



Received: 12-07-2023
Accepted: 22-08-2023

ISSN: 2583-049X

Development of L&D Program: A Sequential Explanatory Study on the Knowledge and Skill Levels and Difficulties of Teachers in Writing Development Project Proposals

Mylene O Castro

Master Teacher II, Dupax del Norte National High School, Nueva Vizcaya, Philippines

Corresponding Author: **Mylene O Castro**

Abstract

Writing a development project proposal is mostly viewed by teachers as a very hard task as it entails enough knowledge, skills and diligence to follow writing standards. With this, this study then was formulated to determine the demographic profile of the participants and their knowledge and skill levels and difficulties encountered by them in writing project proposals. Further, it aims to determine the significant relationship between and among the participants' knowledge and skill levels and difficulties in writing project proposals. This study used the sequential-explanatory

approach as a research design which is a sequential approach that is utilized when the researcher wants to compare quantitative and qualitative data. The study revealed that the teacher-respondents' demographic profiles greatly influence their knowledge and skill in writing project proposals, and are contributory factors in the difficulties they encounter when they write. This study then led to recommend for development of learning and development program.

Keywords: Demographic Profile, Knowledge, Skill, Proposal, Learning and Development

1. Introduction

Numerous development projects made by the Department of Education intend to augment the operational needs of schools in order to improve Access, Equity, Equality and Efficiency since national allocations or funds could hardly provide all the needed resources, equipment, buildings, trainings/seminars, etc. Thus, sourcing out from local governments, private and nongovernment sectors, stakeholders and even the community is considered the most possible way for every school to continue delivering basic education services for teachers and learners.

In a school, same ways and means are undertaken by all its teaching and nonteaching staff and personnel for school continuous improvement. With this, a division-wide advocacy to strategize development projects that require tapping of possible donors or sponsors of needed resources is followed in the school level. As such, most teachers cleverly design development projects that anchor on provision of quality education by asking support which may be in form of cash assistance, in-kind donations, labor, and many more that help school to mobilize all its plans. Teachers can easily craft titles and objectives along with activities and strategies to realize such objectives. They are endowed as well with passion and commitment to work. However, teachers find difficulties in writing development project proposals which are to be evaluated and accepted in the Division level. Writing a development project proposal is mostly viewed by teachers as a very hard task as it entails enough knowledge, skills and diligence to follow writing standards. In addition, having these proposals be permitted and accepted in the Division level requires project owners to have clear understanding on the process in approving permit and acceptance of Development Projects slated in the E-SIP, thus they are required to follow the guidelines enumerated in Division Memo No. 43, s. 2018, entitled, Division Guidelines in Preparing Development Projects.

It is in this premise that this study is proposed to investigate on the difficulties of teachers in writing development project proposals in order to think of viable solutions or intervention along learning and development to address such problems.

Objectives of the Study

The study investigated the knowledge and skill levels and difficulties of selected Faculty and Staff in Dupax del Norte National High School in writing project proposals. Specifically, this research attempted to answer the following questions: (1) What is the demographic profile of the participants in terms of: Position/rank; Years/length of service; Number of SDO-accredited projects; and Number of L&D Attended. (2) What are the knowledge and skill levels and difficulties encountered by the

participants in writing development project proposals? (3) Is there a significant relationship between and among the participants' knowledge and skill levels and difficulties in writing development project proposals and their demographic profiles? (4) What specific intervention be proposed to address the difficulties of the participants in writing development project proposals?

2. Methodology

This study used the sequential-explanatory approach as a research design which is a sequential approach that is utilized when the researcher wants to compare quantitative and qualitative data. As a result, the qualitative data is used in the interpretation and clarification of the quantitative data analysis results. The participants are the project proponents of the school's AIP 2022. Among the 27 Faculty and Staff, there are 20 project owners.

3. Results and Discussion

Table 1: Frequency and percentage distribution of the profile of the teacher participants

Parameter	Frequency	Percentage
<i>Teaching Position</i>		
T-I	4	20%
T-II	6	30%
T-III	10	50%
<i>Length of Service</i>	Frequency	Percentage
1-5	7	35%
6-10	5	25%
10 Above	8	40%
<i>Number of Projects accredited in the School</i>	Frequency	Percentage
None	1	5%
1-2	2	10%
3-4	17	85%
5 Above	0	0%
<i>Number of Projects accredited in the Division</i>	Frequency	Percentage
None	17	85%
1-2	2	10%
3-4	1	5%
5 Above	0	0%
<i>Number of L&D Attended</i>	Frequency	Percentage
NONE	3	16%
1-2	9	47%
3-4	2	11%
5 Above	5	26%

It could be gleaned from the table that among the twenty participants, ten or 50% are Teacher III in rank, and eight or 40% of them have been teaching for 10 years; while seven or 35% have been teaching for 1-5 years. This implies that there are neophytes in the teaching profession. In terms of the number of projects accredited in the school, majority or 17 or 85% out of 20 participants have 3-4 projects while same number have no projects accredited in the division, only one or 5%. Lastly, along number of Learning and Development Attended in the different levels, 1-2 range got the highest share, having nine or 47%, 5 above range got five or 26%, 3-4 range takes two or 11%; and 3 or 16% have never attended L&D program.

Table 2: Knowledge level of the teacher-respondents in writing project proposals

a. Knowledge on Parts/Format	Mean	VD
Project Title	1.8	Knowledgeable
Background and Rationale	1.85	Knowledgeable
Objectives and Expected Outcomes	1.85	Knowledgeable
Target and Beneficiaries	1.9	Knowledgeable
Project Description, Interventions, Methods and Strategies	1.55	Not knowledgeable
Project Implementation Plan (Gantt Chart)	1.5	Not knowledgeable
Budgetary Requirements and Source of Funding	1.65	Not knowledgeable
Monitoring and Evaluation	1.55	Not knowledgeable
Strategies for Project Sustainability or Replication	1.55	Not knowledgeable
Grand Mean	1.87	Knowledgeable
b. Quality Assurance	Mean	VD
School Level Quality Assurance Protocol	1.65	Not knowledgeable
District Level Quality Assurance Protocol	1.65	Not knowledgeable
Division Level Quality Assurance Protocol	1.65	Not knowledgeable
Grand Mean	1.65	Not knowledgeable
c. Parts/Format of Acceptance	Mean	VD
Project Title	1.6	Not knowledgeable
Background and Rationale	1.7	Knowledgeable
Objectives and Expected Outcomes	1.65	Not knowledgeable
Target and Beneficiaries	1.65	Not knowledgeable
Project Description, Interventions, Methods and Strategies	1.55	Not knowledgeable
Project Implementation Plan (Gantt Chart)	1.35	Not knowledgeable
Budgetary Requirements and Source of Funding	1.6	Not knowledgeable
Monitoring and Evaluation	1.4	Not knowledgeable
Strategies for Project Sustainability or Replication	1.35	Not knowledgeable
Appendices	1.3	Not knowledgeable
Grand Mean	1.515	Not knowledgeable

Table 4 presents that out of 20 respondents, they obtained an overall mean of 1.87 which is qualitatively described as Knowledgeable. Analytically, the respondents posted a mean of 1.9 in writing the target and beneficiaries which is verbally described as Knowledgeable. Other three indicators have means ranging from 1.8 to 1.85 which are qualitatively described also as Knowledgeable. On the other hand, there are five indicators with means ranging from 1.5 to 1.55, qualitatively described as Not Knowledgeable. This would imply that there are more indicators which respondents are not knowledgeable at. On quality assurance, all the four given indicators have the same mean, 1.65, which is qualitatively described as Not Knowledgeable. On parts/format of the acceptance or completion of project proposal, only one indicator has a mean of 1.7 which is qualitatively described as Knowledgeable. The 10 indicators have the means ranging from 1.3 to 1.65, qualitatively described as Not Knowledgeable. An overall mean of 1.515, qualitatively described as Not Knowledgeable was obtained. It could be inferred that teacher-respondents are not knowledgeable in almost all indicators along knowledge on parts or proposal, quality assurance and parts/format of acceptance. The findings in the present study are in

consonance with what Ningsih (2020) [18] posits that the authors/ writers are well aware that writing, or learning to write, is a difficult task. It is not enough to just "write things down" in a second language.

Table 3: Skill level of the teacher respondents in writing project proposals

Skill Level	Mean	VD
Project Title	1.55	Not skilled
Background and Rationale	1.5	Not skilled
Objectives and Expected Outcomes	1.6	Not skilled
Target and Beneficiaries	1.25	Not skilled
Project Description, Interventions, Methods and Strategies	1.2	Not skilled
Project Implementation Plan (Gantt Chart)	1.3	Not skilled
Budgetary Requirements and Source of Funding	1.2	Not skilled
Monitoring and Evaluation	1.2	Not skilled
Strategies for Project Sustainability or Replication	1.3	Not skilled
Grand Mean	1.344444	Not skilled

Table 3 displays an overall mean of 1.34, qualitatively described as Not Skilled. This implies that all the respondents are not yet skilled in writing project proposals following the given standard. The findings find support in the study of Aydin (2019) [1] who posits that an individual’s belief on his/her self-efficacy at any given subject is of high importance and writing self-efficacy perception describes the belief one has in his/her writing skills. Significant findings in his study show that preservice Turkish teachers’ perceptions of their writing self-efficacy improved during their education, that they made progress in prewriting and draft items, but that there was no significant change in revising and editing which is one of the most important processes in writing.

Table 4: Difficulties of the teacher-respondents in writing project proposals

Template/Parts	Mean	VD
Recasting the Project Title and aligning it to the title found in the approved AIP	3.45	Agree
Capturing the Priority Improvement Area (PIA) and discussing the content of the School in relation to the PIA	3.5	Agree
Objectives and Expected Outcomes	3.5	Agree
Aligning the objectives (Specific and General) found in the AIP	3.6	Agree
Indicating the General Objective	3.6	Agree
Writing specific objectives in SMART form	3.55	Agree
Spelling out the beneficiaries of the project	3.65	Agree
Characterizing the Project/Innovation	3.5	Agree
Discussing the mechanism of the project	3.6	Agree
Discussing the development of the project	3.5	Agree
Aligning the Project activity in the AIP	3.6	Agree
Presenting Activities using Gantt Chart	3.6	Agree
Matching the budgetary requirements with the approved AIP	3.6	Agree
Spelling out all the budgetary requirements in matrix form	3.4	Agree
Using the monitoring template found in DO 44, s. 2015, DM 43, s. 2018	3.55	Agree
Conducting analysis of M&E conducted	3.45	Agree
Providing recommendations from the result of the M&E	3.45	Agree
Appending approved: Site Development Plan and Approved Program of Works (POW)	3.35	Agree

Annual Implementation Plan/Supplementary Plan (AIP)	3.35	Agree
Work and Financial Plan (WFP)	3.2	Agree
Organization		
I write a rationale that lacks any semblance of logical organization and the reader cannot identify a line of reasoning and loses interest.	3	Agree
Purpose		
I write with a purpose that is generally unclear.	2.5	disagree
Use of References		
I do not cite references to support claims.	2.75	disagree
Sentence Structure		
I fail to avoid errors in sentence structure which are frequent enough to represent a major distraction to the reader.	2.7	disagree
Word Choice		
I use many words inappropriately that confuse readers.	2.65	disagree
I also use clichés and colloquial language.	2.8	disagree
Grammar, spelling, mechanics		
I commit numerous errors which obscure the meaning of the passage.	2.9	disagree
Grand Mean	3.30	agree

Table 4 reveals a remarkable number of “agree” responses of the teacher respondents along difficulties in writing project proposals, thus, the obtained grand mean is 3.307, qualitatively agree. It could be inferred from the table that the difficulties of teacher respondents along the given template with 20 specific parts take 20 “agree” responses with the means ranging from 3.45 to 3.65. This would imply that the teacher respondents agree that they find difficulties in almost all the given parts of the template to be used in writing a project proposal. Hence, the above results uphold the findings of the study of Garcia, R. G., & Asuncion, Z. 2022, which reveal that struggling writers, according to Fearn and Farnan (2008), lack both writing skill and information, are hesitant to engage in the writing process, and have doubts about their ability to write. However, the respondents do not find any difficulties in their purpose to write as their responses obtained a mean of 2.5 with verbal description as disagree. Meanwhile, difficulties on the use of references, sentence structure and word choice, take means ranging from 2.65 to 2.8 with verbal description disagree. It could be inferred that the respondents do not experience difficulties in terms of the other writing standards.

The results of the present study can find support from different studies which state that in terms of grammar and word choice, struggling writers build shorter and simpler sentences (Saddler *et al.*, 2008). In terms of writing expertise, struggling writers are inexperienced with the various creating processes (Saddler & Graham, 2007). Furthermore, they discovered that carrying out these writing activities was a difficult chore for them (McCutchen, 1995; Liberty & Conderman, 2018). They spent less time planning and created shorter, half-completed stories as a result (Saddler, *et al.*, 2004). When respondents are asked about the factors that can affect their writing of project proposals, majority answered that they do not have much knowledge on correct project proposals and not enough resources and time, not interested, poor grammar, overlapping activities, not familiar with the templates/format, not aware of the SIP/AIP, lack of trainings/workshops on crafting project proposals, availability of coach.

Table 5: Relationship among the dependent variables

Variables	r-value	VD	p-value	QD
knowledge on parts/format	0.56948	Moderate Correlation	0.00033	Significant
quality assurance				
quality assurance	0.53426	Moderate Correlation	0.00201	Significant
parts/format of acceptance				
parts/format of acceptance	0.40491	Moderate Correlation	0.01506	Significant
skill level				
skill level	0.00469	Very Low Correlation	0.05080	Not Significant
template/parts				
			alpha level of 0.05	

Table 5 presents the significant relationship between knowledge on parts/format and quality assurance among the respondents. The correlation coefficient is 0.56948 with degree of relationship of moderate correlation, with p-value 0.000031 less than the critical value of 0.05. This implies that the respondents are not knowledgeable of the different parts or format of a research and the three levels of quality assurance; significant relationships were obtained also between the following: quality assurance and parts/format of acceptance, the correlation coefficient is 0.53426 with degree of relationship of moderate correlation, with p-value 0.002001 less than the critical value of 0.05. This implies that the respondents are not knowledgeable of the different parts or format of acceptance and the three levels of quality assurance; the parts or format of acceptance and skill level among the respondents with the correlation coefficient is 0.40491 with degree of relationship of moderate correlation, with p-value 0.01506 less than critical value of 0.05. This implies that the respondents' knowledge level of the different parts or format of acceptance may affect their skill level in writing a project proposal; the difficulties in writing following the template/parts and the skill level of the respondents, the correlation coefficient is 0.00469 with the degree of relationship of very low correlation, with p-value 0.05080 less than critical value of 0.05. This implies that the respondents' difficulties in following the given template does not affect their skill level in writing a project proposal. The above results find support in the following studies which reveal that many students with writing challenges face difficulty while rewriting their papers because they are more concerned with correcting mechanical flaws than with increasing the overall quality of their work (McCutchen, 1995; MacArthur *et al.*, 1991). When it comes to approaches, struggling writers have a tendency to execute writing strategies and basic writing abilities poorly (Graham *et al.*, 1992). Poor spelling and handwriting challenge their lower-level writing skills, affecting their performance (Graham & Harris, 2000).

Table 6: Summary of Correlations between the Respondents' Profile and their Knowledge on parts or format of a proposal

Variables	r-value	VD	p-value	QD
Teaching Position	0.19664	very weak correlation	0.00177	significant
Length of service	0.04837	very weak correlation	0.01682	significant
Projects accredited in the school	0.218719291	weak correlation	0.00000279505	Not significant
Projects accredited in the division	0.02140	very weak correlation	0.02216	significant
L&D attended	0.14391	very weak correlation	0.00645	significant

Table 6 shows that all the demographic profile of the respondents (teaching position, length of service, number of projects accredited in the division, and number of L&D attended and their knowledge on parts or format are significantly correlated. However, it is only with projects accredited in the school that the knowledge on parts or format of a project proposal is not significantly correlated with a computed correlation coefficient of 2.18 with p-value of 2.2950506 at 0.05 level of significance. This implies that mostly, respondents have projects accredited in the school level only using the knowledge on the parts of a project proposal taught by the school level quality assurance team. The results are in consonance with Saddler & Graham, 2007 who quip that in terms of writing expertise, struggling writers are inexperienced with the various creating processes. When respondents are asked why most of them do not write proposals to be accredited not only in the school but more importantly, in the division, their answers are the Learning and Development program like INSET or Pre-School Year Conference they have attended are very informative and relevant, but they do not finish writing development projects due to lack of time, limited knowledge and no available coach to guide them. They further answered that they need training/workshop and other technical assistance.

Table 7: Summary of Correlations between the Respondents' Profile and their Knowledge on Quality Assurance

Variables	r-value	VD	p-value	QD
Teaching Position	0.05768	very weak correlation	0.00051	very significant
Length of service	0.06480	very weak correlation	0.00458	significant
Projects accredited in the school	0.045309964	very weak correlation	0.000003684	significant
Projects accredited in the division	0.09647	very weak correlation	0.00114	significant
L&D	0.01469	very weak correlation	0.00214	significant

Table 7 shows that it is only with teaching position that the quality assurance is very significantly correlated with computed correlation coefficient of 0.05768 with p-value of 0.00051 less than the critical values of 0.05. Further, other profiles are significantly correlated with knowledge on quality assurance. The results imply that Teacher III which is the majority teaching position of the respondents have much knowledge on quality assurance. This supports the mandate of the Division to make all teachers aware of the Development Project Guidelines and the templates to be followed.

Table 8: Summary of Correlations between the Respondents' Profile and their Knowledge on Parts/Format of Acceptance Report

Variables	r-value	VD	p-value	QD
Teaching positions	0.005409649	very weak correlation	0.010540279	significant
Length of service	0.09425066	very weak correlation	0.133287908	not significant
Projects accredited in the school	0.000186832	very weak correlation	0.012227553	significant
Projects accredited in the division	0.000186832	very weak correlation	0.012227553	significant
L&D	0.016594374	very weak correlation	0.003733399	significant

Table 8 shows significant relationships that were yielded between the respondents' profiles and their knowledge on parts/format of the acceptance. The results imply that all teachers, regardless of the teaching position, length of service, number of projects accredited in the school and division and L&D can be equipped with knowledge on template/format of the acceptance that help them in writing project proposals.

This supports the mandate of the Division to make all teachers aware of the Development Project Guidelines. (Division Memorandum no. 43, s. 2018 (Division Guidelines in Preparing Development Projects), Division Memorandum no. 06, s. 2021 and Division Memorandum No. 133, s. 2022 (Corrigendum and Addendum to Division Memorandum No. 06, s. 2021 Learning and Development (L&D) Guidelines and Utilization of Human Resource Development (HRD) ISO Forms, and LAC session guidelines per se stated in DO no. 35, s. 201).

Table 9: Summary of Correlations between the Respondents' Profile and their Skill Level in Writing Project Proposal

Teaching positions	0.148027699	Very Weak Correlation	0.001273133	significant
length of service	0.298956393	Weak Correlation	0.122086843	not significant
Projects accredited in the division	0.15292113	Very Weak Correlation	0.003115409	significant
Projects accredited in the school	0.15292113	Very Weak Correlation	0.003115409	significant
L&D	0.238435052	Weak Correlation	0.001100628	significant

Table 9 shows significant relationships that were obtained between the respondents' profiles and their skill level except in the respondents' length of service which is not significantly correlated with a computed correlation coefficient of 0.298956393 with p-value of 0.122086843 higher than the critical value of 0.05. Further, respondents' teaching position, projects accredited in the school and division and L&D and their skill level are significantly correlated. It could be inferred that when teachers write development projects and attend Learning and Development Program along writing, they are given opportunities to show their writing skills. However, if they do not write or attend any seminars about writing proposals, they may become hesitant to write and improve their skill.

Hence, the above results uphold the findings of the study of Garcia, R. G., & Asuncion, Z. 2022, which reveal that struggling writers, according to Fearn and Farnan (2008), lack both writing skill and information, are hesitant to engage in the writing process, and have doubts about their ability to write.

Table 10: Summary of Correlations between the Respondents' Profile and their Difficulties of Teachers in Writing Project Proposal

Variables	r-value	VD	p-value	QD
Teaching positions	0.333484545	Weak Correlation	0.508993214	Not significant
Length of service	0.073288341	very weak correlation	0.051715651	Not significant
Projects accredited in the school	0.280785211	Weak Correlation	0.000032384	Significant
Projects accredited in the division	0.269402027	Weak Correlation	0.007776278	Significant
L&D	0.060335053	Very Weak Correlation	0.141003464	Not significant

Table 10 shows significant results between the respondents' profile and their difficulties in writing project proposal only in projects accredited in the school and in division. Projects accredited in the school and their difficulties along template/parts of the proposal, organization, purpose, use of references, sentence structure and word choice, are significantly correlated having the correlation coefficient of 0.280785211 with p-value of 0.000032384 less than the critical value of 0.05. Also, projects accredited in the division is significantly correlated to the said difficulties having the correlation coefficient of 0.269402027 with p-value of 0.007776278 less than the critical value of 0.05. It could be inferred that majority of the respondents experience difficulties in writing project proposal, hence majority do not have projects accredited in the school and in the division. The findings in the present study are in consonance with what Ningsih 2020 posits that the authors/writers are well aware that writing, or learning to write, is a difficult task. Moreover, most teachers are not well-verse with the Development Project Guidelines. Lastly, when respondents are asked about the factors that can affect their writing of project proposals, majority answered that they do not have much knowledge on correct project proposals, not familiar with the templates/format, and lack of trainings/workshops on crafting project proposals.

5. Conclusions

In light of the foregoing, the following conclusions were derived: (1) Half of the 20 respondents are Teacher III in rank and have been teaching for 10 years. For the number of projects accredited in the school, majority of the respondents have only 3-4 projects however, same number of respondents have no projects accredited in the division. Along the number of L&D attended, majority of them have attended only 1-2, five respondents have 3-4 or 11% and 3 or 16% have never attended L&D program; (2) Their knowledge level on the parts or format of the proposal which is **knowledgeable**, means they are aware of some parts, however, there are more indicators where they are not knowledgeable at which only means they are not so much

familiar with all the given parts of a project proposal. Along their knowledge level on Quality Assurance and parts or format of the acceptance or completion, all respondents are **not knowledgeable**. In terms of skill level, all respondents are not yet skilled in writing each part since they are not familiar on the format or parts of a project proposal. Lastly, in their difficulties in writing project proposals along the template or parts, they find difficulty in almost all the parts and remained neutral or not certain in only few parts. Having difficulties and uncertainties among the respondents in writing project proposals reveal their struggles and the lack of enough skills and knowledge is a contributory factor. (3) Respondents' knowledge on parts/format and the three levels of quality assurance; knowledge on format of acceptance and quality assurance; and knowledge of the parts/template of the acceptance and skill level in writing proposal are **significantly related**. The respondents lack enough knowledge of the rudiments in writing a project proposal affects their skill level. However, the difficulties in writing following the template of acceptance and the skill level of the respondents are **not significantly related**. They find difficulties in following the template since they are not familiar with it but this doesn't affect their skill level. Moreover, respondents' profiles, when correlated to the following: knowledge on parts of a proposal, all the profiles except projects accredited in the school contribute in the acquisition of knowledge on parts; Quality assurance, teaching position impacts the respondents' knowledge on quality assurance; knowledge on parts of the acceptance report, respondents, regardless of their profiles, are capable to equip themselves with knowledge on parts/format of acceptance report; skill level, respondents' profile, except length of service, influence their skill level in writing project proposal; and difficulties in writing, respondents' profile which are projects accredited in the school and in the division contribute to their difficulties in writing project proposals; (4)The respondents need a learning and development program capacitating them on format of the parts of the project proposal and addressing the difficulties of the teacher-respondents along writing project proposals. The following recommendations are advised: (1)Encourage respondents to write a project proposal and submit it to the school, district and Division Office for acceptance or accreditation; (2)Conduct a LAC session about the prescribed template/parts of the project proposals and explain the Quality Assurance standards in consonance with DepEd memoranda; (3)Propose a topic during the Pre-School Year Conference or Mid-Year In-Service Training about writing project proposals; (4)Design a Learning and Development Program that would capacitate the respondents on how they write project proposals and eventually equip them with skills to come up with a proposal which can be accredited not only in the school and district but also in the division office.

6. References

1. Aydin S. Improvement of Preservice Turkish Teachers' Perceived Writing Self-Efficacy Beliefs, 2019. Retrieved from: <https://jestp.com/index.php/estp/article/view/7>. Retrieved last May 20, 2022.
2. Daniels S. Teacher-Writer Perceptions on the Essence of Writing: Influences, Identity and Habits of Mind to Sustain a Writing Life, 2018. Retrieved from: <https://commons.und.edu/>. Retrieved last May 11, 2022.
3. DepEd Order No. 35, s. 2016. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/DO_s2016_035.pdf
4. DepEd Order No. 44, s. 2015. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/DO_s2015_44_0.pdf
5. DepEd Order No. 66, s. 2010. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/>
6. Division Memorandum No. 05. S. 2018. <https://www.deped-nv.com.ph/memo>
7. Division Memorandum No. 43, s. 2018. <https://www.deped-nv.com.ph/memo>
8. Division Memorandum No. 8, s. 2019. <https://www.deped-nv.com.ph/memo>
9. Division Memorandum No. 133, s. 2022. <https://www.deped-nv.com.ph/memo>
10. Garcia RG, Asuncion Z. Remediating the Writing Performance of Struggling Writers through a Self-regulated Strategy Development Approach. SALTeL Journal (Southeast Asia Language Teaching and Learning). 2022; 5(1):23-30. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.35307/saltel.v5i1.80>
11. Graham S. Changing How Writing Is Taught. Review of Research in Education. 2019; 43(1):277-303. Doi: 10.3102/0091732X18821125
12. http://wbfiles.worldbank.org/documents/hdn/ed/saber/supporting_doc/EAP/Teachers/Philippines
13. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.3102/0091732X18821125>
14. <https://www.google.com/search?q=deped+policy+guide+lines+in+writing+development+projects+or+innovation>
15. <https://www.wku.edu/idst/documents/499rubric.pdf>
16. Lego M. DepEd Guidelines on Conducting a Project for Innovation in School. Retrieved from: <https://www.teacherph.com/deped-project-for-innovation-in-school>. Retrieved last May 18, 2022.
17. Maharani D, *et al.* Students' Academic Writing Competence Realized in Writing Research Proposals: Viewed from their Content, Organization and Cohesion, Range, Register, and the Accuracy of Language, 2021. Retrieved from: <https://d1wqtxts1xzle7.cloudfront.net/>. Retrieved last May 11, 2022.
18. Ningsih N. School Development Program, 2020. Retrieved from: <https://www.ccefinland.org/school-development-program>. Retrieved last May 11, 2022.
19. Vazir K. Educational development projects at IED: Towards school improvement, 2007. Retrieved from: <https://ecommons.aku.edu>. Retrieved last May 10, 2022.