JOURNAL OF INTERDISCIPLINARY PERSPECTIVES
PRINT ISSN: 2984-8288 | ONLINE ISSN: 2984-8385
https://doi.org/10.69569/jip

TWR Publishing

Research Article

Teachers' Evaluation of a Well-Being Support Program at Jaime Cardinal Sin Learning Center

Angelo V. Ayala[1,2], *Francis Michael P. Yambao*[1]

Author Information:

[1]Graduate School, Centro Escolar University, Mendiola, City of Manila, Philippines

[2]Research Department, Jaime Cardinal Sin Learning Center, Punta, Sta. Ana, City of Manila, Philippines

Corresponding Author:

Angelo V. Ayala
Email: ayala2545093@mnl.ceu.edu.ph

Article History:

Date received: September 16, 2026
Date revised: November 1, 2026
Date accepted: November 12, 2026

Recommended citation:

Ayala, A., & Yambao, F.M. (2026). Teachers' evaluation of the Kumustahan well-being support program at Jaime Cardinal Sin Learning Center. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, *4*(12), 224-233. https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2026.473

Abstract. This study reviewed the implementation of the Kumustahan Program, a teacher well-being support initiative at Jaime Cardinal Sin Learning Center, using Stake's Responsive Evaluation Framework. Using a qualitative-dominant convergence mixed-method design, data were collected from 20 teacher-respondents through a digital survey and evaluation. Results showed that teacher-respondents generally perceived the program positively in terms of engagement (M = 4.36), facilitation (M = 4.27), impact (M = 4.05), and strategies (M = 3.98), while scheduling (M = 3.34) ranked as the lowest of all program dimensions. Qualitative findings indicated that participants viewed the program as a supportive space for fostering unity, empathy, and compassion, while scheduling, the absence of established norms, new-teacher discomfort, and repetitive activities were concerns. Participants recommended improving scheduling, established norms, varied activities, and staggered or tiered sessions. These findings informed the development of an enhanced Kumustahan Program aligned with the 2026-2027 school calendar.

Keywords: *Mixed-method evaluation; Program evaluation; Teacher support; Teacher well-being; Workplace well-being.*

In recent years, some teachers have chosen to leave their teaching posts and venture into another profession to prioritize their own well-being. Recent studies highlight school climate as a main factor in teachers' workplace burnout. Shackleton et al. (2019) and Sohail et al. (2023) emphasized that teacher burnout extends beyond work-related stress, while Mortiz (2023) and Apad & Quines (2025) associated school climate with teacher burnout and teacher work performance. On the other hand, Gallego (2024), Hammar Chiriac et al. (2024), and Hashimoto & Maeda (2021) identified faculty relations as an emerging predictor and contributed to establishing and maintaining positive school climate.

Existing studies also suggest the importance of organizational interventions and support mechanisms that address teachers' occupational demands and strengthen professional relationships. The faculty support system includes formal and informal mechanisms through which teachers can receive administrative, emotional, social, and professional support in the workplace. Shackleton et al. (2019) and Nwoko et Al. (2023) suggest implementing school behavior plans, restorative practices, and peer mediation services, while providing organizational, leadership, colleague, and stakeholder support and collaboration practices to maintain teachers' occupational well-being. Dreer (2022), Harrison et al. (2025), and Sevilla et al. (2025) found that teacher well-being improves

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0)

when school climates meet teachers' needs for belonging, competence, and autonomy.

Although school-based initiatives may provide support, systemic evaluation of their effectiveness and implementation is still needed. Instead of merely following a standard construct measuring the effectiveness of a teacher well-being program, institutions must also include the narratives, experiences, and concerns of the teachers whom they are intended to support. Robert Stake's Responsive Evaluation Framework supports this purpose because program evaluation is not limited to program objectives alone; it also addresses respondents' concerns, issues, interactions, particularities, and values (Stake, 2004).

Altogether, these findings indicate that school climate and faculty support systems are interconnected rather than being treated as separate constructs. School climate represents the broader organizational context in which teachers experience occupational demands and interpersonal relationships. Within this climate, faculty support systems serve as a means of making administrative, collegial, emotional, and professional resources accessible to teachers. When these mechanisms are perceived as supportive, responsive, and psychologically safe, they may strengthen teacher well-being and provide resources for managing burnout-related conditions. Conversely, weak, inconsistent, or inaccessible support may limit the school climate's capacity to protect teacher well-being.

To address this growing concern, the Jaime Cardinal Sin Learning Center (JCSLC) launched the Kumustahan Program in 2023. From the root word of the name itself, kumusta, translated as 'how are you', this program aimed to check teachers' overall well-being through group sessions and activities. This is done quarterly as planned, facilitated by the Prefect of Students. However, since its implementation in 2023, the Kumustahan Program has not been very consistent. Even when Kumustahan Programs are scheduled in the monthly calendar of activities, they are often postponed in favor of other priorities, such as the Professional Learning Community (PLC) of different subject areas or grade levels. In addition, there is no official document stating clear guidelines for implementing the program. No evaluation has yet assessed its effectiveness and efficiency in supporting faculty members' well-being. Unfortunately, inconsistent implementation and a lack of clear guidelines limit the program's ability to support faculty members' well-being.

Now, with the implementation of DO 9, s. 2026, shifting to a three-term academic calendar starting in SY 2026-2027, teachers receive a two-day wellness break (days 9 and 10) at the end of the term. This is to promote teachers' work-life balance and support their well-being. With this recent change in the education sector, it is timely and relevant to revisit and make necessary adjustments to the Kumustahan Program in JCSLC.

Therefore, as existing scholarships have substantially identified school climate, faculty support systems, and occupational stress as organizational conditions associated with teacher burnout and teacher well-being, there are still unresolved concerns about how these conditions are translated into implementing and evaluating school-based teacher wellness intervention programs, especially here in the Philippines. The problem is not a lack of teacher well-being programs, but a limited understanding of how teachers' experiences and concerns can be used to develop and/or redesign an existing faculty support initiative. This case is relevant to JCSLC's Kumustahan Program, which took effect in 2023 but has not had any development or visits to further develop the program's faculty support initiative.

To address this concern, this paper applied Robert Stake's Responsive Evaluation Framework, which focuses on faculty members' experiences, concerns, perceptions, and implementation issues. Rather than determining the program's effectiveness, this evaluative study focuses on the conditions under which the Kumustahan Program can be useful and modified into a more responsive faculty well-being support program. For this study, participants were selected as primary stakeholders due to their direct experience with the Kumustahan Program. Accordingly, the questionnaire elicited their perceptions, implementation concerns, and recommendations. Quantitative responses described patterns in participants' assessments, while qualitative responses identified recurring and divergent concerns that informed the proposed program revisions. The study adopted an adapted responsive approach because data collection relied primarily on a post-program questionnaire rather than direct observation or iterative stakeholder engagement. Thus, the findings represent participants' reported experiences and perceptions, with both favorable and critical responses informing revisions to make the program more responsive to identified faculty concerns.

This study aimed to revitalize the Kumustahan Program as a teachers' well-being initiative for JCSLC faculty members. This paper examined the experiences and perceptions of JCSLC faculty members who participated in the program, as well as their evaluation of its impact, engagement, facilitation, strategies, and scheduling. Additionally, this paper sought to identify the program's strengths and limitations, as well as suggestions for improvement. These evaluations will help formulate a more comprehensive Kumustahan Program for teachers' well-being support that can be implemented not only in JCSLC but in any educational institution that wants to support its faculty members.

In line with these objectives, this paper sought to answer the following questions: (a) How do the faculty members of JCSLC describe their experiences in the Kumustahan Program? (b) How satisfied are JCSLC faculty members with the implementation of the Kumustahan Program in terms of participants' perceived impact, engagement, facilitation, strategies, and scheduling? (c) What are the best features and limitations of the Kumustahan Program based on the experiences of the faculty members of JCSLC? What improvements do faculty members of JCSLC suggest for the Kumustahan Program?

Methodology

Research Design

This study used a multi-method approach to evaluate the Kumustahan Program through the lens of JCSLC faculty members and to develop a more revitalized teacher well-being support initiative in the institution. Guided by relevant literature and Stake's Responsive Evaluation Framework, the researcher-developed questionnaire comprised four sections: demographic information and respondents' consent; three opening questions; the five-point Likert scale measuring the program's impact, engagement, facilitation, strategies, and scheduling, which were followed by short-response justifications; and open-ended questions exploring teachers' experiences, perceptions, strengths, limitations, and recommendations. The study analyzed qualitative and quantitative data separately but used them complementarily to interpret the program and identify areas for revision.

Participants and Sampling Technique

This paper utilized purposive sampling, with eligible participants comprising full-time JCSLC faculty members who participated in at least one Kumustahan Program session during school year 2025–2026. Of the 26 eligible faculty members, including newly appointed and long-serving teachers, 20 voluntarily participated in the study (76.9%). The nonparticipation of six eligible faculty members (23.1%) may introduce nonresponse bias, as their perceptions may differ from those of respondents. The researcher was a JCSLC faculty member and a colleague of the participants and program facilitator, without supervisory authority over them. The researcher had experience but was not involved in developing the original Kumustahan Program. Because the researcher distributed the survey and handled the data, potential social-desirability and researcher biases were acknowledged, and interpretations were grounded in participants' expressed responses. As an institutional program evaluation, the study emphasized context-specific perceptions rather than statistical generalizability beyond JCSLC.

Research Instrument

The researcher-developed questionnaire drew on literature on teacher well-being and program evaluation and aligned with Stake's Responsive Evaluation Framework. It contained 34 items across four sections: demographic and consent items; four opening questions; 25 five-point Likert-scale items assessing 5 constructs under impact, engagement, facilitation, strategies, and scheduling; and four open-ended questions exploring teachers' experiences, perceptions, strengths, limitations, and recommendations. Quantitative items used the response anchors: 1 = Very Unsatisfied; 2 = Unsatisfied; 3 = Neutral; 4 = Satisfied; and 5 = Very Satisfied. Scores for each dimension were averaged, with possible scores ranging from 3-5 for impact and facilitation, 2-5 for engagement and strategies, and 1-4 for scheduling. The five dimensions were derived from CDC's Program Evaluation Framework (2024), which provides a structured approach to planning, conducting, and using an assessment of a project, policy, or intervention; in this case, the Kumustahan Program.

An external expert in educational management and administration conducted a content review of the instrument, assessing item clarity, relevance, content coverage, and alignment with the research objectives. Based on the review, items were revised by clarifying ambiguous wording, removing redundant items, and aligning questions with the evaluation dimensions. Because only one expert conducted the review and item-level relevance ratings

required for computing content-validity indices were not obtained, I-CVI and S-CVI were not calculated. The expert review is therefore treated as preliminary evidence of content adequacy rather than comprehensive content validation. Quantitative ratings were analyzed descriptively, while participants' written justifications and open-ended responses constituted the qualitative dataset.

Data Gathering Procedure

Prior to data collection, the researcher sent a formal letter to the school principal and concerned offices requesting permission to conduct the study on the current implementation of the Kumustahan Program, secure related documents, and collect data and responses from JCSLC faculty members; the request was granted. This step ensured an ethical process for conducting research within the institution's programs and activities. Upon receiving approval to conduct the study, the research instrument was distributed to JCSLC teachers through Google Forms. Before answering the questionnaire, teacher-respondents were informed of the study's purpose, voluntary participation, and the confidentiality of their responses. They could choose to continue or decline participation in the study. Those who provided informed consent proceeded with the questionnaire. Google Form was available to accept responses from April 6 to 10, 2026. The data collection timeline coincided with the last week of the school year. After the response period, the data collected were retrieved, organized, and prepared for analysis in line with the research questions.

Data Analysis Procedure

Quantitative and qualitative findings were analyzed separately and subsequently compared for convergence and divergence, with both supporting and contradictory evidence considered in developing the proposed program modifications. Qualitative responses were analyzed thematically following Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-phase procedure. A combined deductive–inductive approach was used, with the research questions guiding analysis while codes and themes were developed from participants' responses. Coding was primarily semantic and conducted manually by the researcher. Following familiarization, initial codes were generated and organized into candidate themes, which were reviewed, refined, defined, and named in relation to the research questions. Divergent responses were retained during theme development to account for perspectives that differed from dominant patterns. The analysis was researcher-led; no independent coding review or formal audit trail was employed, although reflexivity was maintained by distinguishing participants' expressed meanings from the researcher's interpretations.

The quantitative data were analyzed using JAMOVI software for descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation). For each program-evaluation dimension, item-level means and standard deviations were calculated. The overall mean was obtained by averaging the item means within each dimension, with all items equally weighted. The composite standard deviation was calculated from respondent-level composite scores, obtained by averaging each participant's responses to the items within the corresponding dimension.

Ethical Considerations

The study did not undergo prospective independent ethics review; however, institutional authorization was obtained from JCSLC, and participant safeguards included voluntary informed consent, the right to decline participation, and confidential treatment of responses. Only participants' department was collected as demographic information; names, email addresses, and other direct identifiers were not collected, and quotations were reviewed and stripped of potentially identifying contextual details to minimize deductive-disclosure risk. Google Forms data were accessible only to the researcher through a personal Google account, stored in Google Sheets, and handled in accordance with RA 10173 (the Data Privacy Act of 2012). The data were retained for one month and subsequently permanently deleted.

Results and Discussion

Experiences of JCSLC Faculty Members in Kumustahan Program

Initial codes related to sharing experiences, emotional expression, self-reflection, collegial connection, follow-up support, and disclosure concerns were grouped into four themes: (1) a space for sharing and emotional release, (2) self-reflection and personal-professional well-being, (3) camaraderie and collegial support, and (4) concerns about follow-up and psychological safety. Responses were provided in English and Filipino; the researcher translated Filipino responses into English, with minor grammatical edits for readability while preserving participants' intended meanings.

Sharing and Emotional Release

Participants describe the Kumustahan Program as a space to share their experiences as teachers, whether positive or negative, amid heavy workloads and busy schedules. From the name itself, "kumusta," which means "how are you," the program checks the psychosocial well-being of the teacher, identifying the risks or challenges they are facing in the teaching profession. The program also serves as an avenue to express feelings or emotions that burden them. The teachers share their problems and concerns, mostly related to teaching and sometimes even personal concerns.

> *[The Kumustahan Program is] good because [teachers] express their challenges. They share information about their experiences, as well as personal information*. Respondent 6

> *A school-based mental health and psychosocial support initiative that focuses on checking in and building supportive conversations. I can describe it as warm, informal, and approachable. It's more like guided conversations where teachers feel safe sharing what they're going through. Each one shares their personal experiences, feelings, and what they are going through.* Respondent 15

Self-Reflection and Emotional Release

Through self-reflection, the program also becomes a space to be more grounded in personal or professional growth and goals, which are often neglected because of the demands of being a teacher. As demanding as it seems, the life of a teacher in the Philippines sometimes requires sacrificing personal time to meet goals for students and fulfill tasks as a school employee. The Kumustahan Program encourages teachers to practice a healthy work-life balance, achieve their goals as teachers, and fulfill personal achievements and ambitions.

> *The program definitely helps with my well-being because it gives me dedicated time to reflect on myself, the areas I need to grow in, and my goals, things I often neglect because of work demands. It helps me understand myself better and become more aware of what matters most.* Respondent 13

> *The Kumustahan Program has positively contributed to my well-being as a teacher. It helped me manage stress, feel supported, and maintain a better work-life balance. Knowing that there is a platform where I can openly share and be heard makes a significant difference in my overall motivation and mental health.* Respondent 19

Camaraderie and Collegial Support

Aside from teachers' well-being, respondents see that the program also fosters camaraderie, showing that teachers are not alone in struggling, as the JCSLC faculty is there to support them and create solutions together. There are instances when teachers felt isolated, especially neophyte teachers who were just experiencing the realities of teaching in the actual setting. These problems can include handling student behavior, parent conferences, and workplace issues. The Kumustahan Program provides that space, like a mentor-mentee relationship, where veteran teachers give tips and advice to neophyte teachers.

> *My overall experience with the Kumustahan Program has been positive and meaningful. It provided a safe space for teachers to express their thoughts, share experiences, and connect with colleagues. The program helped foster a sense of community and support, especially during challenging times in teaching.* Respondent 19

> *My general experience with the activity is positive and meaningful. It provides a chance to slow down and reflect on both personal and professional aspects of life. The Kumustahan Program promotes a culture of care, openness, and support, helping teachers stay emotionally resilient, connected, and motivated in their work*. Respondent 18

Follow-up and Psychological Safety

However, participants also identified concerns about the program. One said the program provides little to no follow-up checks or extensions for teachers after the activity, since the program is only conducted once or twice at their level. Aside from that, a respondent shared that the program lacks open discussions to address work-

related issues, and one even expressed concern that what they share in the program may be used against them.

> *I'd say 50/50, since it can really release the baggage, but after the session, there is no follow-up or extension of help provided*. Respondent 1

> *… However, since I initially expected it to be a space to address work-related issues openly, I feel there's still room for improvement to make it more inclusive of those kinds of discussions too*. Respondent 13

> *It's okay because [maybe] my sharing can be used against me*. Respondent 20

Participants also described the Kumustahan Program as beneficial to teachers' well-being. One respondent described the program as a medical check-up, serving as a preventive measure to address teachers' struggles before they further affect their holistic development. This school initiative creates a sense of validation for teachers' personal or professional experiences through sharing with co-teachers. This also empowers the school to take time to listen to their plight and, if possible, propose resolutions that can help lessen teachers' burden.

> *Helpful, as it becomes an eye-opener that the teachers are not the only ones experiencing [struggles]. Teachers can feel the connection [to each other], and you may learn from the sharing.* Respondent 2

> *Happy because [teachers] can share their resentment or grudge. The administrators will know [about it] and see that they care or have concern for teachers' feelings. The happiest part is that teachers become visible when they share. It helps in terms of mental health. This also becomes a safe space, especially when personal matters are shared or discussed, using the principle of "what you hear, leave it here." It also provides time to express feelings after exhausting work.* Respondent 8

Overall, the respondents described their experience in the Kumustahan Program as a positive and purposeful activity for teachers' holistic well-being. The findings align with Shackleton et al. (2019), as the results illustrate how a school-based support mechanism may help mitigate teacher burnout and occupational stress. For respondents, this is not an ordinary professional meeting, but an informal gathering of teachers who wanted to pause or slow down, take a breath, and share what they feel. This also serves as a platform to promote unity as a faculty by encouraging teachers to communicate well and be open with their fellow teachers, while also being empathetic and compassionate toward fellow teachers who are struggling in the profession.

Respondents also believed the Kumustahan Program can become an essential tool for monitoring teachers' well-being. The findings align with Nwoko et al. (2023), as the Kumustahan Program, initiated by the school administration, creates a supportive environment to assist teachers who are dealing with stress in the profession. The Kumustahan Program serves as a preventive measure to identify factors or stressors that affect a teacher's holistic development and to address them promptly. However, limitations were reported by the teacher-respondents, which include follow-up and monitoring, and privacy and security concerns for the teachers. These limitations are points to consider in enhancing the Kumustahan Program for the next school year.

Level of Satisfaction of the JCSLC Faculty Members in the Kumustahan Program

Table 1. *Overall Satisfaction Across Program Dimensions*

Dimensions	Overall Mean	Qualitative Description	Rank
Impact	4.05	Satisfied	3
Engagement	4.36	Very Satisfied	1
Facilitation	4.27	Very Satisfied	2
Strategies	3.98	Satisfied	4
Scheduling	3.34	Neutral	5

Note: 4.21 – 5.00 Very Satisfied, 3.41 – 4.20 Satisfied, 2.61 – 3.40 Neutral, 1.81 – 2.60 Unsatisfied, 1.00 – 1.80 Very Unsatisfied; Ranks represent descriptive ordering based on mean scores and should not be interpreted as statistically significant differences among program dimensions.

Table 1 presents the overall faculty satisfaction across the five dimensions of the Kumustahan Program. Among the program dimensions, "engagement" obtained the highest overall mean (M = 4.36). This suggests that the teacher-respondents were very satisfied with their participation throughout the Kumustahan session. This was followed by "facilitation" (M = 4.27), "impact" (M = 4.05), and strategies (M = 3.98). This suggests that the teacher-

respondents' well-being was generally positively affected by the tailored strategies during the session. However, scheduling (M = 3.34) ranked lowest among all program dimensions. This indicates an area for improvement in the Kumustahan Program.

Table 2. *Program Satisfaction in Terms of Participants' Perceived Impact*

Participants' Perceived Impact Indicators	*M*	*SD*	Qualitative Description
Work-related stress reduction	4.05	0.686	Satisfied
Improvement in emotional well-being	4.00	0.649	Satisfied
Maintain healthy work-life balance	3.95	0.605	Satisfied
Contributes to positive professional attitude	4.15	0.745	Satisfied
Coping with workplace challenges	4.10	0.788	Satisfied
Overall	**4.05**	**0.687**	**Satisfied**

Note: M=Mean, *SD*=standard deviation. Means were interpreted as follows: 4.21-5.00=Very Satisfied, 3.41–4.20=Satisfied, 2.61–3.40=Neutral, 1.81–2.60=Unsatisfied, 1.00–1.80=Very Unsatisfied.

Table 2 presents the faculty members' level of satisfaction with the participants' perceived impact of the Kumustahan Program. The results revealed that the respondents were satisfied with the program's impact, with all indicators obtaining mean scores from 3.95 to 4.15. Among the impact indicators, "contributes to positive professional attitude" had the highest mean (M = 4.15, SD = 0.745), reflecting teachers' perspective on their profession. Meanwhile, although they remained at a satisfactory level, "emotional well-being" (M = 4.00, SD = 0.649) and "maintain healthy work-life balance" (M = 3.95, SD = 0.605) ranked lowest in the impact dimension. This indicates that although the program focuses on teachers' emotional well-being, its influence on maintaining their work-life balance as professionals and as private individuals is less evident.

Table 3. *Program Satisfaction in Terms of Engagement*

Engagement Indicators	*M*	*SD*	Qualitative Description
Participation	4.30	0.865	Very Satisfied
Sharing of idea	4.40	0.681	Very Satisfied
Participant attentiveness	4.40	0.754	Very Satisfied
Participant interaction	4.35	0.671	Very Satisfied
Personal involvement	4.35	0.587	Very Satisfied
Overall	4.36	**0.704**	Very Satisfied

Note: M=Mean, *SD*=standard deviation. Means were interpreted as follows: 4.21-5.00=Very Satisfied, 3.41–4.20=Satisfied, 2.61–3.40=Neutral, 1.81–2.60=Unsatisfied, 1.00–1.80=Very Unsatisfied.

Table 3 presents the faculty members' level of satisfaction with participants' engagement in the Kumustahan Program. Overall, respondents were very satisfied with the program's engagement, with all indicators receiving mean scores ranging from 4.30 to 4.40. Among the engagement indicators, both "participant attentiveness" (M = 4.40, SD = 0.754) and "sharing of ideas" (M = 4.40, SD = 0.681) received the highest mean scores. This signifies that the program has engaged participants to openly share and contribute their ideas while being attentive throughout the sessions. Although ranked lowest, the indicator "participation" (M = 4.30, SD = 0.865) still falls within the very satisfactory level, suggesting that teachers were assured to attend and participate in the Kumustahan Program.

Table 4. *Program Satisfaction in Terms of Facilitation*

Facilitation Indicators	*M*	*SD*	Qualitative Description
Facilitator encouragement	4.35	0.587	Very Satisfied
Supportive learning environment	4.50	0.607	Very Satisfied
Session management	4.15	0.745	Satisfied
Facilitator sensitivity	4.20	0.768	Satisfied
Participant collaboration	4.15	0.587	Satisfied
Overall	**4.27**	**0.664**	**Very Satisfied**

Note: M=Mean, *SD*=standard deviation. Means were interpreted as follows: 4.21-5.00=Very Satisfied, 3.41–4.20=Satisfied, 2.61–3.40=Neutral, 1.81–2.60=Unsatisfied, 1.00–1.80=Very Unsatisfied.

Table 4 presents the faculty members' satisfaction level with the facilitation of the Kumustahan Program. Overall, respondents were very satisfied with how the program was facilitated, although most individual indicators received satisfactory ratings, ranging from 4.15 to 4.50. Among the facilitation indicators, the "supportive learning environment" received the highest mean (M = 4.50, SD = 0.607). The frequent mention of a "safe space" by the respondents when asked about their experience of the Kumustahan Program complements this rating. This further implies that the Kumustahan Program really became a space where teachers are respectfully listened to and feel supported by their fellow teachers. Meanwhile, "facilitator sensitivity" (M = 4.20, SD = 0.768), session

management (*M* = 4.15, *SD* = 0.745), and participant collaboration (*M* = 4.15, *SD* = 0.587) received satisfactory ratings. This indicates that the respondents felt that the program was facilitated in an organized, responsive, and collaborative manner.

Table 5. *Program Satisfaction in Terms of Strategies*

Strategies Indicators	*M*	*SD*	Qualitative Description
Responsiveness to wellness needs	3.75	0.716	Satisfied
Practical applicability	3.95	0.759	Satisfied
Stress-management promotion	4.05	0.605	Satisfied
Emotional well-being support	4.00	0.725	Satisfied
Social connectedness	4.15	0.671	Satisfied
Overall	**3.98**	**0.696**	**Satisfied**

Note: M=Mean, *SD*=standard deviation. Means were interpreted as follows: 4.21-5.00=Very Satisfied, 3.41–4.20=Satisfied, 2.61–3.40=Neutral, 1.81–2.60=Unsatisfied, 1.00–1.80=Very Unsatisfied.

Table 5 presents the faculty members' level of satisfaction with the strategies used in the Kumustahan Program. The results showed that respondents were satisfied with the strategies used in the program, with mean scores ranging from 3.75 to 4.15 across all indicators. Among the strategy indicators, "social connectedness" (*M* = 4.15, *SD* = 0.671) had the highest mean, indicating that the strategies used in the program aim to encourage positive relationships among teachers. Meanwhile, "responsiveness to wellness needs" ranked lowest (*M* = 3.75, *SD* = 0.716), which indicates that although the strategies implemented satisfy teachers, they should be more aligned with the current conditions of the teachers.

Table 6. *Program Satisfaction in Terms of Scheduling*

Scheduling Indicators	*M*	*SD*	Qualitative Description
Schedule convenience	3.65	0.745	Satisfied
Schedule compatibility	3.65	0.875	Satisfied
Session duration	3.40	0.754	Neutral
Session frequency	2.65	1.268	Neutral
Schedule communication	3.35	1.040	Neutral
Overall	**3.34**	**1.007**	**Neutral**

Note: M=Mean, *SD*=standard deviation. Means were interpreted as follows: 4.21-5.00=Very Satisfied, 3.41–4.20=Satisfied, 2.61–3.40=Neutral, 1.81–2.60=Unsatisfied, 1.00–1.80=Very Unsatisfied.

Table 6 presents the faculty members' level of satisfaction with the scheduling of the Kumustahan Program. Compared to other program dimensions, scheduling received relatively lower ratings (2.65-3.65), corresponding to neutral to satisfied descriptions. Among the scheduling indicators, both "schedule convenience" (*M* = 3.65, *SD* = 0.745) and "schedule compatibility" (*M* = 3.65, *SD* = 0.875) received the highest mean. This indicates that respondents were generally satisfied with how the Kumustahan Program was scheduled at their convenience while ensuring it would not hamper institutional operations or their responsibilities as teachers. However, "session duration" (*M* = 3.40, *SD* = 0.754), "schedule communication" (*M* = 3.35, *SD* = 1.040), and "session frequency" (*M* = 2.65, *SD* = 1.268) received neutral ratings. This suggests that the session duration, originally only 1 hour, was not enough for teachers to fully enjoy the session. Teachers also felt that the Kumustahan Program schedule, although set at the teachers' convenience, was sometimes inconsistent. Notably, activity frequency ranked lowest, indicating that sessions for the school year 2025-2026 were less adequate. Originally, the program was scheduled every quarter, but it was sometimes postponed or moved to a later date because it coincided with student programs and activities. Overall, while the scheduling remains generally acceptable, the duration, frequency, and communication of the program sessions need improvement to further enhance participants' overall experience.

Best Features and Limitations of the Kumustahan Program

For the respondents, one of the main features of the Kumustahan Program is the title itself, pangangamusta. Instead of conventional counseling, this program highlights pangangamusta, a part of Filipino culture rooted in the values of pakikipagkapwa (fellowship) and Pakikiramdam (shared inner perception). Although it is rooted in the Spanish ¿Cómo estás? from the Spanish colonization, it then localized in Philippine society. Pangangamusta is not simply showing care and concern for others; it extends from ensuring a person's holistic well-being to strengthening social relationships. In the context of the Kumustahan Program, teachers are checked on whether they are holistically well. Teachers are then given time to express what they feel, and as a community, we express our solidarity and companionship with each other.

Another feature that highlights the Kumustahan Program is the activities provided. Kumustahan Program differs from normal counseling sessions, where thought-provoking questions are maximized. A respondent even claimed that this separates it from ordinary seminars or webinars about mental health awareness because it is most visible in checking or monitoring teachers' well-being within the school year. To encourage teachers to share and build a comfortable environment, the program maximizes interactive and engaging activities. Despite being repetitive, respondents said this feature can be an advantage in effectively implementing the Kumustahan Program as a well-being support initiative.

However, when asked about their level of satisfaction with the implementation of the Kumustahan Program in terms of scheduling, respondents expressed that inconsistent scheduling, tied to limited time, hinders the program's effectiveness. Formal meetings, PLCs, and other school tasks also coincide with the Kumustahan Program, resulting in postponement or cancellation. Additionally, the Kumustahan Program was conducted during the hectic second and/or third quarter, leading teachers to view it as another hindrance rather than an instrument in their teaching profession. Since the Kumustahan Program was only conducted once or twice last school year, no follow-up or extension was done to track teachers' changes and development.

Another limitation respondents pointed out was their perception of the Kumustahan Program. Some respondents hesitated to share because they thought whatever they said during the Kumustahan Program might be used against them. Another respondent said trust was not built, prompting them to share experiences at the surface level. These narratives stem from the lack of norms or guidelines for participants at the start of the activity. An informal reminder before the session could reinforce the need for a clear set of norms for participants to follow.

Although the Kumustahan Program was launched in 2023, some teachers, especially those hired after its launch, were not aware of its objectives and process. Although this was mentioned in the personnel orientation, it was not discussed thoroughly because it lacked the necessary documents showing the program's guidelines. Some were even hired after the orientation. Therefore, when they attended their first Kumustahan Program, newly hired teachers could not share as well because they felt awkward, despite encouragement from seasoned teachers. On the other hand, during the first Kumustahan session, seasoned teachers tended to be more careful about what they shared because they did not want the new teachers to feel excluded.

Despite being rated satisfactorily by respondents and cited as one of the program's best features, they expressed concern about the repetition of the same strategies used in the Kumustahan Program. Although they experienced the Kumustahan Program only once in SY 2025-2026, they likely compared it to the strategies used during SY 2024-2025. Additionally, a respondent shared that the sessions focused more on answering questions and doing activities than on open dialogue. This emphasizes that even during interactive and engaging activities, sessions should also provide opportunities for dialogue and conflict resolution.

Recommendations of the JCSLC Faculty Members for the Kumustahan Program

Respondents suggested that the Kumustahan Program be held every quarter (or term), particularly at the end, when all quarter (or term) end activities, such as checking of activities, card giving, and recognition, are done. Administrators need to ensure that the Kumustahan Program does not coincide with other formal meetings and other teacher-role activities. This will show that they are giving time and prioritizing teachers' holistic well-being. Respondents also recommended having a standard set of norms for the participants to follow. This will ensure the smooth flow of the program while considering participants' privacy and security. To lessen the awkwardness between old and new faculty members, respondents suggested a Kumustahan Program before the start of the school year. At this point, the kumustahan session mainly centers on socializing and getting to know each other. Facilitator/s should create an activity to build a safe space and a comforting environment at the start of the school year.

Teacher-respondents are also requesting more varied activities that can be experienced during the kumustahan session. A respondent, however, emphasized that aside from being interactive, it should also discuss and address teachers' struggles, especially within the school setting, through meaningful dialogues and conversations. Lastly, the current Kumustahan Program sessions are grouped based on their grade-level departments (Primary: Preschool to Grade 3; Intermediate: Grade 4 to Grade 6; Junior High School: Grade 7 to Grade 10; and Senior High

School: Grade 11 and 12, with the addition of non-advisory teachers). In line with this, the respondents suggested a whole-faculty Kumustahan Program, where they share and discuss their experiences from a general perspective; a grade-level department kumustahan, which is currently implemented; and one-on-one kumustahan for personal and private concerns and struggles. This ensures that the Kumustahan Program can address teachers' concerns and difficulties, from general perspectives to specific and private cases. Through this staggered, or tiered, approach, the facilitator can also monitor teachers' well-being and identify teachers who show signs of distress and need specific interventions. Depending on the tier, the facilitator may also invite another expert, such as the guidance associate or counselor, to share another perspective.

Conclusion

The Kumustahan Program was perceived by participants as a supportive faculty well-being activity that promotes self-reflection, collegial engagement, and shared experiences. While participants reported favorable perceptions of its impact, engagement, and facilitation, implementation concerns indicated the need for program enhancement. These findings informed the proposed enhanced Kumustahan Program, aligned with the school calendar, and participants identified concerns and recommendations. The proposal is context-specific to JCSLC and requires local adaptation and a pilot evaluation before applying it in other settings. Future studies should evaluate its implementation and examine teacher well-being outcomes using appropriate baseline and outcome measures. This study is limited by its single-institution context, small purposive sample, nonresponse, and varying participant exposure to the program. Findings also rely on a researcher-developed instrument and self-reported data, which may be subject to social-desirability bias. Researcher positionality as a colleague and program participant may have influenced interpretation. The absence of baseline and outcome measures limits claims of program effectiveness, while the small, identifiable institutional setting presents potential deductive-disclosure risks despite confidentiality safeguards.

Contributions of Authors

Author 1: conceptualization, literature search, data gathering, data encoding, initial manuscript preparation, and revision
Author 2: supervision, methodological guidance, manuscript editing, and final review

Funding

No external funding was received for this research.

Conflict of Interests

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Acknowledgment

The authors would like to thank the administrators and faculty members of Jaime Cardinal Sin Learning Center for their invaluable contribution to make this study possible.

References

Apad, M.S., & Quines, L. (2025). Work values, school climate and culture: A path model analysis on work performance of teachers in public elementary schools. European Journal of Education Studies, 12(5). https://www.oapub.org/edu/index.php/ejes/article/view/5851?

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2024, August 20). CDC program evaluation framework. https://www.cdc.gov/evaluation/php/evaluation-framework/index.html

Department of Education. (2026, April 16). Department Order No. 009, s. 2026: Guidelines on the implementation of the three-term school calendar in basic education. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/DO_s2026_009r.pdf

Dreer, B. (2022). Teacher well-being: Investigating the contributions of school climate and job crafting. Cogent Education, 9(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2022.2044583

Gallego, M.K. (2024). School climate and burnout among mathematics teachers as basis for teacher empowerment action plan: A convergent parallel design. American Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation, 3(5), 10–21. https://doi.org/10.54536/ajmri.v3i4.2849

Hammar Chiriac, E., Forsberg, C., & Thornberg, R. (2024). Teacher teams: A safe place to work on creating and maintaining a positive school climate. Social Psychology of Education, 27, 1775–1795. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-023-09880-1

Harrison, M., Wang, Y., Cheng, A., Tam, C.K.Y., Pan, Y.-L., & King, R. (2025). School climate and teacher wellbeing: The role of basic psychological need satisfaction in student- and school-related domains. Teaching and Teacher Education, 153. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2024.104819

Hashimoto, H. & Maeda, K. (2021). Collegial organizational climate alleviates Japanese schoolteachers' risk for burnout. Frontiers in Psychology, 12. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.737125

Mortiz, K.J. (2023). School climate and teacher burnout in the post-pandemic time. International Journal of Arts, Sciences and Education, 4(4), 30–44. https://ijase.org/index.php/ijase/article/view/299

Nwoko, J.C., Emeto, T.I., Malau-Aduli, A.E.O., & Malau-Aduli, B.S. (2023). A systematic review of the factors that influence teachers' occupational wellbeing. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 20(12), 6070. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10298565

Sevilla, G.D., Cañezal, C., Montalban, J., Martin, A.M., de Castro, C.C., & Serrato, M.G. (2025). Assessing teacher well-being and support needs in Philippine private schools: Recommendations for community-based wellness programs. Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives, 3(10), 504-509. https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2025.626

Shackleton, N., Bonell, C., Jamal, F., Allen, E., Mathiot, A., Elbourne, D., & Viner, R. (2019). Teacher burnout and contextual and compositional elements of school environment. Journal of School Health, 89(12), 977–993. https://doi.org/10.1111/josh.12839

Sohail, M.M., Baghdadi, N.A., Choi, J., Huynh, H.V., Whetten, K., & Proeschold-Bell, R.J. (2023). Factors influencing teacher wellbeing and burnout in schools: A scoping review. Work, 75(4), 1317–1331. https://doi.org/10.3233/WOR-220234

Stake, R. (2004). Stake and responsive evaluation. (M. C. Alkin, Ed). Age Publications