



TEACHING BEHIND BARS: CHALLENGES EXPERIENCED BY EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL AS BASIS FOR CRAFTING AN INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT PROGRAM

Joselito L. Bagting, RCrim, MSCJ¹, Michelle F. Anoba, LPT²,
Maria Aurora C. Avestruz, RCrim, MCJE², Rose Ann Bata, Rcrim²,
Fiscal Alessandro D. Jurado (Ret.)², Edelito P. Deles, RCrim, PhD Crim, PD-SML³

¹Program Head, College of Criminology | Metro Manila College

²Faculty, College of Criminology | Metro Manila College

³Faculty Taguig City University

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra29276>

DOI No: 10.36713/epra29276

ABSTRACT

This study determined the challenges experienced by educational personnel in delivering educational services at New Bilibid Prison, Muntinlupa City, as a basis for developing an Instructional Support Program. It employed a quantitative descriptive-comparative design. From a population of 98 authorized educational personnel, 79 respondents were selected through proportionate stratified sampling across the Minimum, Medium, and Maximum Security Compounds. Data were gathered using a researcher-made questionnaire subjected to expert validation and pilot testing. Frequency, percentage, weighted mean, ranking, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), and Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference test were used at the 0.05 level of significance. Instructional resources were the most prevalent challenge (WM = 3.19), followed by security and operational procedures (WM = 2.55) and professional development opportunities (WM = 2.52). Learner-related factors (WM = 2.50), learning environment (WM = 2.39), and institutional and administrative support (WM = 2.23) were rated lower overall. The grand weighted mean of 2.56 indicated a serious overall challenge. Ratings did not differ significantly by job status or years of instructional experience. Differences by security compound occurred in instructional resources, security and operational procedures, and professional development; differences by educational level/program handled occurred in instructional resources and institutional support. The study concludes that resource access, security-compatible instructional continuity, and relevant professional development should be prioritized. A six-component Instructional Support Program is proposed. The study describes reported challenges and does not test the program's effectiveness.

KEYWORDS: Correctional Education, Educational Personnel, Instructional Resources, Teaching Behind Bars, Instructional Support Program

INTRODUCTION

Education in prison enables persons deprived of liberty (PDLs) to continue learning and develop competencies relevant to community life. Educational personnel make this provision possible within the constraints of a custodial institution. Teaching in such settings involves ordinary instructional responsibilities alongside institutional rules governing movement, schedules, materials, access, and safety.

In the Philippines, Republic Act No. 10575, or the Bureau of Corrections Act of 2013, provides the legal foundation for BuCor modernization and includes education and training among reformation programs. The Bureau of Corrections Manual (2024) identifies formal, non-formal, and skills education as part of reformation services. These policy commitments establish the importance of education, but they do not by themselves demonstrate that all educators have adequate materials, suitable learning spaces, or access to relevant professional development.

The Commission on Higher Education's 2024 documentation of the College Education Behind Bars partnership at Davao Prison and Penal Farm illustrates collaboration in tertiary educational access. A TESDA-BuCor partnership announced at New Bilibid Prison in August 2024 also supported vocational training, educational materials, and seminars or workshops for personnel and PDL trainers. Such arrangements show that correctional education may involve several institutions; local needs must nevertheless be assessed rather than presumed.

Prior Philippine studies have reported interruptions in classes and shortages of school supplies in jail-based education, while needs assessments have informed educational extension proposals for PDLs. International work has also discussed educators' adjustment to correctional environments and the need for relevant support and inclusive instructional practices (Patrie, 2023; Glazzard et al., 2025). These sources offer context, but the present study focuses on educational personnel's own ratings at New Bilibid Prison.



The study assessed six areas: instructional resources, learning environment, institutional and administrative support, security and operational procedures, learner-related factors, and professional development opportunities. It also compared ratings across respondent profiles and used the findings to formulate an Instructional Support Program. The program is a proposed output; its implementation and effectiveness are outside the scope of the research.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The study aimed to determine the challenges experienced by educational personnel in delivering educational services at New Bilibid Prison, Muntinlupa City, as a basis for crafting an Instructional Support Program. Specifically, it sought to:

- (1) describe respondents' profile in terms of job status, years of teaching/instructional experience, security compound, and educational level/program handled;
- (2) Assess the extent of challenges across the six domains;
- (3) Determine whether challenge ratings differed significantly by profile;
- (4) identify the most prevalent challenge area;
- (5) Propose an Instructional Support Program based on the findings.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND STUDIES

Instructional Resources in Correctional Education

Instructional resources include printed references, modules, supplies, teaching aids, equipment, and authorized technologies. In correctional education, availability and actual access are distinct: a resource may exist but be unavailable at the time of instruction. Correctional-education technology guidance and Technology implementation guidance discuss correctional educational technology as an implementation issue involving preparation, policy, and technical arrangements. Their guidance supports examining whether resources can be used within institutional requirements; it does not establish local resource adequacy.

Philippine studies add a needs-based perspective. A Philippine study of jail-based learning identified school-supply availability among difficulties experienced in jail-based Alternative Learning System provision. A Philippine needs-assessment study of PDL education assessed educational needs among PDLs and used the results to develop an extension proposal. Although these studies concern learners rather than the current respondents, they reinforce the value of aligning materials and support with identified needs. The present study therefore treats sufficiency, access, suitability, and availability as a distinct challenge domain.

Learning Environment

The learning environment includes physical space, lighting, ventilation, noise, seating, and access to appropriate facilities. These factors are related to resources but are analytically separate: instructors may have suitable modules yet

lack a space for demonstrations or group work. Patrie (2023) described correctional educators' need to understand institutional culture and build supportive relationships. Research on inclusive correctional education also discuss time, resources, and training as barriers to inclusive instruction. These studies suggest that the environment includes both physical conditions and the arrangements surrounding teaching.

Official reports of correctional education partnerships show different ways learning can be organized, but do not prove that the same facilities or outcomes exist at New Bilibid Prison. The present study therefore relies on the perceptions of participating educational personnel rather than importing findings from other institutions. Learning-space support should be linked to the activities required by each educational level and program.

Institutional and Administrative Support

Institutional support includes communication, administrative responses, resource requests, coordination, and educational partnerships. The BuCor Manual (2024) provides administrative context for education within reformation services. CHED Regional Office XI (2024) documents collaboration for tertiary education in a correctional facility, while Correctional education implementation guidance discuss implementation considerations for education and training in correctional contexts. Patrie (2023) emphasizes relationships with colleagues as part of educators' adjustment to correctional work.

These sources suggest that coordination and clearly assigned responsibilities can support instructional delivery. However, routine communication may be manageable even when resource mobilization remains difficult. This study accordingly assesses administrative support separately from the availability of materials, physical learning conditions, and operational restrictions.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND STUDIES (CONTINUED)

Security and Operational Procedures

Correctional education must comply with rules governing movement, schedules, access, materials, and institutional activities. The relevant research concern is how operational procedures affect instructional continuity, not whether legitimate security requirements should be weakened. A Philippine study of jail-based learning reported class interruptions in a Philippine jail-based learning setting. Correctional-education technology guidance and Technology implementation guidance likewise frame correctional education technology and delivery as processes that must be planned around institutional policy and access arrangements.

For program planning, schedule conflicts may require a coordinated calendar, while late notice may require a communication protocol and contingency lesson plans. The present study therefore examines the instructional consequences of schedules, restrictions, and interruptions and proposes responses compatible with security requirements.



Learner-Related Factors

Educational personnel may encounter differences in prior schooling, literacy, learning pace, motivation, participation, and classroom behavior. Such differences create instructional responsibilities and should not be treated as inherent deficiencies among PDLs. A Philippine needs-assessment study of PDL education identified needs across literacy, numeracy, entrepreneurial, and livelihood skills. A qualitative study of ALS learners explored learner experiences in an ALS program, while Research on inclusive correctional education connected inclusive practice with suitable preparation, time, and resources.

These studies support assessment, differentiated activities, clear classroom routines, and appropriate referral arrangements. The present study examines the challenges educators report in responding to learner diversity rather than directly measuring learner ability or achievement.

Professional Development and Instructional Support

Professional development includes seminars, workshops, mentoring, certification, and opportunities to exchange teaching practices. Relevant training must also be accessible and compatible with duty schedules. BuCor's reported TESDA partnership includes seminars and workshops for personnel and PDL trainers (BuCor, 2024). A study of professional learning for correctional educators examine educators' learning experiences in a workshop for teaching incarcerated learners, while Patrie (2023) emphasizes peer support and relationship building.

Professional learning should be linked to specific instructional difficulties and practical outputs, such as adapted lessons, classroom-management strategies, or approved offline materials. Metro Manila College Criminology faculty may contribute seminars or mentoring through Social Orientation and Community Involvement (SOCI), subject to consultation, institutional approval, and agreement with BuCor.

Synthesis and Research Gap

The literature points to interrelated instructional, environmental, administrative, operational, learner-related, and professional-development concerns. Existing Philippine studies often focus on learners or specific programs, while international sources offer context for educator support and implementation. The present study addresses the need for a focused, comparative assessment of educational personnel across the Minimum, Medium, and Maximum Security Compounds of New Bilibid Prison. The resulting support program is designed from reported priorities rather than assumed needs.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design and Locale

The study used a quantitative descriptive-comparative research design to determine the challenges experienced by educational personnel at New Bilibid Prison, Muntinlupa City. The descriptive component summarized ratings across six challenge domains. The comparative component examined whether mean ratings differed when respondents were grouped by

job status, years of teaching or instructional experience, security compound, and educational level or program handled.

Respondents and Sampling

The population consisted of 98 authorized educational personnel. A sample of 79 respondents was selected through proportionate stratified sampling across the Minimum, Medium, and Maximum Security Compounds. Respondents included uniformed personnel, non-uniformed teachers, volunteers, trainers, facilitators, coordinators, and other personnel directly involved in educational delivery. The findings are limited to the participating personnel and the setting studied.

Research Instrument

Data were gathered through a researcher-made structured questionnaire. It collected respondents' demographic and professional profile and assessed six domains: instructional resources, learning environment, institutional and administrative support, security and operational procedures, learner-related factors, and professional development opportunities. Each domain consisted of ten indicators, for a total of 60 challenge items.

The instrument used a four-point scale from Not Serious to Very Serious. The source manuscript describes expert review, comparison with related instruments, face-validity review, and pre-testing with 25 individuals excluded from the main sample. Revisions were made after the pre-test to improve clarity and relevance.

Data Collection and Ethics

The procedure included identifying relevant concerns through literature review and initial stakeholder discussions, developing and refining the questionnaire, securing authorization from relevant authorities, conducting a pre-test, administering the final instrument, retrieving completed questionnaires, and processing responses. Informed consent, voluntary participation, confidentiality, anonymity in reporting, and the right to withdraw were emphasized. The study also committed to honest analysis and reporting.

Statistical Treatment

Frequency and percentage summarized the respondents' profile. Weighted means described perceived challenge levels, and ranking identified the most prevalent domain. One-way ANOVA tested differences in mean ratings among profile groups at the 0.05 significance level. Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference test was used for post hoc comparisons where omnibus differences were significant. The interpretation of the scale followed the study's intervals: 1.00–1.75 = Not Serious; above 1.75–2.50 = Less Serious; above 2.50–3.25 = Serious; and above 3.25–4.00 = Very Serious. Because some subgroups were small, inferential results should be interpreted cautiously.



RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Profile of Respondents

The sample comprised 79 educational personnel from the three security compounds. The source manuscript reports 39 uniformed teachers or personnel (49.37%), 35 non-uniformed teachers (44.30%), and five volunteers (6.33%). Respondents were also grouped by years of teaching/instructional experience, security compound, and educational level or program handled to support the comparative analyses. The profile groups provide context for interpreting the challenge ratings but do not establish the causes of those ratings.

Instructional Resources

Instructional resources were the most prevalent challenge domain, with a weighted mean of 3.19, interpreted as Serious. The most pronounced difficulty was access to sufficient instructional materials (WM = 3.80, Very Serious), followed by obtaining supplies for instructional activities (WM = 3.67, Very Serious), access to appropriate technological resources (WM = 3.63, Very Serious), and insufficient resources for the number of learners (WM = 3.43, Very Serious). These findings point to problems of quantity, availability, and access rather than one isolated material type.

Challenge Domain	Weighted Mean	Interpretation	Priority
Instructional resources	3.19	Serious	1
Learning environment	2.39	Less Serious	5

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION (CONTINUED)

Institutional and Administrative Support

Institutional and administrative support was rated Less Serious overall (WM = 2.23). Nevertheless, limited partnerships with private institutions and organizations affecting donated educational materials and resources was rated Very Serious (WM = 3.58), as was limited institutional resources affecting educational delivery (WM = 3.28). Administrative requirements that added to teaching demands were rated Serious (WM = 2.68). Communication with institutional personnel (WM = 1.52), coordination with educational partners (WM = 1.61), and coordination of instructional activities with offices or personnel (WM = 1.66) were rated Not Serious.

The pattern indicates that routine communication was generally manageable, while resource mobilization and workload-related requirements were more pressing. Partnerships should be planned around a verified needs list, security-approved donations, and clearly assigned responsibilities.

Challenge Domain	Weighted Mean	Interpretation	Priority
Institutional and administrative support	2.23	Less Serious	6
Security and operational procedures	2.55	Serious	2

Outdated resources or resources requiring replacement received the lowest item rating (WM = 2.08, Less Serious). The contrast suggests that respondents were more constrained by insufficient or inaccessible usable materials than by obsolescence alone. A resource inventory, replenishment process, controlled resource bank, and approved offline repository are therefore priority proposals.

Learning Environment

The learning environment received an overall weighted mean of 2.39, interpreted as Less Serious. However, limited access to appropriate learning facilities was rated Serious (WM = 3.16), followed by limited learning/activity space (WM = 2.86), limited classroom space (WM = 2.77), the physical condition of instructional areas (WM = 2.62), and physical limitations affecting the variety of activities (WM = 2.53). Inadequate ventilation or lighting received the lowest rating (WM = 1.75, Not Serious), and noise or environmental distractions were rated Less Serious (WM = 1.82).

The overall mean masks specific facility-access and space constraints. Support should therefore prioritize access to suitable and flexible learning spaces for demonstrations, group activities, and program-specific instruction rather than assuming all physical conditions require equal intervention.

Security and Operational Procedures

Security and operational procedures were rated Serious overall (WM = 2.55). Conflicts between institutional schedules and planned instructional activities ranked highest (WM = 2.72), followed by security requirements limiting instructional activities (WM = 2.71). Movement restrictions and operational interruptions were tied at WM = 2.61. Restrictions on materials, equipment, or technology received WM = 2.58, and interruptions caused by security procedures received WM = 2.56. Delays in accessing instructional areas received the lowest rating in the domain (WM = 2.30, Less Serious).

The results suggest that the broader impact of schedules, movement restrictions, security controls, and unexpected operations is more important than access delays alone. A coordinated calendar, designated education and security focal persons, timely notice of changes, and contingency lesson plans may protect instructional continuity while respecting institutional requirements.



RESULTS AND DISCUSSION (CONTINUED)

Learner-Related Factors

Learner-related factors received an overall WM of 2.50, interpreted as Less Serious based on the unrounded mean of 2.499. Differences in learner behavior and attitudes affecting classroom management ranked highest (WM = 2.66, Serious), followed by the need to adapt activities to different learner abilities (WM = 2.62), differences in educational backgrounds (WM = 2.61), addressing different learning needs within one group (WM = 2.59), and maintaining consistent participation (WM = 2.56). The lowest-rated item was the need to modify instructional strategies because of differences in learning abilities (WM = 2.25, Less Serious).

Although the domain average was Less Serious, six of its ten indicators were rated Serious. The findings support targeted assistance in differentiated instruction, learner assessment, classroom management, and flexible learning activities. Learner

diversity should be treated as a planning consideration, not as a deficiency.

Professional Development Opportunities

Professional development was rated Serious overall (WM = 2.52). Limited opportunities for training specifically related to correctional education ranked first (WM = 2.68), followed by workload or institutional schedules limiting participation (WM = 2.67). Limited access to workshops on innovative teaching strategies received WM = 2.59, while competency enhancement/certification and classroom-management training were tied at WM = 2.57. Financial or logistical limitations received the lowest rating (WM = 2.29, Less Serious).

These results indicate that the availability, relevance, and scheduling of professional learning were more prominent concerns than cost alone. Training should be context-specific and compatible with duty schedules, and should include correctional education, classroom management, differentiated instruction, assessment adaptation, offline teaching strategies, and security-aware lesson planning.

Challenge Domain	Weighted Mean	Interpretation	Priority
Learner-related factors	2.50	Less Serious	4
Professional development opportunities	2.52	Serious	3

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF CHALLENGE RATINGS

One-way ANOVA was used to test whether the six domain ratings and the overall challenge score differed by job status,

years of instructional experience, security compound, and educational level/program handled. Statistical significance was evaluated at $p < .05$.

Profile Group	Challenge Area	F (df)	p	Decision
Job status	Instructional resources	0.333 (2,76)	.717	Not Significant
Job status	Learning environment	0.535 (2,76)	.588	Not Significant
Job status	Institutional support	0.614 (2,76)	.544	Not Significant
Job status	Security/operations	0.798 (2,76)	.454	Not Significant
Job status	Learner-related factors	0.719 (2,76)	.491	Not Significant
Job status	Professional development	1.768 (2,76)	.178	Not Significant
Job status	Overall score	0.415 (2,76)	.662	Not Significant
Years of experience	All six domains	All $p > .05$	—	Not Significant
Security compound	Instructional resources	9.133 (2,76)	<.001	Significant
Security compound	Security/operations	4.783 (2,76)	.011	Significant
Security compound	Professional development	3.282 (2,76)	.043	Significant
Security compound	Overall score	0.897 (2,76)	.412	Not Significant
Program handled	Instructional resources	4.329 (4,74)	.003	Significant
Program handled	Institutional support	3.204 (4,74)	.018	Significant
Program handled	Overall score	0.707 (4,74)	.590	Not Significant

The source results indicate no significant differences in domain ratings by job status or years of instructional experience. Differences by security compound occurred in instructional resources, security and operational procedures, and professional development. By educational level/program handled, differences occurred in instructional resources and institutional and administrative support. The overall challenge score did not differ significantly across the profile groups, suggesting that the

significant differences were concentrated in particular domains rather than reflecting a general difference in perceived challenges.

The absence of significant differences in some comparisons should not be interpreted as proof that every group has identical experiences. Small subgroups may limit statistical power, and the results describe perceptions rather than causal effects.



POST HOC COMPARISONS AND PRIORITY RANKING

Tukey HSD Results

Profile	Challenge Domain	Comparison	Mean Difference	p
Compound	Instructional resources	Minimum vs Medium	0.360	.009
Compound	Instructional resources	Minimum vs Maximum	0.494	<.001
Compound	Instructional resources	Medium vs Maximum	0.133	.044
Compound	Security/operations	Medium vs Maximum	-0.224	.017
Compound	Professional development	Medium vs Maximum	0.204	.039
Program Handled	Instructional resources	Technical-vocational vs Junior High	0.275	.013
Program Handled	Instructional resources	Technical-vocational vs Senior High	0.303	.006
Program Handled	Institutional support	Technical-vocational vs Senior High	0.269	.025

For instructional resources, Minimum Security Compound respondents reported higher challenge ratings than those in the Medium and Maximum compounds; the Medium group also rated resource challenges higher than the Maximum group. For security and operational procedures, the Maximum group reported higher challenges than the Medium group. For professional development, the Medium group reported higher challenges than the Maximum group.

By program handled, Technical-Vocational Education personnel reported higher instructional-resource challenges than Junior High School and Senior High School personnel. They also reported higher institutional and administrative support challenges than Senior High School personnel. These comparisons support differentiated interventions by compound and program. Results should be interpreted cautiously because several subgroups were small.

Most Prevalent Challenge Area

Challenge Domain	Weighted Mean	Interpretation	Rank
Instructional resources	3.19	Serious	1
Security and operational procedures	2.55	Serious	2
Professional development opportunities	2.52	Serious	3
Learner-related factors	2.50	Less Serious	4
Learning environment	2.39	Less Serious	5
Institutional and administrative support	2.23	Less Serious	6
Grand weighted mean	2.56	Serious	—

Instructional resources clearly ranked first, establishing the primary focus for support. Security-compatible continuity and professional development followed. Lower-ranked domains still require attention where individual items were rated serious or very serious, particularly access to learning facilities, institutional resource partnerships, classroom management, and differentiated instruction.

PROPOSED INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT PROGRAM

General objective: To improve the continuity, adequacy, responsiveness, and sustainability of educational service delivery at New Bilibid Prison while maintaining institutional security. The program below is proposed on the basis of the study's reported priorities; it has not been implemented or evaluated as part of this research.

Component 1. Instructional Resource Access and Replenishment

Objective: Improve the adequacy, accessibility, and security-compliant use of instructional materials, supplies, equipment, and offline technologies.

Key activities: Conduct a program- and compound-based resource inventory; identify minimum instructional requirements; prioritize procurement and replenishment; establish a controlled resource bank and approved offline repository; and develop screened partnership and donation arrangements.

Responsible units and schedule: Education Unit, institutional administration, supply/procurement, security unit, and partner educational institutions. Conduct the initial audit and plan during Months 1–3, then replenish and review quarterly.

Monitoring indicators: Completed inventory; approved priority list; resource-availability rate; and reduction in reports of unavailable materials.

Component 2. Security-Compatible Scheduling and Instructional Continuity

Objective: Reduce avoidable interruptions while maintaining institutional security requirements.

Key activities: Prepare a coordinated instructional calendar; designate education and security focal persons; establish a timely communication protocol for schedule changes; develop contingency lesson plans and portable learning kits; and monitor cancelled, shortened, and rescheduled sessions.



Responsible units and schedule: Education Unit, Security and Operations Units, compound coordinators, and educational personnel. Establish procedures during Months 1–3 and implement them on an ongoing basis.

Monitoring indicators: Percentage of scheduled sessions completed; timeliness of notice about changes; rescheduled-session rate; and documented resolution of recurring schedule conflicts.

Component 3. Correctional Education Professional Development

Objective: Strengthen competencies required for teaching in a correctional environment.

Key activities: Provide needs-based training on correctional education, innovative and offline teaching strategies, differentiated instruction, classroom management, learner diversity, assessment adaptation, and security-aware lesson planning. Establish mentoring, peer observation, and a professional learning community. Through an approved SOCI partnership, MMC Faculty, College of Criminology may co-host seminars, mentor personnel, and review adapted lessons.

Responsible units and schedule: Education Unit, Human Resource/Training Unit, qualified trainers, and partner higher-education institutions, including participating MMC faculty subject to approval. Plan at least two major learning activities per academic year with quarterly peer-learning sessions.

Monitoring indicators: Participation and completion rates; competency self-assessments; mentoring records; and evidence of strategies applied in lesson plans.

PROPOSED INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT PROGRAM (CONTINUED)

Component 4. Learner-Responsive Instruction and Classroom Support

Objective: Help educational personnel respond consistently to differences in learners' educational backgrounds, abilities, participation, and classroom needs.

Key activities: Conduct appropriate learning-needs assessments; develop differentiated and flexible lesson activities; share classroom-management strategies; adapt assessment methods when authorized; and identify referral pathways for concerns requiring specialized assistance.

Responsible units and schedule: Education Unit, program coordinators, educational personnel, and authorized support professionals. Begin needs assessment in Months 1–3 and review teaching practices each term.

Monitoring indicators: Number of adapted lesson plans; participation in peer-sharing sessions; documented use of differentiated activities; and educator feedback on classroom support.

Component 5. Learning Space and Facility Support

Objective: Improve access to functional, conducive, and instructionally appropriate learning spaces.

Key activities: Review space and facility access by compound and program; prioritize room use for activities requiring demonstrations or group work; record facility concerns; coordinate approved adjustments; and prepare alternatives when the preferred learning area is unavailable.

Responsible units and schedule: Education Unit, facilities/administrative personnel, compound coordinators, and Security Unit. Complete the initial review in Months 1–3 and conduct quarterly follow-up.

Monitoring indicators: Completed facility review; documented access schedule; number of concerns resolved; and educator assessment of learning-space suitability.

Component 6. Institutional Coordination, Partnerships, and Monitoring

Objective: Sustain administrative support, resource mobilization, and evidence-based program improvement.

Key activities: Establish clear points of contact; maintain a needs-based partnership plan; coordinate authorized donations and resource development; record activities and outputs; and hold periodic review meetings on resource availability, class continuity, professional development, and unresolved concerns.

Responsible units and schedule: Institutional administration, Education Unit, Security and Operations Units, partner organizations, and approved higher-education partners. Establish coordination procedures in Months 1–3 and conduct quarterly reviews.

Monitoring indicators: Approved partnership activities; documented resources and training delivered; completion of review meetings; action items resolved; and periodic feedback from educational personnel.

Implementation note: All activities involving external partners, instructional materials, equipment, visits, or technology must comply with institutional approval, safety, privacy, and security procedures. The proposed program should be adjusted after consultation with educational personnel and relevant authorities.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of Findings

The study involved 79 educational personnel selected from a population of 98 across the Minimum, Medium, and Maximum Security Compounds of New Bilibid Prison. Respondents rated six challenge domains. Instructional resources were the most prevalent challenge (WM = 3.19, Serious), followed by security and operational procedures (WM = 2.55, Serious) and professional development opportunities (WM = 2.52, Serious). Learner-related factors (WM = 2.50), learning environment (WM = 2.39), and institutional and administrative support (WM = 2.23) were rated Less Serious overall. The grand weighted mean was 2.56, interpreted as Serious.

The most pronounced item-level concerns included access to sufficient instructional materials (WM = 3.80), obtaining supplies (WM = 3.67), access to appropriate technological resources (WM = 3.63), limited resource partnerships (WM =



3.58), and inadequate resources for learner numbers (WM = 3.43). Scheduling conflicts and security requirements also constrained instructional continuity. Training specific to correctional education and work schedules limiting participation were the leading professional-development concerns.

No significant differences were found by job status or years of instructional experience. Significant differences by security compound appeared in instructional resources, security and operational procedures, and professional development. Differences by educational level/program handled appeared in instructional resources and institutional support. The overall challenge score did not differ significantly across these groups.

Conclusions

First, the educational personnel surveyed experienced a serious overall level of challenge in delivering educational services within the correctional setting. Second, instructional resource adequacy and access were the most prominent concerns and should receive first priority in support planning. Third, security and operational requirements affect continuity when schedules, movement controls, and instructional plans are not sufficiently coordinated. Fourth, personnel need relevant, accessible, and schedule-compatible professional development. Fifth, challenge patterns vary in specific domains by compound and program handled, supporting targeted rather than wholly uniform responses. Finally, the findings justify proposing a six-component Instructional Support Program, but its effectiveness can only be determined through future implementation and evaluation.

Recommendations

1. Conduct a verified inventory of materials, supplies, equipment, and approved offline technologies by compound and program; use the results to guide replenishment and resource allocation.
2. Strengthen coordination between education and security personnel through an agreed calendar, designated focal persons, timely schedule-change notices, and contingency lesson plans.
3. Provide context-specific professional development on correctional education, differentiated instruction, classroom management, assessment adaptation, and offline teaching strategies.

4. Improve access to suitable learning spaces through a documented facility review and practical scheduling arrangements.

5. Develop needs-based partnerships, including possible SOCI collaboration with MMC Faculty, College of Criminology, subject to consultation, authorization, and agreed responsibilities.

6. Implement the proposed program on a pilot basis, monitor the specified indicators, collect educator feedback, and revise components according to results.

7. Future researchers may replicate the study in other correctional facilities and include additional evidence sources, while recognizing that the present findings are based on self-reported assessments from one institution.

REFERENCES

1. Buhain, C. J. A. (2026). *Education behind bars: The lived experiences of Alternative Learning System learners in a Philippine prison*. *Adult Education Quarterly*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1177/07417136261467015>
2. Commission on Higher Education Regional Office XI. (2024, July 15). DNSC holds its first College Education Behind Bars graduation. <https://ro11.ched.gov.ph/2024/07/15/dnsc-successfully-holds-its-first-ceeb-graduation/9204/news-and-activities/>
3. Faa, L. (2023). *Tracking the persons deprived of liberty who are Alternative Learning System (ALS) passers 2016–2019: Basis for Bureau of Jail Management and Penology (BJMP) Manila for policy formulation*. SSRN. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4562682
4. Patrie, N. (2023). *Teaching in an unfamiliar place: A mixed methods-grounded theory study on the experiences of new correctional educators*. *Journal of Prison Education and Reentry*, 7(3), 290–309. <https://doi.org/10.25771/dee8-x383>
5. Republic of the Philippines. (2013). Republic Act No. 10575: *An Act strengthening the Bureau of Corrections (BuCor) and providing funds therefor*. The Lawphil Project. https://lawphil.net/statutes/repacts/ra2013/ra_10575_2013.html
6. Stickle, B., & Schuster, S. S. (2023). *Are schools in prison worth it? The effects and economic returns of prison education*. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 48, 1263–1294. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-023-09747-3>
7. Technical Education and Skills Development Authority. (2021, September 20). *NBP inmates to receive training on urban farming*. <https://www.tesda.gov.ph/Media/NewsDetail/20040>