

Implementation And Evaluation of Limited Face to Face Classes: Basis for Adoption of Health and Safety Manual

CHRISTIAN JUDE B. CALUNSAG, MSIT

Instructor/Web Administrator

Jose Rizal Memorial State University – Dapitan City

christiangyud@gmail.com

Abstract — The research study determined the adoption of the university's health and safety manual in Dapitan City, Zamboanga del Norte, Philippines and the implementation and evaluation of limited face-to-face sessions. To gather information about the implementation and evaluation of the few face-to-face classes that formed the basis for the Health and Safety Manual, quantitative research and descriptive surveys were used. Purposive sampling was used to select a total of hundred (100) respondents from the respondent community. Frequency and percentage counting were the statistical techniques used to analyze the demographic profile of the respondents; weighted means were used to analyze the level of application of health and safety regulations during restricted face-to-face instruction. The findings showed that most respondents who answered the survey regarding the implementation of limited face-to-face classes in the University Dapitan City, Zamboanga Del Norte, were aged 18-21 years old, female, and first-year students. The results also showed that respondents strongly agreed with the risk of limited face-to-face classes and the opportunities of face-to-face courses. As a result, the implementation of few face-to-face classes was much implemented.

Keywords — **Implementation, Limited Face-To-Face, Adoption, Health, And Safety.**

I. Introduction

The quality of a person's life is significantly impacted by their education. Education improves knowledge, abilities, personality, and attitude. Most significantly, education affects people's chances of finding employment. An educated person has a higher chance of landing a respectable job. World Health Organization ([WHO] 2021) claims that the Corona virus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic has had a profound effect on civilization. Governments all around the world are now rethinking their educational systems and embracing the best delivery techniques for their kids as a result of this worldwide public health calamity. The nationwide closure of all educational institutions in the Philippines was one of the most important actions taken in an effort to prevent schools from serving as COVID-19 case clustering locations.

The epidemic also led the increasing use of alternative teaching strategies like distance learning. There are substantial issues with the teaching and learning process that have an impact on learners' adaptability and development even though this increased learning continuity and made the best use of remote learning modalities. The landscape of higher education has changed as a

result of the 2019 corona virus disease pandemic (COVID-19). Alternative instructional strategies, such as online, hybrid, and blended learning, are being examined as academic institutions around the world struggle with the global health challenge. Because they understand the importance of striking a balance between the psychological, social, emotional, and physical aspects of student lives, a lot of students, colleges, and universities around the world are worried about the pandemic.

Prior to the pandemic, college students were a nuisance, but the epidemic has undoubtedly shattered this terrible situation among students by bringing suffering, frustration, discomfort, anxiety, loss, and other unpleasant feelings and experiences.

The Inter-Agency Task Force team (2021), in charge of the nation's COVID-19 response, has reportedly authorized in-person instruction in regions with Alert Levels 1 to 3. A resolution affirming the Commission on Higher Education's proposal for a phased adoption of limited face-to-face classes under the government's alert system levels was also adopted by the Inter-Agency Task Force (IATF).

In especially after a physical separation, the reopening of the school for face-to-face encounters must be carefully planned in stages to ensure the safety of students, teachers, and school staff. Planning and implementing school health policies during this epidemic must be based on precise information provided by multiple entities. In order to assist schools in reopening and getting ready for a potential COVID 19 reappearance, the World Health Organization (WHO) has released a checklist. The checklist complements and adds to the current COVID-19-related guidelines. Worldwide Organization for Health [WHO], 2021).

In especially after a physical separation, the reopening of the school for face-to-face encounters must be carefully planned in stages to ensure the safety of students, teachers, and school staff. Planning and implementing school health policies during this epidemic must be based on precise information provided by multiple entities. In order to assist schools in reopening and getting ready for a potential COVID 19 reappearance, the World Health Organization (WHO) has released a checklist. The checklist complements and adds to the current COVID-19-related guidelines. Worldwide Organization for Health [WHO], 2021).

A teaching strategy called face-to-face learning involves teaching a class of students their course material and other learning materials in person. This makes it possible for teachers and students to communicate in real time. In-person instruction gives pupils rapid feedback and inspires them to study more successfully. Computer-based education is far too challenging. Interaction with instructors is beneficial for the learning process. Face-to-face communication is ideal for solving academic challenges. In particular after a physical separation, the reopening of schools for face-to-face interactions must be carefully planned in stages to ensure the safety of students, educators, and school staff. To ensure student safety or at the very least reduce dangers, school health precautions for in-person instruction must be properly planned and implemented in

compliance with national and international criteria. World Health Organization [WHO], 2021).

II. Methodology

This chapter will demonstrate and elaborate on the methodology employed in performing this research analysis, including the type of research method, the study's setting, the participants, the tools and instruments employed, and the statistical techniques. In this study, a descriptive-survey methodology will be used. To collect their comments and perspectives on the implementation of limited face-to-face classes, students will be given questionnaires. The danger and opportunities of holding face-to-face lessons in the midst of a pandemic will be assessed using this methodology.

Research Environment

This study will be conducted in University.

Research Respondents

The researcher respondents are 100 random students in University who are enrolled in face-to-face classes.

Table 1. Respondents' Distribution

College	Number of Respondents
CAS	20
CED	20
CCJE	20
CIT	20
CBA	20
Total	100

Research Instrument

In order to acquire information about the implementation of limited face-to-face classes, the researchers developed a tailored survey questionnaire. a four-part questionnaire in the form of a checklist. The first section dealt with the demographics of the respondents, the second with the potential dangers of holding face-to-face classes at the University, the third with the potential benefits of holding a few face-to-face classes there, and the fourth with the respondents' perceptions of how well the safety rules were being followed on campus.

Validating the Questionnaire

A group of experts will review, make recommendations for, and enhance the questionnaire that the researchers created. The final, amended, verified, and revised questionnaire will be field tested before being distributed to the chosen respondents.

Data Gathering Procedure

The questionnaire will be distributed at random with the permission of the research adviser and instructor after it has been verified, pre-tested, and a thorough interview has been conducted to ascertain the reliability of the respondents' responses. Prior to sending the questionnaire to the targeted random sample respondents, the researchers wrote to the dean of school departments to ask for permission to conduct a study on the perspectives of students enrolled in a small number of face-to-face classes regarding the risk, opportunity, and degree of implementation of safety guidelines on campus.

The questionnaire will be given to the chosen research participants after the letter has been approved. The researchers will personally and online survey the random respondents to learn what students think about the implementation of limited face-to-face classes, the risks involved, and the level of implementation.

Statistical Treatment of Data

The following statistical tools are used to interpret the data gathered:

To determine the profile of the respondents, this simple percentage will be use.

Formula:

$$P = \frac{f}{N} \times 100$$

Where: P= the percentage

f= the frequency

N= total number of respondents

To determine the adoption of the university's health and safety manual, this weighted mean formula will be use.

The **Weighted mean** is calculated by multiplying the weight with the quantitative outcome associated with it and then adding all the products together. If all the weights are equal, then the weighted mean and arithmetic mean will be the same.

Formula:

$$W_m = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{W_i X_i}{N} \right)$$

Where: W_m = the weighted mean

W_i = the respective weight of each response

X_i = the number of respondents in a particular response

N = the number of sample

The perception of students regarding the adoption of the university's health and safety manual in the University System were interpreted using the given verbal description.

Legend:

Weight	Range of Values	Description
5	4.21 – 5.00	Strongly Agree
4	3.41 – 4.20	Agree
3	2.61 – 3.40	Neither Agree
2	1.81 – 2.60	Disagree
1	1.00 – 1.80	Strongly Disagree

Ethical Consideration

A letter will be addressed to the respondents requesting their permission and approval to conduct the research. The names of the respondents wouldn't be made public. Participants' responses and results will be maintained in complete secrecy.

III. Results and Discussion

As a result, compared to the other ages indicated below, students between the ages of 18 and 21 participate more actively in the survey about the implementation of face-to-face classes.

Table 2. Respondents' Profile in Terms of Age

Age Bracket	Frequency	Percentage
18-21 years old	64	64%
22-24 years old	28	28%
25-27 years old	5	5%
28 above	3	3%
Total	100	100%

Sex

Table 3 shows the sex distribution of the respondents; 64 percent, of the respondents were female. Only 34 percent of the population were male. This demonstrates that female respondents are much more prevalent than male respondents in answering the survey.

Table 3. Respondents' Profile in Terms of Sex

Sex	Frequency	Percentage
F	66	66%
M	34	34%
Total	100	100%

Year Level

It is reflected in table 4 the profile of respondents in terms of year level. Respondents who were in their first-year college had 32.00 percent, followed by those who were in their second-year college, 28.00 percent, next by fourth year college, respectively, with 30.00 percent and the year level who answered only 10.00 percent is the third-year college.

It denotes that respondents who are first Year College are more interested to know the adoption of the university's health and safety manual in conducting limited face- to- face classes in University.

Table 4. Respondents Profile in terms of Year level

College Level	Frequency	Percentage
1 st Year	32	32%
2 nd Year	28	28%
3 rd Year	10	10%
4 th year	30	30%
Total	100	100

College Department

The profile of the respondents in terms of college department is shown in Table 5. The data indicates the similarities of five different respondents of college department. 20 respondents were accurately chosen by the researchers from each academic area. This suggests that the respondents' profiles in terms of their college departments were chosen at random in different ways, leading to the fact that their percentages are the same.

Table 5. Respondents Profile in terms of College Department

College/ Department	Frequency	Percentage
CAS	20	20%
CED	20	20%
CBA	20	20%
CCJE	20	20%
CIT	20	20%
Total	100	100

Problem 2. What are the risks of limited face to face classes?
Table 6. The Risk of limited face to face classes

Statements	MEAN	Interpretation
1. Students cannot manage to understand their lessons during face-to-face class.	2.89	Neither Agree
2. Implementation of limited face-to-face classes could cause a transmission of fever, cough and colds.	3.22	Neither Agree
3. Within the campus, virus transmission is more rapid.	3.32	Neither Agree
4. There's a possibility of COVID transmission during class hours.	3.44	Agree
5. Due to the suspension of the normal face-to-face teaching activities, students' competency and academic performance deteriorated.	3.48	Agree
6. Positivity rate of covid cases might be increased.	3.50	Agree
7. Adjustments of the students to the new system of learning in new normal could possibly affect their mentality and their academic performance.	3.60	Agree
8. Lack of implementations of safety protocols inside the classroom can cause virus transmission.	3.56	Agree
9. Students cannot finish their studies because of virus transmission	3.35	Neither Agree
10. Virus transmission can cause depression to the students.	3.52	Agree
AVERAGE WEIGTED MEAN	3.39	Neither Agree

Table 6 illustrates the dangers of introducing restricted face-to-face instruction at University. The risk of a few in-person classes had an average weighted mean of 3.39, which was categorized as neither agree nor disagree. This suggests that there are differing views among respondents on whether the danger involved in adopting the few face-to-face classes at the University is acceptable.

According to the data, respondents were indifferent about the potential adoption of the university's health and safety manual of implementing only a few face-to-face classes, which is that the students might not be able to comprehend their lessons in person (2.89). The implementation of limited face-to-face classes could result in the spread of fever, cough, and cold, according to the respondents, whose weighted mean was 3.22. The respondents' weighted mean was 3.32 and they did not agree that viral transmission occurs more quickly on campuses.

The respondents' consensus that COVID transmission is a possibility during class hours was highlighted by a weighted mean of 3.44. The positivity rate of COVID cases may increase, which had a weighted mean of 3.50, which is interpreted as agreeing to the potential risk of implementing limited face-to-face classes. Respondents agree with a 3.48 weighed mean that students' competency and academic performance declined as a result of the suspension of the normal face-to-face teaching activities. With a weighted mean of 3.60, respondents agreed that students' adaptations to the new system of learning in the new normal may have an impact on their mental health and academic performance. Failure to follow safety procedures in the classroom can result in the spread of viruses.

The weighted mean of 3.56 suggests that respondents are aware of this potential threat. According to the survey questionnaire's findings, pupils are unable to complete their education due to the spread of viruses, which is marked as neither agree with a weighted mean 3.35. With a weighted mean of 3.52, respondents concur that student depression can be brought on by virus transmission.

This suggests that respondents do not agree that there would be a risk to their health if the limited face-to-face classes were implemented, such as if students could not comprehend their lessons in face-to-face classes or could not complete their studies due to virus transmission. They also do not agree that virus transmission is more rapid on campuses.

The World Health Organization is not strongly supported by these findings ([WHO] 2020). that more research is needed to fully understand the role of children in transmission. Few outbreaks affecting kids or schools have been documented so far. The modest number of outbreaks among teaching or support personnel that have been documented thus far, however, raises the possibility that the spread of COVID-19 in educational settings may be constrained. Children typically have milder illnesses and less symptoms, therefore incidents occasionally go unreported. Furthermore, preliminary research findings indicate that teenage infection rates may be higher than those of younger children.

Problem3. What are the opportunities of limited face to face classes?
Table 7. The Opportunities of limited face to face classes

Statements	MEAN	Interpretation
1. Enabling students to finish their coursework and advance to the next level with equip of knowledge.	4.15	Strongly Agree
2. Face-to-face learning motivates students to study more effectively and provides immediate feedback.	4.37	Strongly Agree
3. Students can understand the topic clearly.	4.27	Strongly Agree
4. Face to face learning of the students are much more effective on adapting information than modular learning.	4.39	Strongly Agree
5. Face to face classes enable the students to collaborate ideas with their peers.	4.31	Strongly Agree
6. Any obscure information discuss by the instructor enables the student to speak out and ask for additional information.	4.27	Strongly Agree
7. Brainstorming and sharing ideas with peers can enhance students learning such us group activities.	4.65	Strongly Agree
8. It helps the students to enhance and improve their socializing skills and gain confidence.	4.65	Strongly Agree
9. Students are more comfortable sitting in a classroom taking notes than sitting at a computer absorbing data.	4.32	Strongly Agree
10. Students can concentrate more on face-to-face learning because there'll be less distraction than if you were at home compare to modular learning.	4.35	Strongly Agree
AVERAGE WEIGTED MEAN	4.37	Strongly Agree

The prospects for establishing a small number of in-person classes at University are shown in Table 7. With a weighted mean of 4.37, the majority of respondents "Strongly Agree" that there are opportunities to conduct a few in-person classes.

The findings showed that respondents strongly agreed that giving students the knowledge they need to complete their coursework and move on to the next level, with a weighted mean of 4.15. Respondents overwhelmingly agree that face-to-face learning motivates students to study more effectively and provides immediate feedback, with a weighted mean of 4.37. Respondents overwhelmingly concur that face-to-face learning enables students to comprehend the subject matter effectively. The weighted mean for that was 4.27. Face-to-face instruction is significantly more successful at assisting students in adjusting to new material as compared to modular learning, with a weighted mean of 4.39. The ability to adapt information is substantially greater with face-to-face learning than with modular learning. This opportunity received a weighted mean of 4.39 from the respondents, who strongly agreed with it.

With a weighted mean of 4.31, respondents overwhelmingly concur that face-to-face classes allow students to collaborate on ideas with their peers. Respondents significantly supported the chance for small-group face-to-face seminars where any ambiguous information provided by the instructor allows the student to speak up and ask for more information, with a weighted mean of 4.27. With a weighted mean of 4.65, the majority of respondents believed that group activities like brainstorming and idea sharing can enhance students' learning. The vast majority of respondents think that this opportunity for students to take a few restricted face-to-face lessons is beneficial for helping them grow and enhance their social skills and confidence (4.65). Respondents strongly agree that taking notes in class is more enjoyable for students than studying information on a computer, with a weighted mean of 4.32. With a mean grade of 4.35, the respondents largely concurred that face-to-face learning, as opposed to modular learning, enables students to focus more because there are fewer distractions than at home.

This shows that the option of taking a constrained number of in-person sessions offers several benefits, including the chance for students to develop and improve their social skills and build confidence. With group activities like brainstorming and idea sharing, pupils' learning can be improved. Also, according to respondents, limited face-to-face learning chances for students are significantly more successful at helping them adjust to new information than modular learning.

These findings support Kyriaki Raouna's (2022) research, which found that face-to-face collaboration is made possible by traditional classroom learning. It is more straightforward and aids in the development of social skills that are crucial for later life. Their general confidence and drive to do more are also increased when they are working in a physical environment as a group.

Problem 4. What is the level of implementation of limited face-to-face classes?
Table 8. The level of Implementation of limited Face-to- face classes.

Statements	MEAN	Interpretation
1. Wearing face mask of students and instructors are strictly observed.	4.42	Very Much Implemented
2. Physical distancing is firmly adhered to.	4.02	Much Implemented
3. Classroom protocols ensuring a one exit and one entrance policy are implemented	3.86	Much Implemented
4. Every students and faculty will go through temperature check upon entering the campus.	3.80	Much Implemented
5. Every students are required to fill in and out form of health forms prior to entry	3.48	Much Implemented
6. Students will be dispersed one at a time in 5 minutes interval during dismissal time	3.36	Much Implemented
7. Every student will go through temperature check and hand sanitizing prior to leaving the centre.	3.54	Much Implemented
8. Setting arrangement inside classrooms are 1 meter distancing	3.71	Much Implemented
9. Every students and faculty are required to be vaccinated to enter school premises.	4.14	Much Implemented
11. 10. Students participating in limited face-to-face classes must have submitted to the school proof of vaccination status and proof of registration with PhilHealth or medical insurance covering Covid- 19.	4.19	Much Implemented
AVERAGE WEIGTED MEAN	3.85	Much Implemented

Table 8 displays the degree to which the safety precautions put in place inside the school's grounds are being used for the few limited face-to-face lessons. Statistics shows that restricted face-to-face implementation in Institution is widely used, with an average weighted mean of 3.85.

The findings demonstrate that wearing face masks while teaching is very thoroughly implemented, with a weighted mean of 4.42 indicating that it was rigorously enforced. With a weighted mean of 4.02, physical distance between individuals on campus is strongly adhered to and widely practiced. With a weighted mean of 3.86, classroom protocols that guarantee a one exit and one admission policy are often used. The weighted mean response of the respondents was 3.80, which indicates that the implementation level of every staff member and student being subjected to a temperature check upon entering the campus is high. Students will be dispersed one at a time in 5 minute intervals during dismissal time is also heavily applied inside the campus. Every student are required to complete in and out form of health forms before to enrollment with a weighted mean 3.48. (3.36). Every student will undergo a weighted mean of 3.54 temperature check and hand sanitizing before to exiting the center, which is heavily conducted inside the school grounds. With a weighted mean of 3.71, the level of application of the 1-meter distance setting arrangement inside classrooms is very high. The weighted mean of 4.14 is widely used to measure how many pupils and faculty members must be immunized in order to attend school grounds. On the Institution, the level of implementation of students participating in limited face-to-face classes must have provided the institution with proof of their vaccination status and proof of registration with PhilHealth or a medical insurance plan that covers Covid-19 is much implemented with a weighted mean 4.19.

That signifies that although the school complies with the requirements of the limited face-to-face instruction, some of the restrictions were broken. However, some of the student were disobedient and disregarded safety precautions, which could put them in danger.

This supports the World Health Organization study ([WHO] 2020). In order to stop the introduction and spread of COVID-19 in schools and the community and to guarantee the safety of students and school employees while they are in class, it is stated that a number of measures and standards should be examined and put into place. For the growth of young children, institutions of higher education, residential schools, or specialized institutions, particular arrangements should be taken into account. The World Health Organization (WHO) suggests that infrastructure, policy, and practice: Ascertain that the infrastructure, procedures, and resources are in place to protect the health and safety of all school personnel, especially those who are more vulnerable. At the school and classroom level, there should be age-appropriate mask use, frequent hand and respiratory hygiene, physical separation of at least 1 meter between people, ventilation, and environmental cleaning procedures in place to reduce exposure. Schools should provide staff and students with information on COVID-19 prevention strategies, create a daily cleaning and disinfection schedule for the school's surroundings, facilities, and frequently touched surfaces, and ensure that hand washing stations are available as well as local and national recommendations for mask use.he

IV. Conclusion

The study concludes that implementing merely a few face-to-face classes involves some risk in light of its findings. For instance, students' academic performance and mental health may be impacted by their adaptation to the new manner of learning in the new normal. Additionally, it can cause viruses to spread, which could depress pupils. Attendees of few face-to-face classes have academic difficulties, which could explain why they receive poor grades. They are also concerned that a lack of safety procedures may allow viruses to increase in the classroom. This means that students in classes with limited face-to-face interaction are concerned that they might catch a virus if they attend classes without the proper implementation of safety precautions.

Limited face-to-face instruction has advantages, according to respondents, including how it can help students build and improve their social skills and confidence, how brainstorming and sharing ideas with peers can enhance students' learning through group activities, and how face-to-face learning is significantly more effective for students than modular learning when it comes to the assimilation of information. It shows that students are keen to participate in the few in-person classes.

The study also concludes that little face-to-face communication is practiced widely. Numerous safety and health precautions have been implemented on campus, including requiring all students and instructors to wear face masks. Additionally, before being permitted to visit the school grounds, students who participate in certain face-to-face classes must verify their immunization status and PhilHealth registration.

The following advice is given in light of the findings summary and the conclusion reached.

1. Students and teaching staff must always follow the guidelines and protocols inside the school premises given by the government to avoid the transmission of virus.
2. To continue the limited face-to-face classes in the campus and for the students to develop more their knowledge, everyone should be responsible, always apply and follow the guidelines from the Inter Agency Task Force (IATF).
3. Jose Rizal Memorial State University Dipolog Campus should always continue and tighten the implementation of the health and safety guidelines for the prevention of COVID-19 transmission inside the University. So, that the parents would not worry for their children's as the university can guarantee the student's safety for them to have a healthy learning environment.

REFERENCES

- [1] Abel, T., & McQueen, D. (2020). Critical health literacy and the COVID-19 crisis. Health Promotion International.
- [2] Alvarez, A. (2021). The phenomenon of learning at a distance through emergency remote teaching amidst the pandemic crisis. Asian Journal of Distance Education. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1289949.pdf>
- [3] Barrios, J. M., & Hochberg, Y. (2020). Risk perception through the lens of politics in the time of the COVID-19 pandemic. National Bureau of Economic Research. <https://doi.org/10.3386/w27008>
- [4] Basilaia, G., & Kvavadze, D. (2020). Transition to online education in schools during a SARS-CoV-2 Coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic in Georgia. *Pedagogical Research*, 5(4).
- [5] Chinazzi, M., Davis, J. T., Ajelli, M., Gioannini, C., Litvinova, M., Merler, S., & Vespignani, A. (2020). The effect of travel restrictions on the spread of the 2019 novel coronavirus (COVID-19) outbreak. *Science*, 368(6489), 395. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aba9757>
- [6] Commission of Higher Education (CHED) - Department of Health (DOH). (2021). Guidelines of the Gradual Reopening Campuses of Higher Education Institution for Limited Face to Face classes During the COVID- 19 Pandemic. Joint Memorandum Circular No. 2021-001 – DTI. Retrieved from <https://ched.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/CHED-DOH-Joint-Memorandum-Circular-No.-2021-001-Guidelines-on-the-Gradual-Reopening-of-Campuses-of-Higher-Education-Institutions-for-Limited-Face-to-Face-Classes-during-the-COVID-19-Pandemic.pdf>
- [7] Commission of Higher Education (CHED). (2020). CHED COVID-19 ADVISORY NO. 3. Retrieved from <https://ched.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/CHED-COVID-2019-Advisory-No.-3.pdf>
- [8] Crawford, J., Butler-Henderson, K., Jurgen, R., Malkawi, B. H., Glowatz, M., Burton, R., Magni, P., & Lam, S. (2020). COVID-19: 20 countries' higher education intra-period digital pedagogy responses. *Journal of Applied Learning & Teaching*, 3. <https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2020.3.1.7>
- [9] DepEd. (2020). Official statement department of education. Retrieved from <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2020/05/06/official-statement-2>
- [10] DOH. (2020). Department of Health Philippines. Retrieved from <http://www.doh.gov.ph/2019-nCoV>
- [11] Ka Ho Mok, K. H., W., Rahman, H. N. (2021). COVID-19 pandemic's disruption on university teaching and learning and competence cultivation: Student evaluation of online learning experiences in Hong Kong. Retrieved from <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/22125868211007011>
- [12] Karalis, T. (2020). Planning and Evaluation during Educational Disruption: Lessons learned from COVID 19 pandemic for treatment and emergencies in education. 7(4). <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3789022>
- [13] Raouna, K. (2022). Online classes vs. Traditional classes- find the best for you. Retrieved from <https://www.learnworlds.com/online-classes-vs-traditional-classes/>
- [14] Salcedo, C. S. (2010). Comparative Analysis of Learning Outcomes in Face-to-Face Foreign Language Classes vs. Language Lab and Online. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning*, 7(2). <https://doi.org/10.19030/tlc.v7i2.88>

- [15] Singh, J., Steele, K., Singh, L. (2021). Combining the Best of Online and Face-to-Face Learning: Hybrid and Blended Learning Approach for COVID-19, Post Vaccine, & Post-Pandemic World. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1177/00472395211047865>
- [16] Toquero, C. M. (2020). Challenges and opportunities for higher education amid the COVID-19 pandemic: The Philippine Context. *Pedagogical Research*, 5(4). <https://doi.org/10.29333/pr/7947>
- [17] United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2020). COVID-19 Educational Disruption and Response. Retrieved from <https://en.unesco.org/covid19/educationresponse>
- [18] Viner, R. M., Russell, S. J., Croker, H., Packer, J., Ward, J., Stansfield, C., & Booy, R. (2020). School closure and management practices during coronavirus outbreaks including COVID-19: The Lancet Child & Adolescent Health, 4(5), 397-404. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2352-4642\(20\)30095-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2352-4642(20)30095-X)
- [19] Winthrop, R. (2020). Top 10 risks and opportunities for education in the face of covid-19. Retrieved from <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/education-plus-development/2020/04/10/top-10-risks-and-opportunities-for-education-in-the-face-of-covid-19/>
- [20] World Health Organization (WHO). (2020). Coronavirus disease (COVID-19): Schools. Retrieved from <https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/question-and-answers-hub/q-a-detail/coronavirus-disease-covid-19-school>
- [21] World Health Organization (WHO). (2021). Face-to-face classes during COVID-19: A call for deliberate and well-planned school health protocols in the Philippine context. Retrieved from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7928711/>