology Integration in the United Arab Emirates School Classrooms*, Educational Technology & Society, 13 (1), 165–175. Retrieved from https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/2aa5/7798d6027df494c780db6f27196eb3ec5550.pdf

[23] Marocchi, D. & Serio, M.C. (2014). Laboratory activities and the perception of students, Teaching/Learning Physics, Integrating Research into Practice, GIREP – MPTL 2014 International Conference, Research Gate, July 2014, Italy. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/280922165_Laboratory_activities_and_the_perception_of_students

[24] Martinez, K. (2012)**.** "*Technology Implementation in K-12 Schools: A Research Study of Perceptions and Practice*", University of Central Florida.

[25] Ingersoll, Merrill, & Stuckey, (2014). "*Seven Trends: The Transformation of the Teaching Force*", Consortium for Policy Research in Education, Retrieved from https://www.cpre.org/7trends

[26] Feistritzer, E.(2011).*"Profile of Teachers in the U.S. 2011"*, National Center for Education Information.

[27] Wilson, S. & Peterson, P.(2006).*Theories of Learning and Teaching What Do They Mean for Educators?*" Best Practice Journal of National Education Association, Washington, D.C. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED495823.pdf

[28] Eze, P. (2011)."*The Relationship between Instructional Strategies/Teacher Methodologies and Student Performance and Its Implication for School Leaders*". Atlanta, Georgia. Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.auctr.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1777&context=dissertations

[29] Erden, E.(2010). *"Problems that Preschool Teachers Face in the Curriculum Implementation"*. Middle East Technical University. Retrieved from https://etd.lib.metu.edu.tr/upload/12612162/index.pdf

[30] Republic Act No. 9155 or Governance of Basic Educaion Act of 2001. Retrieved from https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/2001/08/11/republic-act-no-9155/

[31] Republic Act No. 10533 or Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013. Retrieved from https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/2013/05/15/republic-act-no-10533/