Readiness of School Facilities for Inclusive Education: A Focus on Accessibility and Adaptability

Rizza Gernette Ann M. Lo, Nomelita S. Lo, Edd

Mabini Colleges, Incorporated, Daet, Camarines Norte

DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.10200455

Received: 02 March 2026; Accepted: 08 March 2026; Published: 16 March 2026

ABSTRACT

This study assessed the readiness of public schools in Basud District, Camarines Norte, for inclusive education, focusing on the accessibility and adaptability of school facilities to support diverse learning needs. A quantitative descriptive–correlational research design was employed, and data were collected from 68 respondents, including school leaders, teachers, and Senior High School Coordinators during the School Year 2025–2026. A validated researcher-made questionnaire examined the availability of facilities, the level of readiness for inclusive education, and challenges encountered by school administrators. Descriptive statistics and Somers' Delta correlation were used for analysis. Findings revealed that schools demonstrated moderate to good readiness in infrastructure, sanitation, and general safety facilities; however, notable gaps persist in accessibility features for learners with disabilities. Limited assistive technologies, Braille signage, accessible sanitation adaptations, and safety equipment were identified as critical areas needing improvement. Correlation analysis indicated that classroom, sanitation, and safety facilities significantly influence school readiness for inclusive education. The study concludes that infrastructure alone does not ensure readiness for inclusive education. Accessible and adaptable learning environments are essential to effectively support diverse learners. Based on these findings, Project ACSSIE (Advancing Classroom, Sanitation, and Safety for Inclusive Education) is proposed to strengthen the readiness of school facilities for inclusive education in Basud District public schools.

Keywords: School facilities, inclusive education, accessibility, adaptability, readiness

INTRODUCTION

Inclusive education is recognized globally as a cornerstone of equitable and quality educational systems, emphasizing the right of all learners to participate in supportive, accessible, and barrier-free learning environments. Beyond promoting academic development, inclusive education fosters essential social competencies, enabling students with and without disabilities to interact meaningfully, develop mutual understanding, and cultivate empathy (Llego, 2022). It has become a central objective of contemporary educational systems worldwide, guided by frameworks such as UNESCO's Education for All initiative and the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD). These frameworks advocate the removal of physical, social, and instructional barriers that impede participation among learners with disabilities, promoting equitable access and meaningful engagement in all aspects of schooling.

The physical environment of schools is critical to achieving inclusive education. Accessible classrooms, sanitation facilities, and safety mechanisms directly influence learners' ability to participate independently and fully in school activities. Inadequate infrastructure such as the absence of ramps, accessible restrooms, assistive technologies, and adaptive classroom equipment remains a persistent barrier, particularly in developing countries. Ensuring that school facilities are functional, accessible, and adaptable is therefore essential to meet the diverse learning needs of all students.

This study is grounded in Educational Adequacy Theory, which asserts that achieving desired educational outcomes depends on the alignment of resources, facilities, and support systems with learners' needs. Within this framework, adequate school facilities are not merely present; they must be functional, accessible, and adaptable to support meaningful participation for all learners, including those with disabilities. Adequacy encompasses the quality, usability, and inclusivity of infrastructure, reflecting the principle that educational environments must actively facilitate equitable learning opportunities rather than serve as passive physical resources.

In the Philippines, inclusive education is supported through multiple policies, programs, and legislative measures designed to enhance access and quality. The "Inclusive Education for All" program provides training for educators, administrators, and parents to address the diverse needs of learners effectively. Special Education (SPED) schools and the Alternative Learning System (ALS) provide pathways for learners with disabilities or those unable to thrive in traditional classrooms. Policy frameworks, including DepEd Order No. 21, Series of 2023, and implementing guidelines for Brigada Eskwela, mandate that school grounds, classrooms, and facilities be maintained safely, cleanly, and free from hazards or unnecessary decorations. Republic Act No. 11650, the Inclusive Education Act, institutionalizes services for learners with disabilities and mandates the establishment of Inclusive Learning Resource Centers across schools, districts, municipalities, and cities, including funding provisions and standards. Likewise, Republic Act No. 10533, the Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013, introduced the K–12 curriculum and reinforced equitable access to quality education for all Filipino learners, regardless of socioeconomic status or geographic location. These legislative and policy frameworks provide both legal and ethical foundations for promoting inclusive education and ensuring equitable learning environments across the country.

Despite these advances, implementation challenges persist, especially in public schools where physical infrastructure, teaching resources, and trained personnel are limited. Many schools lack specialized materials and adaptive equipment necessary for accommodating diverse learners. Teachers often report inadequate preparation to meet the needs of students with disabilities, and school facilities frequently fail to meet accessibility standards. Limited funding, bureaucratic constraints, and uneven policy enforcement exacerbate these challenges, underscoring that legislative mandates alone do not guarantee effective inclusion. Research consistently highlights gaps in accessible classrooms, sanitation facilities, learning materials for students with sensory impairments, and safety mechanisms.

In Camarines Norte, these challenges are particularly pronounced. Public secondary schools continue to face insufficient funding for inclusive infrastructure, limited availability of specialized equipment, and inadequate accessibility features such as ramps, elevators, and adaptive restrooms. These conditions emphasize the need for systematic assessment of school readiness for inclusive education, particularly regarding the accessibility, adaptability, and functionality of school facilities. Evaluating these factors is critical for identifying gaps, guiding resource allocation, and implementing evidence-based strategies to strengthen inclusive learning environments.

Given this context, the present study investigates the readiness of public secondary schools in Basud District for inclusive education, with a focus on the availability, accessibility, and adaptability of school facilities. The research aims to determine the extent to which existing infrastructure supports learners with disabilities and to identify the challenges encountered by school administrators in maintaining inclusive learning environments. By highlighting gaps and successful strategies, the study seeks to provide actionable recommendations to inform policy development, guide resource allocation, and improve practical interventions for inclusive education within Basud District.

METHODOLOGY

This study utilized a quantitative research method and employed a descriptive-correlational research design to assess the readiness of public school facilities for inclusive education in secondary schools in Basud, Camarines Norte. The quantitative approach allowed the researcher to collect numerical data and apply statistical analyses to draw objective conclusions about the current status of school facilities and their readiness for inclusive education. The study involved 68 respondents, including 32 school heads, 32 teachers, and 4 senior high school coordinators. A total enumeration sampling method was employed, which included the entire population, ensuring comprehensive coverage and enhancing the reliability of the results.

Data were collected using a researcher-made questionnaire, which was administered during scheduled school visits after obtaining approval from the relevant authorities and informed consent from the respondents. The instrument consisted of three sections: 1) the availability of public-school facilities for inclusive education, 2) the level of readiness of schools for inclusive education, and 3) the challenges encountered by school leaders in preparing school facilities for diverse learners. Responses on the availability and readiness of facilities were measured using a four-point Likert scale, while challenges faced by school leaders were assessed using a checklist format.

The researcher-made questionnaire underwent content validation by experts in educational management and inclusive education to ensure clarity, relevance, and alignment with the objectives of the study. Prior to the actual data collection, the instrument was pilot tested among selected teachers from a nearby district who were not part of the actual respondents. The reliability of the instrument was computed using Cronbach's alpha, which yielded a reliability coefficient indicating acceptable internal consistency of the questionnaire items.

Ethical standards were strictly observed throughout the study, including voluntary participation, confidentiality, and anonymity of all respondents. The collected data were tabulated and analyzed using SPSS Version 21 to generate descriptive statistics and to examine the relationships between variables

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

School Facilities Available as to Infrastructure, Classroom Facilities, Sanitation and Hygiene, and Safety and Security. The availability of school facilities, specifically focusing on infrastructure, classroom facilities, sanitation and hygiene, and safety and security, serves as a critical foundation in assessing the readiness of schools to implement inclusive education. These components are essential indicators in evaluating how well-prepared schools

Infrastructure. The highest-rated indicator for infrastructure is the availability of adequate classroom space that is accessible and adaptable to diverse learners, with 59 respondents (86.76%) confirming its presence. This finding suggests that schools are prioritizing classroom arrangements that accommodate learners with different needs, including those who use mobility aids or require flexible seating. Adequate space is essential for accessibility and adaptability, as it reduces barriers to movement and supports a more inclusive learning environment. However, while the availability of space is relatively high, other aspects of infrastructure such as ramps, corridors, and accessible pathways may still require further improvement to fully support inclusive education.

Table 1Availability of Facilities in Inclusive Education along Infrastructure

Indicators	Available	Percentage(%)	Not Available	Percentage (%)
Are the classrooms in good condition and free from structural defects which are adaptable to learners with special needs?	53	77.94	15	22.06
Is there adequate space in classrooms accessible and adaptable to diverse learners?	59	86.76	9	13.24
Are there sufficient accessible classrooms to accommodate the student population?	57	83.82	11	16.18
Are there wide doorways and corridors to adaptable to wheelchairs and mobility aids	56	82.35	12	17.65
Are there accessible ramps and rails for students with disabilities?	44	64.71	24	35.29
Are there accessible entrances and exits in the school buildings?	58	85.29	10	14.71

Classroom Facility Classroom Facility. The findings on classroom facilities reveal uneven levels of availability in supporting inclusive education. Schools show relative strength in providing accessible entrances and exits (76.47%), indicating progress in ensuring physical access and mobility for learners with disabilities. However, significant gaps remain, particularly in the provision of visual aids and assistive technologies for learners with sensory impairments, which recorded the lowest availability at 30.88%. Other adaptive features such as adjustable desks, clear pathways, and flexible classroom layouts were also inconsistently available, with less than half to just over half of classrooms equipped with these facilities. The results suggest that while basic structural accessibility is being addressed, the lack of specialized and adaptive classroom resources continues to limit equitable learning opportunities for students with diverse needs.

Table 2 Availability of Facilities in Inclusive Education along Classroom Facility

Indicators	Available	Percentage (%)	Not Available	Percentage (%)
Are there adjustable desks or tables to accommodate students with different mobility needs?	31	45.59	37	54.41
Are there ramps and rails within classrooms to allow easy movement for wheelchair users?	33	48.53	35	51.47
Accessible seating arrangements to ensure inclusion of students with disabilities in classroom activities?	47	69.12	21	30.88
Are there visual aids and assistive technology for students with visual impairments or hearing impairments?	21	30.88	47	69.12
Are there flexible classroom layouts to accommodate different teaching methodologies and activities?	37	54.14	31	45.59
Are there accessible entrance and exits in the classroom?	52	76.47	16	23.53

Sanitation and Hygiene Facilities. The findings indicate that sanitation and hygiene facilities in inclusive public schools generally meet basic health and safety standards, demonstrating strong compliance with required provisions. High availability of functioning toilets and accessible handwashing facilities with soap and clean water (both at 92.65%) reflects commendable progress in addressing students' fundamental sanitation needs. These results suggest that schools are effective in providing essential hygiene infrastructure that supports health, dignity, and participation; however, continued attention is necessary to ensure that such facilities are consistently adapted to fully meet the inclusive needs of learners with disabilities.

Table 3 Availability of Facilities in Inclusive Education along Sanitation and Hygiene Facility

Indicators	Available	Percentage (%)	Not Available	Percentage (%)
Are there functioning toilets available and are accessible and adaptable for diverse learners?	63	92.65	5	7.35
Are there accessible hand-washing facilities with soap and clean water?	63	92.65	5	7.35
Are there signages with Braille and raised lettering adapted for visually impaired students?	14	20.59	54	79.41
Is there accessible toilets equipped with grab bars and sufficient space for wheelchair maneuverability?	27	39.71	41	60.29
Is Wheelchair-accessible sinks at appropriate heights for handwashing making accessible to learners with physical disabilities?	22	32.25	46	67.65
Is there a system for regular cleaning and maintenance of school facilities making it more adaptable to learners with limited movement or with locomotion difficulties?	37	54.41	31	45.59

Safety and Security Facilities. Safety and security facilities are fundamental components of an inclusive and

supportive learning environment. In schools, these facilities serve not only to protect students from physical harm but also to provide reassurance that their well-being is prioritized. The presence of functional safety measures, such as fire alarms, extinguishers, emergency exits, and first-aid kits, helps ensure preparedness in times of crisis. For learners with disabilities, safety provisions must also include accessible pathways, clear signages, and evacuation procedures that take into account diverse needs.

The results show that the highest-rated facility is the presence of a perimeter fence, with 91.18% of schools reporting availability. This indicates that perimeter fencing plays a critical role in protecting learners from external risks and unauthorized access. The widespread provision of perimeter fencing underscores its role as a basic yet essential element of school safety, ensuring that learners can engage in academic activities within a controlled and protected environment.

Table 4Availability of Facilities in Inclusive Education along Safety and Security Facilities

Indicators	Available	Percentage (%)	Not Available	Percentage (%)
Is there a perimeter fence around the school premises?	62	91.18	6	8.82
Are there sufficient lighting and visibility around the school grounds making it adaptable to person with poor eyesight?	55	80.88	13	19.12
Are there fire safety equipment such as fire extinguishers and smoke detectors installed that is accessible to learners with disabilities?	38	55.88	30	44.12
Are there emergency evacuation plans and procedures in place that diverse learner could access?	56	82.35	12	17.65
Are there designated assembly areas for emergency situations for physically disabled learners?	42	61.76	26	38.24
Is there a school clinic accessible to diverse learners and with basic medical supplies for all?	43	63.24	25	36.76

Level of Readiness of Public Schools Facilities of Basud District to Inclusive Education. The schools are well-prepared in terms of physical facilities and safety provisions. However, the relatively lower readiness levels in classroom facilities and sanitation and hygiene indicate areas that may benefit from further enhancement. Strengthening these aspects would help ensure balanced readiness and improve the overall quality, safety, and functionality of the learning environment.

Infrastructure. The findings on infrastructure show that schools are generally well prepared, with the availability of sufficient accessible classrooms emerging as a major strength and rated Excellent (WM = 3.34). However, several key indicators remain only at a Good level, revealing important gaps in overall readiness. Classrooms free from structural defects scored the lowest (WM = 2.79), raising concerns about facility maintenance, while classroom space, wide doorways and corridors, and accessible ramps and pathways (WM ranging from 2.94 to 2.97) indicate partial compliance rather than full accessibility.

These results suggest that although schools have made progress in providing accessible infrastructure, limitations in maintenance and consistent implementation continue to pose barriers, particularly for learners with mobility needs. Infrastructure readiness is strongly linked to the inclusivity of learning spaces, supporting the principle that physical accessibility is a prerequisite for meaningful participation in education (UNESCO, 2020). Schools' partial compliance suggests an incremental approach toward universal design, where basic access exists, but comprehensive adaptation is still developing.

Table 5Level of Readiness of Public-School Facilitiesalong Infrastructure

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1. Are the classrooms in good condition and free from structural defects which are adaptable to learners with special needs?	2.79	Good
2. Is there adequate space in classrooms accessible and adaptable to diverse learners?	2.97	Good
3. Are there sufficient accessible classrooms to accommodate the student population	3.34	Excellent
4. Are there wide doorways and corridors to adaptable to wheelchairs and mobility aids?	2.94	Good
5. Are there accessible ramps and rails for students with disabilities?	2.96	Good
6. Are there accessible entrances and exits in the school buildings?	3.28	Excellent
Overall Weighted Mean	3.05	Good

Rating Scale: Descriptive Interpretation

3.25-4.00 - Excellent

2.50-3.24 - Good

1.75-2.49 - Fair

1.00-1.74 - Poor

Classroom Facility. The findings indicate that while schools demonstrate an overall *Good* level of sanitation and hygiene readiness (WM = 2.61), this performance is uneven across indicators. Facilities are strongest in providing accessible handwashing stations with soap and clean water (WM = 3.10), showing effective compliance with basic hygiene standards. However, critical accessibility features for learners with disabilities are lacking, particularly Braille and tactile signages (WM = 2.07), accessible toilets with grab bars and adequate space (WM = 2.18), and wheelchair-accessible sinks (WM = 2.47), all rated *Fair*. The data reveal that schools focus more on general hygiene infrastructure than on inclusive sanitation adaptations for learners with visual and mobility impairments.

These gaps suggest that schools focus more on general physical access than on specialized pedagogical supports that enable full inclusion. The limited availability of adaptive learning tools indicates a potential barrier to equitable participation for students with visual, hearing, or mobility impairments, aligning with Largo et al. (2025) who argue that infrastructure alone is insufficient without supportive classroom resources.

Table 6Level of Readiness of Public-School Facilitiesalong Classroom Facility

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1. Are there adjustable desks or tables to accommodate students with different mobility needs?	2.50	Good
2. Are there ramps and rails within classrooms to allow easy movement for wheelchair users?	2.91	Good
3. Accessible seating arrangements to ensure inclusion of students with disabilities in classroom activities?	2.60	Good
4. Are there visual aids and assistive technology for students with visual impairments or hearing impairments?	2.29	Fair
5. Are there flexible classroom layouts to accommodate different teaching methodologies and activities?	2.74	Good
6. Are there accessible entrance and exits in the classroom?	3.10	Good
Overall Weighted Mean	2.69	Good

Rating Scale: Descriptive Interpretation

3.25-4.00 - Excellent

2.50-3.24 - Good

1.75-2.49 - Fair

1.00-1.74 - Poor

Sanitation and Hygiene Facilities. The sanitation and hygiene readiness data show an overall weighted mean of 2.61, interpreted as *Good*, indicating that schools generally meet basic hygiene standards; however, notable disparities exist across specific accessibility indicators. Schools perform strongest in providing accessible handwashing stations with soap and clean water (WM = 3.10), reflecting effective implementation of general hygiene policies such as WASH in Schools. In contrast, accessibility features for learners with disabilities remain insufficient, particularly signages with Braille and raised lettering (WM = 2.07), accessible toilets with grab bars and adequate maneuvering space (WM = 2.18), and wheelchair-accessible sinks (WM = 2.47), all rated *Fair*.

These findings suggest that while schools prioritize general sanitation infrastructure, they inadequately address the specialized needs of learners with visual and mobility impairments, highlighting a gap between basic hygiene provision and inclusive facility design. While basic hygiene infrastructure meets general health standards, specialized accessibility adaptations remain inadequate. This reflects a critical area for improvement, as inclusive sanitation is essential not only for health but also for learners' dignity and participation (CRPD, 2006).

Table 7Level of Readiness of Public-School Facilitiesalong Sanitation and Hygiene Facility

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1. Are there functioning toilets available and are accessible and adaptable for diverse learners?	3.09	Good
2. Are there accessible hand washing facilities with soap and clean water?	3.10	Good
3. Are there signages with Braille and raised lettering adapted for visually impaired students?	2.07	Fair
4. Is there accessible toilets equipped with grab bars and sufficient space for wheelchair maneuverability.	2.18	Fair
5. Is Wheelchair-accessible sinks at appropriate heights for handwashing making accessible to learners with physical disabilities?	2.47	Fair
6. Is there a system for regular cleaning and maintenance of school facilities making it more adaptable to learners with limited movement or with locomotion difficulties?	2.76	Good
Overall Weighted Mean	2.61	Good

Rating Scale: Descriptive Interpretation

3.25-4.00 - Excellent

2.50-3.24 - Good

1.75-2.49 - Fair

1.00-1.74 - Poor

Safety and Security. The findings indicate that public schools demonstrate a *Good* level of readiness in safety and security facilities, with an overall weighted mean of 2.90, reflecting meaningful progress in providing protected learning environments. Schools tend to prioritize physical barriers and external security measures, which contribute to visible safety and reassurance. However, gaps remain in more comprehensive preparedness, particularly in internal safety mechanisms, emergency response systems, and inclusive provisions for diverse

learners. The results suggest that while basic security measures are in place, greater attention and sustained investment are needed to strengthen holistic and inclusive safety readiness in schools.

Table 8Level of Readiness of Public-School Facilities along Safety and Security Facilities

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1. Is there a perimeter fence around the school premises?	3.26	Excellent
2. Are there sufficient lighting and visibility around the school grounds making it adaptable to person with poor eyesight?	3.00	Good
3. Are there fire safety equipment such as fire extinguishers and smoke detectors installed that is accessible to learners with disabilities?	2.68	Good
4. Are there emergency evacuation plans and procedures in place that diverse learner could access?	2.82	Good
5. Are there designated assembly areas for emergencies for physically disabled learners?	2.91	Good
6. Is there a school clinic accessible to diverse learners and with basic medical supplies for all?	2.72	Good
Overall Weighted Mean	2.90	Good

Rating Scale: Descriptive Interpretation

3.25-4.00 - Excellent

2.50-3.24 - Good

1.75-2.49 - Fair

1.00-1.74 - Poor

Challenges Faced by Public Schools' Administrator in the Preparation of School Facilities. The findings reveal that public school administrators consistently encounter significant challenges in preparing school facilities for inclusive education, as reflected by an overall weighted mean of 2.83 (*Encountered*). The most evident barriers include limited funding, bureaucratic processes, resistance to change, and insufficient resources and support services, which collectively restrict the timely implementation of accessibility features and inclusive initiatives. These challenges highlight the strong influence of systemic and attitudinal factors that hinder facility readiness, often outweighing technical solutions. While infrastructure limitations were rated slightly lower, they remain a notable concern, particularly in older or space-constrained schools. Overall, the results underscore that without improved funding mechanisms, streamlined procedures, and stronger advocacy for inclusive practices, efforts to create accessible and equitable learning environments for learners with disabilities will remain constrained.

Table 9 Challenges Faced by Public Schools' Administrators in the Preparation of School Facilities

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
Limited Funding. Securing adequate funding for infrastructure improvements and accessibility features. Limited budgets may restrict the ability to make necessary modifications to facilities to accommodate diverse learners.	2.84	E
Infrastructure Limitations. Many public schools' facilities in the Philippines face structural limitations that make it difficult to implement accessibility features. Older buildings may lack ramps, elevators, or wide doorways necessary for students with mobility impairments.	2.81	E

Lack of Awareness and Training. School principals and staff may lack awareness of inclusive education principles and best practices for accommodating diverse learners. This can result in a lack of understanding of the specific needs of students with disabilities and how to address them effectively.	2.83	E
Bureaucratic Processes. Dealing with bureaucratic processes and obtaining approvals for infrastructure improvements or modifications can be time-consuming and challenging. This can delay the implementation of necessary changes to school facilities.	2.84	E
Resistance to Change. Resistance to change from staff, parents, and community members which can hinder efforts to make school facilities more inclusive. 2.84Some stakeholders may be reluctant to embrace new 2approaches or modifications to accommodate diverse learners.	2.82	E
Insufficient Resources and Support Services. Inadequate resources and support services, such as assistive technologies, specialized equipment, and trained personnel, can limit the ability of schools to meet the needs of diverse learners effectively.	2.84	E
Physical Space Constraints. Limited physical space within school facilities for implementing inclusive practices. Schools may struggle to allocate space for quiet areas, sensory rooms, or specialized classrooms for students with diverse needs.	2.83	E
Cultural and Social Attitudes. Cultural and social attitudes toward disability and diversity may present barriers to creating truly inclusive environments within schools. Negative stereotypes and stigma surrounding disability can impact the acceptance and integration of students with disabilities into mainstream classrooms.	2.83	E
Collaboration and Coordination. Effective collaboration and coordination among various stakeholders, including school staff, parents, community members, and government agencies, are essential for implementing inclusive education practices. However, achieving consensus and cooperation among diverse stakeholders can be challenging.	2.83	E
Sustainability of Efforts. Ensuring the sustainability of efforts to make school facilities accessible and adaptable to diverse learners requires long-term planning and commitment. School principals may struggle to maintain momentum and support for inclusive education initiatives over time.	2.83	E
Overall Weighted Mean	2.83	E

Rating Scale: Descriptive Interpretation

3.25-4.00 - Often Encountered (OE)

2.50-3.24 - Encountered (E)

1.75-2.49 - Sometimes Encountered (SE)

1.00-1.74 - Not Encountered (NE)

Relationship between the Available Facilities and the Readiness of Public Schools Facilities in Inclusive Education. To determine the relationship between the availability of facilities and the readiness of public schools for inclusive education, the study employed Somers' Delta correlation analysis. Somers' Delta is a non-parametric measure used to assess the strength and direction of association between ordinal variables. In this study, it was used to determine whether the presence of certain school facilities influences the readiness of schools to implement inclusive education. Positive Somers' Delta values indicate that greater availability of facilities corresponds to higher levels of readiness for inclusive education, while negative values suggest an inverse relationship.

The results of the Somers' Delta correlation analysis indicate that the availability of certain school facilities is significantly associated with readiness for inclusive education, though the strength of this relationship varies by facility type. Classroom facilities showed a significant positive relationship, particularly wide doorways and corridors adaptable to mobility aids, suggesting that accessible and flexible learning spaces enhance school readiness. Sanitation and hygiene facilities also demonstrated a strong positive correlation, highlighting the critical role of accessible toilets and wash areas in supporting inclusive education. Safety and security facilities exhibited the strongest and most consistent relationships with readiness, emphasizing that features such as ramps, emergency exits, alarms, and secure environments are foundational to inclusive implementation. Overall, the findings reveal that readiness for inclusive education depends more on the quality, accessibility, and functionality of facilities than on their mere presence, underscoring the multidimensional nature of inclusivity in public schools.

Table 10 Test for Significant Relationship between the Availability of the Facilities and the Readiness of Public School Facilities in Inclusive Education

Readiness vs Availability (Indicators)	Availability of Facilities							
	Infrastructure		Classroom Facility		Sanitation and Hygiene Facilities		Safety and Security Facilities	
	d	p-value	d	p-value	d	p-value	D	p-value
Condition of classrooms and absence of structural defects adaptable to learners with special needs	.060	.708	.182	.173	.076	.779	.597*	.011
Adequacy of classroom space accessible and adaptable to diverse learners	.100	.563	.171	.192	-.076	.785	.355*	.024
Availability of sufficient accessible classrooms to accommodate the student population	-.011	.949	-.089	.562	.444**	.003	.300*	.025
Presence of wide doorways and corridors adaptable for wheelchairs and mobility aids	-.023	.865	.288*	.037	.106	.424	-.143	.386
Availability of ramps, handrails, and other accessibility features for learners with disabilities	.241	.075	.228	.085	.157	.246	-.027	.843
Presence of clear signage, safety equipment, and emergency features accessible to all learners	.352	.076	.054	.738	.003	.985	.075	.588

*Correlation is significant @ 0.05 level

**Correlation is significant @ 0.01 level

Proposed Interventions to Overcome the Challenges Faced by the School Administrators in Preparing Schools Facilities for Inclusive Education. The study findings reveal that while public schools in Basud have made notable progress in physical accessibility, basic health, and safety measures, significant gaps remain in inclusive instructional supports, disability-focused sanitation adaptations, and accessible safety equipment. Schools demonstrated moderate to good readiness, with strengths in accessible classrooms, entrances, toilets, handwashing facilities, and perimeter fences, but weaknesses in classroom condition, space, corridors, ramps, visual aids, assistive technologies, Braille signage, grab bars, and internal emergency preparedness. Administrators consistently faced challenges such as limited funding, bureaucratic processes, resistance to change, and insufficient resources, which constrained the implementation of inclusive facilities. Correlation analysis further showed that classroom, sanitation, and safety facilities rather than infrastructure alone were key predictors of readiness, highlighting the importance of functional, adaptable, and inclusive features. To address

these gaps, Project ACSSIE (Accessibility, Capacity, and Support for Schools in Inclusive Education) is proposed as a strategic intervention to strengthen school readiness for inclusive education in Basud District. The project targets both structural and administrative dimensions of inclusion, emphasizing functional, adaptable, and accessible learning environments for all learners, particularly students with disabilities. Project ACSSIE aims to enhance the knowledge and capacity of school administrators by providing training on inclusive education principles, the role of school infrastructure, classroom organization, and instructional adaptations necessary for diverse learners. The initiative also promotes the assessment and optimization of existing facilities, including classroom layouts, sanitation, hygiene, and safety measures, to meet inclusive standards. Administrators are introduced to assistive technologies, adaptive classroom equipment, and visual aids that facilitate participation for learners with mobility and sensory impairments. Implemented through a one-day interactive webinar combined with guided follow-up activities, Project ACSSIE covers practical strategies for improving accessibility, adaptability, and inclusive instructional supports. Expected outcomes include increased administrator capacity, higher school readiness across infrastructure, classroom functionality, sanitation, and safety, and the cultivation of an inclusive school culture. By bridging the gap between policy mandates and practical implementation, Project ACSSIE addresses systemic and operational barriers, promotes sustainable inclusive practices, and provides evidence-based guidance for improving equity and participation in learning. The initiative also offers a replicable model for other districts, demonstrating how targeted training, facility assessment, and practical interventions can strengthen school readiness and support equitable learning opportunities for all students. Ultimately, Project ACSSIE contributes to the broader goal of ensuring that learners, particularly those with disabilities, can participate fully, safely, and equitably in educational settings, thereby fostering academic success, social integration, and lifelong learning.

CONCLUSIONS

The findings of this study indicate that public schools in Basud have made significant progress in establishing foundational infrastructure, sanitation, and general safety facilities, reflecting compliance with basic standards for health, hygiene, and student protection. Facilities such as accessible classrooms and entrances, functional toilets and handwashing stations, and perimeter fences were among the most available and well-maintained, demonstrating that schools recognize the importance of providing a safe and functional learning environment for their students. These strengths suggest a commitment to general accessibility and the well-being of learners within the school setting. Despite these accomplishments, the study also revealed substantial gaps in the provision of facilities that specifically support inclusive education for students with disabilities. Assistive technologies, Braille and tactile signage, adaptive safety equipment, and disability-responsive sanitation features such as grab bars and wheelchair-accessible sinks were limited in availability. This highlights that while schools meet general infrastructure standards, they often lack deliberate adaptations needed to accommodate learners with sensory, mobility, or other special needs. Such gaps emphasize that accessibility and inclusivity require targeted planning, investment, and sustained implementation beyond the basic provision of facilities.

The readiness of schools to implement inclusive education also varied across facility types. Classroom facilities and sanitation adaptations showed lower levels of readiness compared with general infrastructure and external safety measures. Limited availability of visual aids, assistive learning tools, flexible classroom layouts, and accessible pathways constrains equitable participation and independent functioning of learners with diverse needs. Strengthening these aspects is critical for achieving balanced readiness, enhancing the functionality of learning spaces, and ensuring that all students can fully engage in the educational process.

Public school administrators were found to face multi-layered challenges in preparing facilities to be inclusive. Financial constraints, bureaucratic procedures, resistance to change, and insufficient resources and support services emerged as the most pressing barriers, while infrastructure limitations were perceived as relatively more manageable. These findings suggest that achieving inclusive education is not solely a matter of physical modifications, but also requires systemic support, policy alignment, stakeholder cooperation, and cultural change within school communities.

In conclusion, while Basud public schools have laid a solid foundation in terms of infrastructure, sanitation, and safety, achieving fully inclusive learning environments requires focused attention on adaptive facilities, assistive technologies, and the professional capacity of school administrators. Programs such as Project ACSSIE, which emphasize classroom accessibility, inclusive sanitation and safety measures, and training for school personnel,

offer practical pathways to address these gaps. By prioritizing functional, learner-centered facility improvements and addressing systemic and procedural barriers, schools can create safe, accessible, and inclusive environments where all learners regardless of ability can thrive academically, socially, and personally.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the study's findings, it is recommended that Basud public schools take a multi-faceted and strategic approach to enhancing the accessibility, functionality, and inclusivity of school facilities to better support learners with diverse needs, particularly those with sensory, mobility, or cognitive impairments. Schools should prioritize providing instructional supports, including assistive technologies such as screen readers, magnifiers, hearing aids, and other adaptive tools, alongside visual aids and inclusive learning materials, to ensure that students with disabilities can actively and independently participate in classroom activities. Sanitation and hygiene facilities must be adapted to include features such as grab bars, wheelchair-accessible sinks, and Braille or tactile signage, promoting not only health and hygiene but also dignity, autonomy, and equal participation. Safety and emergency preparedness measures, including accessible fire safety equipment, emergency exits, assembly areas, and inclusive drills, should be implemented to ensure that all learners, regardless of ability, can navigate potentially hazardous situations safely. Classroom facilities, in particular, should be upgraded with improvements in ventilation, lighting, seating arrangements, and accessibility, while adopting flexible layouts, adjustable desks, and furniture suited to diverse learners, creating adaptable learning spaces that accommodate mobility aids and foster inclusive interactions. To address systemic challenges, such as limited funding, bureaucratic processes, resistance to change, and insufficient resources, schools should advocate for targeted budget allocations for inclusive infrastructure, implement capacity-building programs for administrators, teachers, parents, and community stakeholders, and foster a culture of awareness and collaboration to reduce attitudinal barriers. Retrofitting existing facilities to ensure accessibility and adaptability, coupled with the adoption of initiatives like Project ACSSIE, can provide a practical framework for translating these recommendations into tangible improvements, focusing on enhancing the functionality, accessibility, and inclusivity of classrooms, sanitation, and safety facilities. Finally, future research is encouraged to explore cost-effective, scalable strategies for improving accessibility and the use of assistive technologies, particularly in resource-limited contexts, as well as longitudinal studies to examine the impact of facility improvements on the academic and social outcomes of students with disabilities. Collectively, these recommendations emphasize that creating safe, functional, and learner-centered school environments is essential for achieving truly inclusive education, ensuring that every student in Basud public schools has equitable opportunities to thrive academically, socially, and personally.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The researcher sincerely expresses heartfelt gratitude to the Dean of the Graduate School for their invaluable guidance, support, and encouragement throughout the course of this study, as well as to the administrators, teachers, and staff of Basud public schools for their cooperation and willingness to provide the data and insights essential for this research. Special appreciation is extended to Graduate School for the academic opportunities and resources that made this study possible, and to family and friends for their unwavering moral support, patience, and encouragement. The researcher also acknowledges all others who, in various ways, contributed to the successful completion of this study, recognizing that their guidance, assistance, and inspiration were instrumental in achieving the goals of this research.

REFERENCES

1. Largo, M. I., Pinili, L., Mangubat, R., Calasang, V., Cabigon, A. F., & Espina, R. (2025). Assessing the role of adaptive materials in inclusive classrooms at Colon Integrated School. International Journal of Educational Studies, 8(2), 48–53. https://doi.org/10.53935/2641533x.v8i2.321
2. Campado, R. J., Toquero, C. M. D., & Ulanday, D. M. (2023). Integration of assistive technology in teaching learners with special educational needs and disabilities in the Philippines. International Journal of Professional Development, Learners and Learning, 5(1).
3. Factor, S. D., & Saenz, C. R. (2025). Barriers and enablers of inclusive education for learners with disabilities: The case of Philippine primary schools. International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science.

4. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2020). Inclusion and education: All means all. Global Education Monitoring Report 2020. UNESCO. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000373718
5. Department of Education, Philippines. (n.d.). Inclusive education in the Philippines. Retrieved from DepEd website.
6. UNICEF, & World Health Organization. (2022). Schools ill-equipped to provide healthy and inclusive learning environments for all children [Press release].