

# **Mental Health Management Protocol (MHMP) Among Public School Teachers and Administrators, Ubay Districts, Ubay, Bohol**

**MA. MAYA V. TUMALON**

[mmvtumalon@universityofbohol.edu.ph](mailto:mmvtumalon@universityofbohol.edu.ph)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4258-2312>

## **ABSTRACT**

In the pursuit of quality education, the Department of Education (DepEd) has undertaken numerous initiatives. Teachers are mandated to facilitate learning with twenty-five or more learners inside the classroom but are constantly asked to do other tasks aside from their actual mandates. These have resulted in overlapping activities causing teachers to experience stressful moments in their daily undertakings. The DepEd Bohol Division has already reported cases of teachers experiencing mental health issues. This study aimed to identify procedures to address teachers and school administrators at risk from mental health problems. The study site was in Ubay, Bohol, which is the largest municipality, was considered as the locale of this study. The study utilized the NEO Personality Inventory-Revised (NEO PI-R) tool. The assessment tool aimed to assess the different dimensions of personality that might affect mental health among identified respondents. This study showed that most of the respondents have work-related issues that result in mental health issues. Also considered is the level of workload. Positive feedback on the different activities in the pilot implementation of the proposed intervention as planned by the registered guidance counselors was noted. The primary activities undertaken included assessment, analysis of results, and developing a mental health management protocol (MHMP).

**Keywords:** educational management, mental health, assessment activity, NEO PI-R tool, assessment, analysis of results, descriptive, Ubay, Philippines

## INTRODUCTION

Filipinos strive for a healthy work-life balance, as well as a comfortable, secure, and tranquil existence. To achieve the SDGs, the Philippines has taken a whole-of-government and whole-of-society strategy. To ensure robustness, national actions are based on laws. A sustainability strategy, often known as a corporate responsibility strategy, comprises prioritized tasks (SDG of the United Nations).

It establishes a structure for focusing investment and driving performance while also including internal and external stakeholders. A good strategy entails more than just prioritization; it also entails devoting all of one's attention to specific topics. It is necessary to ensure an individual's well-being to achieve a peaceful, harmonious, and progressive society. In the Philippines, legislation was passed to improve the delivery of integrated mental health care while also promoting and preserving the rights of those who need psychosocial health services (No. 110 RA).

The Agenda for Sustainable Development (2030), a shared roadmap provided regarding peace and prosperity for the planet and the people today and in the future, was accepted by all UN Member States in 2015. At their heart, the 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) offer an urgent call to action for all developed and developing countries to collaborate in a global partnership. They recognize that eradicating poverty and other types of deprivation must be paired with measures to improve health and education, reduce inequality, and stimulate economic growth – all while battling climate change and working to safeguard the oceans and forests (UNSDGs). The agenda mentioned above for sustainable development, which includes mental health, consists of all stakeholders. The Department of Education (DepEd) aspires to produce Filipinos proud of their country and whose values and skills enable them to achieve their full potential and make important contributions to nation-building. If properly addressed, DepEd's mission and goal will develop Filipinos who are God-fearing, community-oriented, environmentally sensitive, and patriotic citizens 9155. (RA). Teachers in charge of providing inclusive education to students were provided capability-building program activities and school

and district-based learning action cell (LAC) sessions to address gaps and improve learners' knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values. Some teachers were fortunate to receive monetary support from their administrators for competence development program activities through school funds. Unfortunately, some schools lack financial management abilities, requiring teachers to spend their own money on teaching and non-teaching-related activities, resulting in additional financial commitments. In addition to the stress of an unexpectedly increased workload, numerous instructors have experienced mental health concerns due to the financial burden. Teachers who work in a stressful atmosphere are more likely to get depressed, leading to health issues. The problem tree below depicts DepEd staff's problems, especially teachers who have direct contact with pupils, experience. Positive social connections and stable relationships are considered ultimate goals or impacts if instructors are provided with appropriate activities for their requirements in the delivery of essential education services. The Magna Carta for Public School Teachers, also known as Republic Act No. 4670, aims to provide services that will help grow and improve public school teachers' well-being and economic status (RA 4670). Teachers whose acts and reactions are signs of mental health disorders have already been reported to the DepEd Bohol Division.

The school officials are concerned about this, but as educators and school managers, they are unsure how to approach the matter.

They basically keep reporting these occurrences as reasons for missed targets, but no particular initiatives or responses have been made.

Because mental health has been shown to have an impact on the lives of teachers and other stakeholders involved in the delivery of basic education services as mandated and planned, the researcher believes it is critical to understand the reasons that cause it.

There may be incidents that have gone undetected, or there may be cases that are already fermenting and could blow at any time (Gallagher-Thompson, Coon, Thompson, Steffen, Sorocco, and Thompson 2003).

Teachers in today's educational system are not only concerned with meeting standards to achieve key performance indicators such as zero dropout rate, no failure rate, 100% promotion rate, 100% meeting competencies in the competency guide as scheduled, and responding to other agencies' calls and mandates, but also with attending to various activities in the classroom. If left unattended, the feeling of being forgotten causes resentment and puts them in danger of emotional, social, and

financial problems, all of which can negatively impact their mental health.

The proponent, of this proposed undertaking as a district supervisor, has no record of any mental health care protection and welfare activities among teachers, who are the key players in making a risk-free, and child-friendly learning environment. Thus, given the opportunity to be part of the Development Academy of the Philippines' scholars in Batch 21 of Middle-Class Managers, she has decided to develop a mental health management protocol (MHMP) as her Capstone Project so that provision of assistance to teachers at risk is available, maintained and sustained. The proponent is, likewise, encouraged by the country's focus on mental health issues and concerns in recent years.

Teachers, like everyone else, have family and personal issues. Teachers' enthusiasm to teach tends to dwindle due to their troubles, resulting in a lack of knowledge as they are less likely to attend capability-building programs. Improper management and supervision have been linked to lower teacher motivation for providing essential education services.

As a district supervisor, the proponent of this planned endeavor has no record of any mental health care protection and welfare activities among teachers, who are the primary stakeholders in creating a risk-free child-friendly learning environment. Similarly, the proponent is heartened by the country's recent focus on mental health issues and concerns.

Section 2 of the Republic Act No. 11036, otherwise known as the Mental Health Law (June 20, 2018), stipulates that the state affirms the fundamental right of all Filipinos to mental health and the fundamental rights of people requiring mental health services. Section 35 outlines DepEd, CHED, and TESDA's duties and responsibilities, which include: (a) integrating age-appropriate mental health content into the curriculum at all educational levels, both public and private institutions; (b) developing guidelines and standards on age-appropriate and evidence-based mental health programs, both public and private institutions; and (c) pursuing strategic mental health initiatives.

In this respect, this researcher has found support for her desire to incorporate mental health into the education system as means of ensuring the support of the government among teachers. (RA No. 11036). SDO Bohol's top management provided her with gender and development (GAD) funds to finance the needed resources and activities in this undertaking. Financial, technical, moral, physical, emotional, and spiritual kinds of

support were planned collaboratively to address the issue of mental health problems among identified respondents. This study on the development of mental health management protocol among teachers and administrators in Ubay Districts during the school year 2019-2020 is mainly focused on work-related issues.

According to Hourani, Williams, and Kress (2006), employees are more stressed at work than in their personal lives. Those aged 25 and under, those who were married but their spouses were not present, and women reported the highest levels of professional stress. Stressed employees exhibited much greater rates of mental health problems and lost productivity than those who were less stressed. It was highly recommended that prevention and intervention efforts geared toward personnel reporting the highest levels of stress to be given priority for resources in this population. Some teaching levels, depending on the teacher's gender, were found to be at a higher risk of mental health problems. The main occupational risk factors identified were lack of support from colleagues, and to a lesser extent, depending on the mental health problem, the fear of physical or verbal abuse and the reasons the teaching profession was chosen.

A study was conducted by Alontaga, & Durban, (2013), to investigate the various sources of stress in Metro Manila among elementary school teachers. One hundred and ninety-one teachers were randomly selected from both public and private schools. To gather the answer of the respondents on stress, a survey questionnaire was developed. This study reports that the behavior and achievement of the pupils recorded a significant difference in age, gender, number of years of teaching experience and type of school (both public and private schools) are the four sources of stress identified. Misbehavior among learners has an impact on teachers' well-being to deal with the teaching-learning processes as observed, even during announced visits. In future research, it is important to use a more objective measure in this field to provide an objective criterion in evaluating pressure on teachers in elementary public schools rather than self-assessment.

It has been shown that teachers have high levels of stress and common mental illness, but few studies have investigated which factors are associated with poor mental health of teachers in the school environment as revealed by Kidger, Brockman, Tilling, Campbell, Ford, Araya, and Gunnell (2016). This is most common in almost every part of the Brazil. Poor teacher well-being was associated with dissatisfaction and stress

at work, wanting to talk to a colleague about feeling down but not feeling able, and a recent change in school governance. Teacher depression was associated with work-related dissatisfaction, wanting to talk to a colleague, but feeling incapable, and low attendance. Harada, Shigemura, Tanichi, Kawaida, Takahashi, and Yasukata, (2015) studied the impact of the Japan earthquake on mental health among victims and found that they included but were not limited to post traumatic stress disorder, depression, and signs of anxiety. In Fukushima, radioactive release caused massive fear and uncertainty among many people, causing massive distress among health among the residents affected, particularly among mothers of young children.

In a study conducted by Leung, Wah Mak, Yu Chui, Chiang, and Lee (2009) secondary school teachers in Hong Kong have high occupational stress, but, insufficient stress coping resources were provided.

It was also revealed that participants paid little attention to their own health and the management of stress. Those who exhibited more stress management behaviors showed significantly less physical symptoms, higher satisfaction with teaching, and lower occupational stress. Cognitive-behavioral programs to enhance teachers' stress management resources are recommended.

Understanding causes and effects of mental health management issues play a great role in management or treatment of mental health issues. Bringer, Sundfor, and Borg (2016) in their investigation, revealed that recovery is facilitated by self-help approaches and numerous contextual factors.

Whitley, Smith, and Vaillancourt, (2013), cited that everyone and other school staff play a key role as stakeholders in child and youth mental health prevention, recognition and intervention. It is important, however, that teachers are equipped with adequate knowledge in mental health to produce effective practices in these fields. Furthermore, Xiao-ming (2004) disclosed that: (1) professional stress among the teachers concerned would cause emotional exhaustion and depersonalization; and, (2) the less effective teaching, the more severe the emotional exhaustion and depersonalization was. Consistent with prior research, lifestyle management interventions as part of workplace wellness programs can reduce risk factors, such as smoking, and increase healthy behaviors, such as exercise (Mattke, Liu, Caloyeras, Huang, Van Busum, Khodyakov,

and Shier, 2013). It was found out that these effects are sustainable over time and clinically meaningful.

Workplace wellness programs cover over 50 million U.S. workers and are intended to reduce medical spending, increase productivity, and improve well-being (Jones, Molitor, and Reif, 2019). In the Philippine educational system, the agency paid celebrities to provide dance exercises as part of the school wellness program. In order to address issues on mental health problems, fund utilization is feasible through Gender and Development (GAD) Funds as provided in the Magna Carta for Women, (RA 9710). Gender and Development perspective and process that is participatory and empowering, equitable, sustainable, free from violence, respectful of human rights, supportive of self-determination and actualization of human potentials.

**Conceptual Design.** One's emotional, psychological and social well-being includes mental health. Mental health influences our way of thinking, feeling and behaving. It also assists in deciding how we deal with stress, how we respond to others, and how we make choices.

If one has mental health problems, the thinking, mood, and behavior could be affected over the course of life. (Mental Health Evidence, & Research Team. (2005). DepEd is expected to produce learners who are globally competitive, and responsive to the needs of the community they are in. (deped.gov.ph). The proponent as a public schools' district supervisor in her previous assignments provided team-building, and training activities at district or school levels, where financial considerations were charged to local government unit funds, school maintenance and other operating expenses.

The conceptual framework above shows the factors that may be affecting teachers that necessitate the establishment of the Mental Health Management Protocol. Overlapping activities, local government projects and programs, competitions and unplanned capability-building programs impinge upon the teachers. Mental health issues of teachers at risk can be assessed through NEO-PI Revised Assessment Tool. There five domains assessed in this tool, namely, Neuroticism (N), Extraversion (E), Openness to Experience (OE), Agreeableness (A), and Conscientiousness (C) and how they relate to mental health, cover the areas that the researcher believes necessary for teachers and their responsibilities.

## Statement of the Problem.

The main purpose of this study, is to identify activities to be included to address the possible causes of mental health issues and problems among teachers at risk. The proposed locale in the pilot implementation of this proposed MHMP are the three districts in Ubay, in the Division of Bohol, during the calendar year 2020.

Specifically, this capstone project will answer to the following questions:

1. What is the respondents' profile with respect to:
  - 1.1. age,
  - 1.2. sex,
  - 1.3. gender preference,
  - 1.4. status,
  - 1.5. the number of family members living with the family,
  - 1.6. years in teaching position,
  - 1.7. rewards and recognitions received,
  - 1.9. highest educational attainment, and
  - 2.0. dimensions of mental health issues?
2. What are the perceptions on the level of workload as provided in DepEd among teachers in terms of:
  2. 1. teaching-learning process,
  - 2.2. learner's outcome,
  - 2.3. community involvement; and
  - 2.4. professional growth?
3. What are the perceived causes of mental health problems as perceived by the respondents?
4. What proposed program of assistance is needed by teachers at risk of mental health problems?
5. What Mental Health Management Protocol was used for this study that could be used as model for the protocols other districts in Bohol can use for helping their administrators and teachers?

## METHODOLOGY

**Research Design.** The descriptive-survey design method was utilized in the conduct of this study. The data gathered were substantiated and enriched with focus group discussions. This study uses case study research design to determine the effects of the newly developed Mental Health Management Protocol (MHMP) being pilot-tested among the



participants who were found to be at risk of mental health issues. The assessment activity covers all teachers and school administrators in Ubay I, II, and III Districts, Division of Bohol during the school year 2019-2020, in determining those with mental health issues in terms of positive and negative emotions. The breakdown is shown below.

Ubay 1 District has twenty-one school administrators, but only fifteen (71.43 per cent) were able to take the assessment activity. Out of three hundred fifty-five teachers in Ubay I District, only three hundred forty-nine (98.31 per cent) were able to take the assessment. Ubay 2 District has fifteen school administrators, twelve (80.00 per cent) were able to take the assessment. Only those identified to be at risk by the Registered Guidance Counselor based on the very high or very low scores on the NEO PI-R dimensions were considered as participants in the pilot testing. Four administrators and forty-seven teachers from Ubay 1 district were at risk based from NEO PI R results. two administrators and sixty-nine teachers from Ubay 2, and five administrators and thirty-three teachers from Ubay 3. They were asked to participate in the team building activities as part of the initial implementation of the mental health management assistance program.

## Instruments

**Phase 1. NEO PI R (Status of Mental Well-Being).** The researcher used the Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO PI R) to determine the status of mental health among the teachers and to select the participants for the Mental Health Management Protocol (MHMP). The is an inventory of personality that examines the Big Five characteristics of a person (openness to experience, awareness, extraversion, agreeability, and neuroticism). The NEO PI R, is a normative Five Factor Model (FFM) questionnaire scale that; offers a comprehensive overview of cognitive, behavioral, experiential, attitudinal, and motivational styles — a detailed description of personality that can be a valuable resource for a range of professionals with 240 items to assess the five dimensions of an individual's personality. The administration takes approximately one hour. (Costa, & McCrae (2008).

**Phase 2 Demographic Variables, Workload, Causes and Assistance Needed.** The Self-Made Questionnaire was administered among those identified in Phase as having Mental Health Issues. It has four parts. The said data gathering instrument was presented to the

members of the panel, composed of the Development Academy of the Philippines (DAP) representative, Department of Education representative, and her adviser, and suggestions were provided. A pilot utilization of the said instrument was not required by the DAP in this quest for the degree, Master in Development Management (MDM).

**Statistical Treatment.** Simple tally and percentages were used to identify participants with depressive tendencies and symptoms. Frequency of responses were tallied, and the percentage of responses were determined by dividing the frequency of responses with the total number of cases multiplied by one hundred.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This study is composed of two phases. First is an assessment of the teachers and school administrators on the level of mental health using the NEO-PIR Tool. It was administered by licensed, and registered guidance counselors from different schools in the division of Bohol, analysis of results was undertaken, and those found to be at risk served as the respondents in the implementation of the development of a proposed mental health management protocol in January, February, and March 2020.

**Table 1. At Risk based on NEO PI-R Assessment Results**

| Respon-<br>dents | School Heads     |                |            |       | Teachers         |           |         |       |
|------------------|------------------|----------------|------------|-------|------------------|-----------|---------|-------|
|                  | Distrib-<br>uted | Re-<br>trieved | At<br>risk | %     | Distrib-<br>uted | Retrieved | At Risk | %     |
| Ubay 1           | 21               | 15             | 4          | 26.67 | 355              | 349       | 86      | 25.21 |
| Ubay 2           | 15               | 12             | 2          | 16.67 | 279              | 270       | 69      | 25.56 |
| Ubay 3           | 21               | 19             | 3          | 15.79 | 229              | 223       | 33      | 14.80 |
| Total            | 57               | 46             | 9          | 23.92 | 863              | 842       | 188     | 17.70 |

As presented in Table 1, Ubay 1 District has twenty-one school administrators. Still, only fifteen (71.43 percent) were able to take the assessment activity, and four (26.67 percent) were a risk of mental health problems. Out of three hundred fifty teachers, only three hundred forty-nine (98.31 percent) were able to take the assessment, eighty-six (25.21 percent) were at risk. Ubay 2 District has fifteen school administrators, twelve (80.00 percent) were able to take in the assessment, and two

(16.67 percent) were at risk of mental health problems. Out of the two hundred seventy-nine, two hundred seventy (96.77 percent) teachers were able to take the assessment, and sixty-nine (25.56 percent) were at risk. Ubay 3 District has twenty-one school administrators; nineteen (90.48 percent) were able to take the test, three (15.79 percent) of them were at risk. Of the two hundred twenty-nine teachers, two hundred twenty-three (97.37 percent) were able to take the assessment, and thirty-three (14.81 percent) teachers were a risk of mental health problems.

Table 2 illustrates the profile of the respondents who were identified as a risk of mental health problems. The data gathering tool was the researcher-made instrument pilot tested with the teachers who were not part of the final data-gathering activity.

Table 2. Profile of the Respondents

| Items                    | School Heads |               |      | Teachers   |               |      |
|--------------------------|--------------|---------------|------|------------|---------------|------|
|                          | Frequency    | Percentage    | Rank | Frequency  | Percentage    | Rank |
| <b>Age</b>               |              |               |      |            |               |      |
| 20-25 years old          | 0            | 0.00          |      | 21         | 11.17         | 5    |
| 26-30 years old          | 0            | 0.00          |      | 38         | 20.22         | 2    |
| 31-35 years old          | 1            | 11.11         | 3.5  | 27         | 14.36         | 3    |
| 36-40 years old          | 1            | 11.11         | 3.5  | 41         | 21.81         | 1    |
| 41-45 years old          | 2            | 22.22         | 2    | 23         | 12.23         | 4    |
| 46-50 years old          | 3            | 33.33         | 1    | 20         | 10.64         | 6    |
| 51-55 years old          | 0            | 0.00          |      | 12         | 6.38          | 7    |
| 56-60 years old          | 1            | 11.11         | 3.5  | 6          | 3.19          | 8    |
| 61-65 years old          | 1            | 11.11         | 3.5  | 0          | 0.00          |      |
| <u>Total</u>             | <u>9</u>     | <u>99.99</u>  |      | <u>188</u> | <u>100.00</u> |      |
| <b>Sex</b>               |              |               |      |            |               |      |
| Boy                      | 1            | 11.11         | 2    | 43         | 27.88         | 2    |
| Girl                     | 8            | 88.88         | 1    | 145        | 77.12         | 1    |
| <u>Total</u>             | <u>9</u>     | <u>99.99</u>  |      | <u>188</u> | <u>100.00</u> |      |
| <b>Gender Preference</b> |              |               |      |            |               |      |
| <u>Male</u>              | 1            | 11.11         | 2    | 43         | 27.88         | 2    |
| <u>Female</u>            | 8            | 88.88         | 1    | 145        | 77.12         | 1    |
| <u>Total</u>             | <u>9</u>     | <u>99.99</u>  |      | <u>188</u> | <u>100.00</u> |      |
| <b>Status</b>            |              |               |      |            |               |      |
| Single                   | 0            | 0.00          |      | 54         | 28.72         | 2    |
| Married                  | 9            | 100.00        | 1    | 128        | 68.09         | 1    |
| Widow                    | 0            | 0.00          |      | 3          | 1.60          | 3    |
| Widower                  | 0            | 0.00          |      | 1          | 0.53          | 5    |
| Separated                | 0            | 0.00          |      | 2          | 1.06          | 4    |
| <u>Total</u>             | <u>9</u>     | <u>100.00</u> |      | <u>188</u> | <u>100.00</u> |      |

| Items  | School Heads |              |      | Teachers   |               |      |
|--|--------------|--------------|------|------------|---------------|------|
|  | Frequency    | Percentage   | Rank | Frequency  | Percentage    | Rank |
| <b>No. of Members Living with the Family</b> |              |              |      |            |               |      |
| None   | 0            | 0.00         | 2.5  | 5          | 2.66          | 9    |
| 1  | 2            | 22.22        | 2.5  | 8          | 4.26          | 8    |
| 2  | 2            | 33.33        | 3.5  | 22         | 11.70         | 4    |
| 3  | 1            | 11.11        | 1    | 28         | 14.89         | 3    |
| 4  | 3            | 33.33        |      | 39         | 20.74         | 1    |
| 5  | 0            | 0.00         |      | 37         | 19.68         | 2    |
| 6  | 0            | 0.00         |      | 20         | 10.64         | 5    |
| 7  | 0            | 0.00         |      | 11         | 5.85          | 7    |
| 8  | 0            | 0.00         |      | 12         | 6.38          | 6    |
| 9  | 0            | 0.00         | 3.5  | 2          | 1.06          | 11   |
| 10   | 1            | 11.11        |      | 4          | 2.13          | 10   |
| <b>Total</b>                                 | <b>9</b>     | <b>99.99</b> |      | <b>188</b> | <b>100.00</b> |      |
| <b>Years in Teaching Position</b>            |              |              |      |            |               |      |
| Less than a year                             | 0            | 0.00         |      | 12         | 6.38          | 5.5  |
| 1-5 years                                    | 0            | 0.00         |      | 78         | 41.49         | 1    |
| 6-10 years                                   | 2            | 22.22        | 1.5  | 32         | 17.02         | 2    |
| 11-15 years                                  | 2            | 22.22        | 1.5  | 28         | 14.89         | 3    |
| 16-20 years                                  | 2            | 22.22        | 1.5  | 17         | 9.04          | 4    |
| 21-25 years                                  | 1            | 11.11        | 3.5  | 12         | 6.38          | 5.5  |
| 26-30 years                                  | 1            | 11.11        | 3.5  | 4          | 2.13          | 7    |
| 31-35 years                                  | 0            | 0.00         |      | 3          | 1.60          | 8    |
| 36-40 years                                  | 1            | 11.11        | 3.5  | 2          | 1.06          | 9    |
| 41-45 years                                  | 0            | 0.00         |      | 0          | 0.00          |      |
| <b>Total</b>                                 | <b>9</b>     | <b>99.99</b> |      | <b>188</b> | <b>100.00</b> |      |
| <b>Highest Educational Attainment</b>        |              |              |      |            |               |      |
| BEEd   | 0            | 0.00         |      | 30         | 15.96         | 3    |
| BSEd   | 0            | 0.00         |      | 12         | 6.38          | 4    |
| BEEd/BSEdQual                                | 0            | 0.00         |      | 9          | 4.79          | 5    |
| MA Units                                     | 0            | 0.00         |      | 81         | 43.09         | 1    |
| MA (CAR)                                     | 8            | 88.88        | 1    | 54         | 28.73         | 2    |
| MA Grad                                      | 1            | 11.11        | 2    | 1          | 0.53          | 6.5  |
| PhD/EdD Units                                | 1            | 11.11        |      | 0          | 0.00          |      |
| PhD/EdD (CAR)                                | 0            | 0.00         |      | 0          | 0.00          |      |
| PhD/EdD Grad                                 | 0            | 0.00         |      | 1          | 0.53          | 6.5  |
| <b>Total</b>                                 | <b>9</b>     | <b>99.99</b> |      | <b>188</b> | <b>100.00</b> |      |

| Items                              | School Heads |            |      | Teachers  |            |      |
|------------------------------------|--------------|------------|------|-----------|------------|------|
|                                    | Frequency    | Percentage | Rank | Frequency | Percentage | Rank |
| Rewards and Recognition            |              |            |      |           |            |      |
| Top Performing Teacher             | 3            | 33.33      | 1.5  | 25        | 13.20      | 1    |
| Top Performing Grade-Level Teacher | 0            | 0.00       |      | 0         | 0.00       |      |
| Top Performing Subject Specialist  | 3            | 33.33      | 1,5  | 1         | 0.53       | 2    |
| Top Performing School Head         | 0            | 0.00       |      |           | 0,00       |      |

As shown in Table 2, the demographic profile of the respondents is based on age, sex, gender, status, number of family members living with the family, years in the teaching profession, rewards and recognitions received, highest educational attainment, and dimensions of mental health.

**Age. School Administrators.** Three (33.33 percent) of the school administrators belonged to the age bracket 46-50, two (22.22 percent) belonged to age bracket 41-45, one (11.11 percent) 31-35, one (11 percent) 36-40 years, one (11.11 percent) 56-60 years, and one (11.11 percent) belonged to ages 61-65. **Teachers.** Forty-one (21.81 percent) belonged to age bracket 36-40 years, thirty-eight (20.22 percent) belonged to age bracket 26-30, twenty-seven (14.36 percent) belonged to ages 31-35, and twenty-three (12.23 percent) 41-45 years of age. Twenty-one (11.17 percent) belonged to age bracket 20-25 years, twenty (10.64 percent) 46-50, twelve (6.38 percent) belonged to age bracket 51-55 years, and six (3.19 percent) belonged to age bracket 56-60.

**Sex. School Administrators.** Eight (88.88 percent) of them are girls, and only one (11.11 percent) boy. **Teachers.** One hundred forty-five (72.12 percent) girls and forty-three (27.88 percent) boys.

**Gender Preference. School Administrators.** Eight (88.88 percent) disclosed they are females, and one (11.11 percent) male. **Teachers.** One hundred forty-five (77.12 percent) females and forty-three (27.88 percent) males.

**Status. School Administrators.** All (100.00 percent) are married. **Teachers.** One hundred twenty-eight (68.09 percent) married, fifty-four (28.72 percent) single, three (1.60 percent) widow, two (1.06 percent) separated, and one (0.53 percent) widower.

**No. of Members Living with the Family School Administrators.** Three (33.33 percent) have 4 members living with the family, two (22.22 percent) have 1, two (22.22 percent) have 2, one (11.11 percent) has 3, and another one (11.11 percent) has 10 members living with the family. **Teachers.** Thirty-nine (20.74 percent) have 4, thirty-seven (19.68 percent) have 5, twenty-eight (14.89 percent) have three, twenty-two (11.70 percent) have 2, and twenty (10.64 percent) have 6 members living with the family. Twelve (6.38 percent) have eight, eleven (5.86 percent) have 7, eight (4.26 percent) have 1, five (2.66 percent) have no member living with the family, four (2.13 percent) have 10, and two (1.06 percent) have 9 members living with the family.

**Years of experience. School Administrators.** Two (22.22 percent) have 6-10 years in teaching, two (22.22 percent) 11-15 years, two (22.22 percent) 16-20 years, one (11.11 percent) 21-25 years, one (11.11 percent) 26-30 years, and one (11.11 percent) 36-40 years teaching experience. **Teachers.** Seventy-eight (41.49 percent) have 1-5 years teaching experience, thirty-two (17.02 percent) have 6-10 years, twenty-eight (14.89 percent) have 11-15 years, seventeen (9.04 percent) have 16-20 years, twelve (6.38 percent) have 21-25 years, twelve (6.38 percent) have less than a year, four (2.13 percent) have 26-30 years, three (1.60 percent) have 31-35 years, and two (1.06 percent) have 36-40 years teaching experience.

**Highest Educational Attainment.** Eight (88.88 percent) earned complete academic requirements (CAR) in graduate study courses, one (11.11 percent) master of arts graduate, and one (11.11 percent) with post-graduate study units. **Teachers.** Eighty-one (43.09 percent) with MA units, fifty-four (28.73 percent) CAR in MA, thirty (15.96 percent) BEEEd graduate, twelve (6.38 percent) BSEd graduate, one (0.53 percent) MA graduate, and one (0.53 percent) Ph.D. graduate.

**Rewards and recognition. School administrators.** Three (33.33 percent) were awarded as top-performing teachers, and three (33.33 percent) were awarded as top-performing subject specialists.

**Teachers.** Twenty-five (13.20 percent) was awarded as a top-performing teacher, and only one (0.53 percent) was awarded as a top-performing subject specialist.

Table 3 illustrates the dimensions of mental health issues on the five dimensions. The findings were as follows:

Table 3. Dimensions of Mental Health Issues

| Dimensions of Mental Health | Frequency School Administrator | Percentage School Administrator | Frequency Teachers | Percentage Teachers |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| <b>Neuroticism</b>          |                                |                                 |                    |                     |
| Very High                   | 0                              | 0.00                            | 6                  | 3.19                |
| High                        | 0                              | 0.00                            | 35                 | 18.62               |
| Average                     | 6                              | 66.66                           | 114                | 60.63               |
| Low                         | 3                              | 33.33                           | 30                 | 16.96               |
| Very Low                    | 0                              | 0.00                            | 3                  | 1.60                |
| <b>Extraversion</b>         |                                |                                 |                    |                     |
| Very High                   | 7                              | 77.77                           | 6                  | 3.19                |
| High                        | 2                              | 22.22                           | 28                 | 14.89               |
| Average                     | 0                              | 0.00                            | 97                 | 51.60               |
| Low                         | 0                              | 0.00                            | 45                 | 23.94               |
| Very Low                    | 0                              | 0.00                            | 2                  | 1.06                |
| <b>Openness</b>             |                                |                                 |                    |                     |
| Very High                   | 0                              | 0.00                            | 2                  | 1.06                |
| High                        | 0                              | 0.00                            | 30                 | 15.96               |
| Average                     | 8                              | 88.88                           | 111                | 59.04               |
| Low                         | 1                              | 11.11                           | 40                 | 21.28               |
| Very Low                    | 0                              | 0.00                            | 1                  | 0.53                |
| <b>Agreeableness</b>        |                                |                                 |                    |                     |
| Very High                   | 0                              | 0.00                            | 3                  | 1.60                |
| High                        | 1                              | 11.11                           | 18                 | 9.57                |
| Average                     | 5                              | 55.55                           | 79                 | 42.02               |
| Low                         | 1                              | 11.11                           | 69                 | 36.70               |
| Very Low                    | 2                              | 22.22                           | 19                 | 10.11               |
| <b>Conscientiousness</b>    |                                |                                 |                    |                     |
| Very High                   | 1                              | 11.11                           | 7                  | 3.72                |
| High                        | 3                              | 33.33                           | 39                 | 20.74               |
| Average                     | 4                              | 44.44                           | 102                | 54.26               |
| Low                         | 1                              | 11.11                           | 30                 | 15.86               |
| Very Low                    | 0                              | 0.00                            | 10                 | 5.32                |
| Total                       | 9                              | 99.99                           | 188                | 100.00              |

## Neuroticism

**School Administrators.** Six (66.66 percent) were categorized as average, and three (33.00 percent) were categorized as low in Neuroticism.

**Teachers.** One hundred fourteen (50.63 percent) were average, thirty-five (18.62 percent) high, thirty (16.96 percent) low, six (3.10 percent) very high, and three (1.60 percent) very low.

## Extraversion

**School Administrators.** Seven (77.77 percent) are very high and two (22.22 percent) high.

**Teachers.** Ninety-seven (51.60 percent) were found to be average, forty-five (23.94 percent), twenty-eight (14.89 percent) high, six (3.19 percent) very high, and two (1.06 percent) very low in extraversion.

## Openness

**School Administrators.** Eight (88.88 percent) average, and one (11.11 percent) low.

**Teachers.** One hundred eleven (59.04 percent) average, forty (21.28 percent) low, thirty (15.96 percent) high, two (1.06 percent) very high, and one (0.53 percent) very low on openness.

## Agreeableness

**School Administrators.** Five (55.55 percent) average, two (22.22 percent) very low, one (11.11 percent) very high, and one (11.11 percent) low.

**Teachers.** Seventy-nine (42.02 percent) average, sixty-nine (36.70 percent) low, eighteen (9.57 percent) high, nineteen (10.11 percent) very low, and three (1.60 percent) very high in agreeableness.

## Conscientiousness

**School Administrators.** Four (44.44 percent) average, three (33.33 percent) high, one (11.11 percent) very high, and another one low.

**Teachers.** One hundred two (54.26 percent) average, thirty-nine (20.74 percent) high, thirty (15.86 percent) low, seven (3.72 percent) very high, and one (0.53 percent) very low in conscientiousness.

As presented in Table 4, the level of workload has been identified into two categories, from the school administrators' and teachers' points of view.



Table 4. Level of Workload

| Level of workload as provided in DepEd | Frequency School Administrator | Percentage School Administrator | Frequency Teachers | Percentage Teachers |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| <b>Teaching-Learning Process</b>       |                                |                                 |                    |                     |
| Greatly Felt                           | 1                              | 11.11                           | 31                 | 16.49               |
| Moderately Felt                        | 5                              | 55.55                           | 139                | 73.94               |
| Felt                                   | 3                              | 33.33                           | 13                 | 6.91                |
| Occasionally Felt                      | 0                              | 0.00                            | 5                  | 2.70                |
| Rarely Felt                            | 0                              | 0.00                            | 0                  | 00.00               |
| <b>Learners' Outcome</b>               |                                |                                 |                    |                     |
| Greatly Felt                           | 3                              | 33.33                           | 19                 | 10.11               |
| Moderately Felt                        | 4                              | 44.44                           | 143                | 70.06               |
| Felt                                   | 2                              | 22.22                           | 2                  | 1.06                |
| Occasionally Felt                      | 0                              | 00.00                           | 22                 | 11.70               |
| Rarely Felt                            | 0                              | 00.00                           | 2                  | 1.06                |
| <b>Community Involvement</b>           |                                |                                 |                    |                     |
| Greatly Felt                           | 3                              | 33.33                           | 15                 | 7.89                |
| Moderately Felt                        | 4                              | 44.44                           | 124                | 65.96               |
| Felt                                   | 2                              | 22.22                           | 36                 | 18.15               |
| Occasionally Felt                      | 0                              | 00.00                           | 12                 | 6.38                |
| Rarely Felt                            | 0                              | 00.00                           | 1                  | 0.53                |
| <b>Professional Growth</b>             |                                |                                 |                    |                     |
| Greatly Felt                           | 6                              | 66.66                           | 18                 | 9.57                |
| Moderately Felt                        | 2                              | 22.22                           | 134                | 71.28               |
| Felt                                   | 1                              | 11.11                           | 28                 | 14.90               |
| Occasionally Felt                      | 0                              | 00.00                           | 7                  | 3.72                |
| Rarely Felt                            | 0                              | 00.00                           | 1                  | 53.19               |

### Teaching-Learning Process

**School Administrators.** Five (55.55 percent) responded that the teaching-learning process nowadays is moderately felt by them, three (33.33 percent) responded felt, and one (11.11 percent) greatly felt on the burden of workload as provided in DepEd.

**Teachers.** One hundred thirty-nine (73.94 percent) moderately felt, thirty-one (16.49 percent) greatly felt, thirteen (6.91 percent) felt, and five (2.70 percent) responded that the level of workload was occasionally felt.

## Learners' Outcome

**School Administrators.** Four (44.44 percent) moderately felt, three (33.33 percent) greatly felt, and two (22.22 percent) felt on the level of workload.

**Teachers.** One hundred forty-three (70.06 percent) moderately felt, twenty-two (11.10 percent) occasionally felt, nineteen (10.11 percent) greatly felt, two (1.06 percent) felt, and two (1.06 percent) occasionally rarely felt the level of workload.

## Community Involvement

**School Administrators.** Four (44.44 percent) moderately felt, three (33.33 percent) greatly felt, and two (22.22 percent) felt on the level of workload.

**Teachers.** One hundred twenty-four (65.96 percent) moderately felt, thirty-six (18.15 percent) felt, fifteen (7.89 percent) greatly felt, twelve (6.38 percent) occasionally felt, and one (0.53 percent) rarely felt on the level of workload.

## Professional Growth

**School Administrators.** Six (66.66 percent) greatly felt, two (22.22 percent) moderately felt, and one (11.11 percent) felt the level of workload on professional growth.

**Teachers.** One hundred thirty-four (71.28 percent) moderately felt twenty-eight (14.90 percent) felt, eighteen (9.57 percent) greatly felt, and seven (3.72 percent) occasionally felt, and one (0.53) rarely felt on the level of workload as regards to professional growth.

As shown in Table 5, respondents presented the identified causes of mental health issues as; overworked load (subject and ancillary), too much clerical works for teachers, expectations from the people outside, graduate study work, and slow promotion process from teacher 1 to teachers three items. Department pressures and expectations, home and personal problems, distance from house to the station, and lack of facilities to download teaching-learning resources were also identified.

Table 5. Causes of Mental Health Issues

| Causes of mental health issues                                  | Frequency<br>School<br>Administrator | Percentage<br>School<br>Administrator | Frequency<br>Teachers | Percentage<br>Teachers |
|---|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Overworked load (subject and ancillary)                         | 0                                    | 0.00                                  | 14                    | 7.45                   |
| Too many clerical works for teachers                            | 2                                    | 22.22                                 | 22                    | 11.70                  |
| Expectations from the people outside                            | 3                                    | 33.33                                 | 5                     | 2.66                   |
| Graduate study work   | 1                                    | 1.11                                  | 21                    | 11.17                  |
| Slow promotion process  | 3                                    | 33.33                                 | 24                    | 12.77                  |
| Department pressures and expectations                           | 1                                    | 1.11                                  | 23                    | 12.23                  |
| Home and personal problems                                      | 2                                    | 22.22                                 | 17                    | 9.04                   |
| Distance from house to station                                  | 2                                    | 22.22                                 | 5                     | 2.66                   |
| Lack of facilities to download teaching –<br>learning resources | 0                                    | 0.00                                  | 8                     | 4.26                   |

It can be determined that several UBAY District teachers and administrators, whatever of age or years of service, have mental health concerns that need to be addressed.

It may also be argued that the Pilot MHMP Team Building exercise was well-received and has the potential to alleviate faculty.

In terms of deliveries, it may be determined that upper management is supportive. Support for the district consultative meeting, which served as the beginning point for ensuring the flow of the scheduled activities, was one of the indicators.

More activities may have been incorporated in the pilot implementation of the MHMP if not for the stringent implementation of the so-called ECQ. SDS Dagatans' 10-Point Agenda and particular metrics demonstrate their seriousness regarding financial, moral, motivational, human, and non-resources from senior management.

The proposed MHMP program can also be concluded to be sustainable, as evidenced by the good support in terms of deliverables.

## REFERENCES CITED

- Alontaga, J. V., & Durban, J. M. (2013, March). A self-assessment of the professional stress among elementary school teachers. In *DLSU Research Congress*.
- Coon, D. W., Thompson, L., Steffen, A., Sorocco, K., & Gallagher-Thompson, D. (2003). anger and depression management: psychoeducational skill training interventions for women caregivers of a relative with dementia. *The Gerontologist, 43*(5), 678-689.
- Costa, Jr, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (2008). The Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) Tool.
- Harada, N., Shigemura, J., Tanichi, M., Kawaida, K., Takahashi, S., & Yasukata, F. (2015). Mental health and psychological impacts from the 2011 Great East Japan Earthquake Disaster: a systematic literature review. *Disaster and military medicine, 1*(1), 17.
- Hourani, L. L., Williams, T. V., & Kress, A. M. (2006). Stress, mental health, and job performance among active duty military personnel: findings from the 2002 Department of Defense Health-Related Behaviors Survey. *Military medicine, 171*(9), 849-856.
- Jones, D., Molitor, D., & Reif, J. (2019). What do workplace wellness programs do? Evidence from the Illinois workplace wellness study. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 134*(4), 1747-1791.
- Kidger, J., Brockman, R., Tilling, K., Campbell, R., Ford, T., Araya, R., ... & Gunnell, D. (2016). Teachers' wellbeing and depressive symptoms, and associated risk factors: A large cross sectional study in English secondary schools. *Journal of affective disorders, 192*, 76-82.
- Leung, S. S., Wah Mak, Y., Yu Chui, Y., Chiang, V. C., & Lee, A. C. (2009). Occupational stress, mental health status and stress management behaviors among secondary school teachers in Hong Kong. *Health Education Journal, 68*(4), 328-343.

Mattke, S., Liu, H., Caloyeras, J., Huang, C. Y., Van Busum, K. R., Khodyakov, D., & Shier, V. (2013). Workplace wellness programs study. *Rand health quarterly*, 3(2).

Whitley, J., Smith, J. D., & Vaillancourt, T. (2013). Promoting mental health literacy among educators: Critical in school-based prevention and intervention. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology*, 28(1), 56-70.

Xiao-ming, L. I. U. (2004). Relationships Between Professional Stress, Teaching Efficacy and Burnout Among Primary and Secondary School Teachers [J]. *Psychological Development and Education*, 2.

World Health Organization. Department of Mental Health, Substance Abuse, World Health Organization, World Health Organization. Department of Mental Health, Substance Abuse. Mental Health, World Health Organization. Mental Health Evidence, & Research Team. (2005). *Mental health atlas 2005*. World Health Organization.

Republic Act No. 9710, The Magna Carta of Women

Republic Act No. 4670, The Magna Carta for Public School Teachers,

Republic Act 11036. Implementing Rules and Regulations of RA 11036. Known as Mental Health Act. Approved January 22, 2019.

Republic Act No.110. An Act Establishing a National Mental Health Policy for the Purpose of Enhancing the Delivery of Integrated Mental Health Services, Promoting and Protecting the Rights of Persons Utilizing Psychosocial Health Services, Appropriating Funds Therefor and Other Purposes

United Nations. Sustainable Development: 17 Goals. (2015). Retrieved from <https://sdgs.un.org/goals>