



Publisher: Scientific-Professional Society for Disaster Risk Management

International Journal of Disaster Risk Management



Article

Assessing Good Governance Practices in Disaster Risk Reduction and Management (DRRM) Among Education Institutions: A Systematic Literature Review

Fritzie Ivy J. Dalangin^{1*}¹ University of Southeastern Philippines, Davao City, Philippines.* Correspondence: fidjara@usep.edu.ph

Received: 15 September 2025; Revised: 10 November 2025; Accepted: 1 December 2025; Published: 30 December 2025.

ABSTRACT

Following PRISMA approach, this systematic literature review looked at 19 peer-reviewed publications on disaster risk reduction and management (DRRM) and good governance practices in schools that were published between 2011 and 2025. The review evaluated the relationship between DRRM implementation outcomes, such as preparedness, response, and recovery, and governance characteristics, including transparency, accountability, participation, and efficiency. Findings show that schools with higher budget allocation and larger institutional scale perform better in response during a disaster. School location significantly determines the level of disaster preparedness, attributed to resources, infrastructure, and program implementation. The review emphasized the need for mixed-method analyses in future studies to capture the combined effects of governance practices and institutional variables. It concludes that strengthening leadership capacity, financial transparency, and participatory governance structures is crucial for building school level resilience.

KEYWORDS

Disaster management; disaster; education; risk management; risk reduction; strategy.

1. Introduction

Promoting resilience, accountability, and responsiveness in the education sector, especially when it comes to the implementation of Disaster Risk Reduction and Management (DRRM)—requires good governance. Schools in the Philippines serve as both educational institutions and hubs for community evacuation. As a result, during emergencies, governance plays a crucial role in ensuring safety, learning continuity, and effective resource management.



Copyright: © 2025 by the authors.

Dalangin, F. I. J. (2025). Assessing Good Governance Practices in Disaster Risk Reduction and Management (DRRM) Among Education Institutions: A Systematic Literature Review. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Management*, 7(2), 21–32. Retrieved from <https://internationaljournalofdisasterriskmanagement.com/index.php/Vol1/article/view/229>

The global guide for reducing disaster risks and losses to lives, livelihoods, and health is the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (SFDRR), which was adopted at the Third UN World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction in Sendai, Japan, in March 2015. With an emphasis on prevention, readiness, and resilience-building, it highlights a transition from catastrophe response to disaster risk management. By 2030, its primary objective is to significantly lower the risk of disasters and the loss of lives, livelihoods, and assets, including financial, material, social, cultural, and environmental ones.

The Philippine Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Act of 2010, or Republic Act 10121, established DRRM procedures at all levels of government, including the educational sector. Through DepEd Order No. 37, s. in 2015, the Department of Education (DepEd) further reinforced this mandate. This department issuance offered a thorough framework for DRRM. When it comes to disaster resource management, these policies emphasize transparency, responsibility, involvement, and effectiveness.

In Davao City, Philippines, almost 400,000 students are officially enrolled in 438 public schools for the School Year 2025–2026. With this large number of learners, public schools become more susceptible to various risks and challenges, particularly in maintaining safety, ensuring sufficient resources, and implementing adequate disaster risk management measures. Moreover, higher risks are expected with learners with special needs. The learner's disabilities make them more vulnerable to disasters due to inadequate disaster protection, improper treatment, and a lack of school facilities (Goswami & Ahmad, 2025). On the other hand, school-level learning resources are also at risk during disasters. Dada, K. S. J., Hamza, J. M., & Mohammed, H. A. (2025) examined disaster risk management in libraries and learning centers. The study highlighted the need for a strong partnership with organizations that facilitate emergency services, resource sharing, and capacity-building activities to ensure that library assets are well maintained, thereby supporting recovery and the preservation of knowledge.

Even with these principles and legal instrumentalities in place, public schools continue to apply them differently. Differences influence the degree of DRRM readiness and governance quality in school size, geography, and budget-use efficiency. According to the study by Alpuerto, M. T., & Briones, E. O. (2025), exposure, experience, and administrative support all have a substantial impact on teachers' and schools' readiness and resilience. While larger or urban schools may exhibit stronger governance processes, smaller or more remote schools frequently suffer from insufficient administrative and financial resources.

To synthesize evidence, identify institutional gaps, and make policy-relevant recommendations for more resilient and equitable school systems, a thorough review of the governance and DRRM literature is therefore essential.

The comprehensive objective of this review is to examine how the governance principles affect the quality of DRRM implementation in public schools. All subsequent stages, including database search, study selection, and data extraction, were conducted under the guidance of the PRISMA 2020 Framework to maximize reproducibility and completeness. More specifically, this systematic literature review aims to: (1) Assess existing literature on good governance practices in DRRM among public schools; (2) Identify additional school-level factors that significantly influence DRRM implementation; and (3) Identify research gaps and propose future directions for school-level DRRM Governance.

2. Methods

2.1. Eligibility Criteria

The identification, screening, and selection of studies for the review were led by a systematic procedure that operationalized the inclusion and exclusion criteria. Given this, only reliable and pertinent materials on disaster risk reduction and management, and on good governance in public schools, were included in the review. During the screening stage, the inclusion criteria were oper-

ationalized by assessing whether the studies discussed sound governance principles such as transparency, accountability, participation, and efficiency in relation to DRRM. Moreover, the studies were checked to focus on the education sector. The review also focused on the published articles and materials between 2011 and 2025. Another important inclusion criterion is that the related studies must be written in English. The exclusion criteria were then applied during the eligibility assessment by removing studies that did not actually examine DRRM. Conceptual papers, commentaries, and editorials without empirical evidence were excluded from the review. Studies whose full texts were inaccessible or were duplicates were automatically removed from the review.

2.2. Information Sources

The review utilized various databases and academic search engines to ensure comprehensive coverage of relevant studies. The following information sources were visited: Google Scholar, Science Direct, and Research Gate, and various databases of international publications for peer reviewed journals articles and publications, empirical research on governance, disaster management, and public management. Philippine journals and government repositories, such as the Department of Education, the Department of Science and Technology, and the National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Council, were also searched for local studies, policy directions, and accomplishment reports.

2.3. Search Strategy

The following keywords were used in a thorough search of Google Scholar, Science Direct, Research Gate, and the official DepEd repository:

“Philippines,” “good governance,” “DRRM in schools,” “budget utilization,” “school size,” and “location,” “disaster preparedness,” “disaster mitigation,” “disaster response,” DRRM effectiveness,” DRRM capacity,” School DRRM budget allocation,” and school DRRM leadership.

Publications from 2011 to 2025 were reviewed, including review papers, empirical research, and policy documents about educational governance and DRRM.

2.4. Selection process

The PRISMA 2020 guidelines were adhered to during the review. The selection decisions were recorded in a PRISMA-based tracking sheet. Each study’s inclusion or exclusion was recorded along with the justification. This ensures that the dataset accurately reflects the scope of the research objectives.

Table 1. Summary of the Selection Process

Stage	Description	Number of Studies
Identification	Records identified through database and gray literature search	124
Screening	Duplicates removed and abstracts reviewed	80
Eligibility	Full-text articles assessed for relevance and quality	40
Inclusion	Studies meeting all inclusion criteria	19

Table 1 presents the summary of the study selection process following PRISMA 2020 guidelines. During the identification stage, a total of 124 documents were gathered from academic databases

and literature sources related to DRRM and governance in the education sector. In the screening stage, duplicate entries were removed, and abstracts were reviewed for relevance and possible contribution to the systematic literature review, which was reduced to 80 studies. Moreover, in the eligibility stage, 40 full-text articles were examined to ensure compliance with the eligibility criteria. With the focus on empirical studies, 19 studies met all inclusion criteria and were included in the final synthesis. These 19 studies formed evidence for synthesis and discussion. This filtering process ensured that high-quality, relevant studies were retained for thematic analysis.

2.5. Synthesis Methods

Thematic coding was conducted manually using an inductive approach: data collection, pattern identification, and theme development to explain the patterns. The researcher took time reading all included studies to identify patterns, categories, and emerging themes related to good governance and DRRM in schools. Deep engagement with the data was employed during manual coding.

Data extraction and familiarization began with creating a spreadsheet with columns to encode the title, author, year, key findings, methodology used, relevance to the review, and source link. All relevant findings were systematically included in the review. The author's descriptive summaries and themes were included. Initial themes were identified and placed as additional column names (descriptive themes). For each study, the researcher assigned code 1 to indicate its classification under that theme; otherwise, 0. Studies were classified into multiple themes. During the preparation of the literature review, the actual filtering and sorting of each column were performed. After the initial coding, review for possible redundancy, clarity, and consistency followed. The researcher also used the Literature Review Relatedness Matrix to ensure study coherence and traceability of the studies utilized.

In refining descriptive themes, all codes were checked for coherence, as to how these themes differ from one another. Related themes were arranged in the spreadsheet accordingly.

Generating the analytical theme focused on interpreting and relating descriptive themes. The final analytical themes were defined to ensure that the systematic review questions were addressed.

Following the systematic literature review, four analytical themes were identified: school governance, resource management, capability, and participation. These themes highlight that governance mechanisms directly influence how schools prepare for, respond to, and recover from disasters.



3. Results

A total of 124 studies were retrieved. However, 80 duplicate studies were removed. Of the 40 studies assessed for relevance and quality, only 19 met all inclusion criteria. These 19 studies formed the evidence base for synthesis and discussion.

Table 2. Summary of the 19 studies reviewed

Author	Year	Method	Key Findings
Abenoja, S., Baog, I. W., Briz, A. C., Bustamante, H. M., Garcia, R., Mongado, R., & Ramos, A. J. B.	2023	Non-experimental quantitative design (This method aims to examine relationships or associations between variables without intervention or treatment.) Students were selected using a technique called probability sampling Adopted a modified Questionnaire developed by Dela Cruz and Ormilla in 2022	The implementation of DRRM and Disaster Preparedness was identified as a critical concern in the school. Students perceive DRRM as highly implemented at the school level. The perceived level of preparedness among students is at a moderate level.
Abila, J. G., & Callo, E. C.	n.d.	Descriptive Correlation Design was utilized	There is an essential link between excellent governance in education and teachers' professional development.
Acierto, Cherlita & Robas, Jessie & Monte, Shanedree	(2023).	Quantitative Survey Design	Schools have fully implemented safe learning facilities. Implementation problems encountered include creating policies, lack of personnel and budget, and lack of education and information.
Almazan, M. T. T.	2023	Literature Review	The issues and challenges encountered by the School Heads in the utilization of funds explain the financial management capacity, which should be enhanced to implement school programs effectively. The involvement of the school stakeholders in the preparation of plans and budget is important to ensure transparency. DRRM implementation in terms of mitigation, preparedness, response and recovery was well-executed.
Alpuerto, M. T., & Briones, E. O.	2025	Correlational research design	Respondents demonstrated high psychological preparedness, as shown in the schools' strong knowledge of preparedness measures. School Disaster resilience was rated very capable across human resources, facilities, and operational capacities.
Beronibla, M. R. M. B.	2024	Descriptive Correlational Design	The alignment of budgetary priorities with actual spending. <i>The results also showed that there was a significant difference in the extent of budget allocation and the degree of budget utilization when respondents are grouped according to their school size</i> Highlighting target budgeting practices is important in the efficient utilization of financial resources.

		Descriptive-Quantitative Method	DRRM in public schools was well implemented
Comighud, S. M.	(2020).	Survey Questionnaires from the National Risk Reduction and Management	The school is capable to respond to hazards in the occurrence of disasters. There is a significant relationship between the status of DRRM implementation and the level of capabilities among the public-school administrators.
Dada, K. S. J., Hamza, J. M., & Mohammed, H. A.	2025	Descriptive Qualitative Approach	The study highlights the significance of proactive policy creation and ongoing capability building. Through these measures, libraries can effectively protect learning resources and uphold library's contribution to knowledge preservation.
Dela Cruz, R. D., & Ormilla, R. C. G.	2022	Descriptive-Quantitative	People involved in DRRM are more prepared for the readiness of the school facilities while disaster preparedness activities are still improving. The extent of school preparedness is significantly associated with the level of their DRRM implementation in terms of safe facilities and curriculum integration
Department of Education	2015	Not applicable	Comprehensive DRRM in Basic Education Framework
Department of Education	2024	Not applicable	Policy guidelines on the implementation of DRRM in schools
Domingo, S. N., & Manejar, A. J. A.	2021	Mixed methods	Institutional structures still need to strengthen their enabling mechanisms for representation and stakeholder participation
Goswami, T., & Ahmad, A.	2025	Review of Literature	There is limited data available on Children with special needs and their disaster management education, thereby highlighting gaps in DRRM educational practices for children with special needs. Lack of inclusion of disability-inclusive provisions for Children with special needs.
Lassa, Jonatan	2011	Mixed Methods	At a global level, a quantitative approach to measuring institutionally vulnerability and the governance of disaster risk reduction is possible. Without considering institutions, institutional quality, and specific governance of disaster reduction at macro, meso, and microscales, disaster risk reduction will not be sustainably implemented.
Ojha, J. C., Bhattarai, P. C., & Devkota, B.	2025	Descriptive-Quantitative	69.7% of teachers held adequate perceptions regarding efforts to manage the COVID 19 Pandemic and reopen Schools. Teachers with more experience positively responded to COVID.

			DRRM implementation and school performance were at a high level.
Pandapatan, A. M.	2025	Descriptive Correlational	Disaster prevention and mitigation, disaster preparedness and mitigation, disaster preparedness, disaster rehabilitation and recovery were significant predictors of school performance.
			Hiring of security personnel was the aspect of DRRM mostly influenced by School Resource allocation.
Pandapatan, A. M.	(2024).	Descriptive	The level of DRRM Implementation was high in all four thematic areas: disaster preparedness, disaster response, disaster rehabilitation, and recovery.
			High levels of preparedness in facilities, training, and program. There was no significant differences by gender. Age and campus location significantly influenced preparedness level.
Pardillo, R. S.	(2024).	Mixed methods	Major challenges include resource limitation, coordination issues, and technical constraints.
			Majority of DRRM implementation occur in cities with higher administrative and infrastructure capabilities. Smaller or rural institutions struggle to implement policies due to insufficient capacity and resource associated with their setting/size.
			Majority of teachers are familiar with the evacuation routes in the school. 29.40% have received training on "Drop, Cover, and Hold" technique needed for earthquake reduction.
Razia, B.	2025	Descriptive-Quantitative	The training of teachers and students regarding disaster risk reduction in schools.
			Urgent need for comprehensive, hands-on training programs for teachers in pre-service and in-service levels
United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific.	n.d.	Not Applicable	Good governance principles
Valenzuela, E. S., & Buenvinida, L. P.	2021	Descriptive Correlational	All the given competencies in managing school operations and resources, such as record management, financial management, school facilities and equipment, staff management, school safety for disaster preparedness, mitigation and resiliency, and management of emerging opportunities have a significant impact on the school's quality and efficiency
Wadasen, R. F. P.	(2024).	Literature Review	School Heads experience challenges in financial management including lack of training, weak financial management skills, delay of school funds, human resource inadequacies, and adherence to existing laws and guidelines.

Table 2 summarizes the 21 studies reviewed, listing the author, year of study, method used, and key findings relevant to the study.

4. Discussion

A total of 19 studies met the inclusion criteria and were analyzed in accordance with the PRISMA Framework. The reviewed literature revealed several repeating themes related to the implementation of sound governance principles in DRRM across schools. These themes include School Governance and Accountability, Budget Utilization and DRRM Effectiveness, and the Influence of school size and location to DRRM implementation. Emerging factors include leadership, capability, and participation.

4.1. Governance Frameworks and Accountability

The global policy foundation for fostering resilience and lowering the risks of disasters through preparedness, investment, and governance is the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015–2030. It emphasizes four priorities for action: (1) understanding disaster risk, (2) strengthening disaster risk governance, (3) investing in disaster risk reduction for resilience, and (4) enhancing disaster preparedness for effective response and “building back better” in recovery. Specifically, the second priority on Strengthening disaster risk governance to manage disaster risk highlights that coordinating efforts of institutions are essentials to effective disaster risk management. In the school context, there must be established government structures that guarantee readiness, safety, and resilience in addition to adhering to DRRM guidelines. Every school is required by DepEd Order No. 37 s. 2015, to form a DRRM Committee that oversees readiness, mitigation, and response efforts. Various studies reveal ongoing government deficiencies that are inconsistent with the international and local instrumentalities. Almazan’s (2020) research shows that different schools use MOOE funding in very different ways, pointing to irregularities in financial governance. Moreover, Dollentes and Gamba (2021) stated that school DRRM coordinators varying degrees of leadership and competency, indicating deficiencies in administrative governance and capacity-building. These realities are inconsistent with SENDAI third priority on investing in disaster risk reduction for resilience.

Participatory leadership and clearly defined accountability frameworks greatly improve DRRM implementation, according to Valenzuela and Buenvinida (2021). Given competencies of School Heads in managing school operations and resources such as financial management, records management, human resource management, even including school safety for disaster preparedness, mitigation and resiliency have significantly impacted the school operation. In a similar study, Abila and Callo (n.d.) discovered enhanced responsiveness and compliance results from inclusive governance, in which stakeholders actively engage in planning. Governance and professional development go hand in hand. These imply that enhancing the level of professional growth and development among teachers, as well as the fundamental behavioral competencies and skills of both teachers and students, will improve the school’s performance in terms of responsiveness, effectiveness, and efficiency.

Lassa (2011) highlighted that without considering institutions, quality and specific governance of disaster reduction will not be sustainably implemented. However, the ability of school administrators to effectively manage both human and financial resources frequently determines how effective governance is. Persistent shortcomings include inadequate financial management abilities, a lack of training, a delay in finances, a lack of financial support personnel, inadequate teamwork, many bookkeeping duties, lack of permanently stationed personnel, inconsistent policy changes, and disorganized record keeping, bookkeeping and compliance with intricate rules and regulations (Wadassen, 2024).

The United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific. (n.d.) governance framework highlights the same principles—participation, rule of law, transparency, responsiveness, equity, and accountability—which align with DepEd’s DRRM objectives but are inconsistently applied at the school level.

4.2. Budget Utilization and DRRM Effectiveness

Numerous studies have found a direct correlation between budget usage and DRRM effectiveness. Despite the implementation of Republic Act 10121, which places a strong emphasis on community resilience, the organizational structure still needs to improve the processes that allow for stakeholder participation and representation.

Financial resources should specifically support additional initiatives and suggestions from barangay councils and sectoral committees. Additionally, monitoring and evaluation strategies should accurately record and track DRRM funds, supplies, and services across agencies, funding sources, and different enabling conditions (Domingo, S. N., & Manesar, A. J. A., 2021). In higher education institutions, most DRRM implementation occurs in cities with higher administrative and infrastructure capacities. Rural institutions face implementation challenges due to limited resources given their size (Pardillo, R. S., 2024).

According to Beronibla (2024) and Almazan (2023), the timely and effective use of Maintenance and Other Operating Expenses (MOOE) funds facilitates the building of safe learning environments. Schools with open and honest financial monitoring systems are more prepared for DRRM. This strategic approach to resource allocation significantly contributes to efficient utilization of financial resources. However, in smaller schools, budget utilization is still a persistent problem. Delays in money releases, school leaders' lack of financial awareness, and conflicting fiscal duties are some of the contributing factors. Common problems encountered in the implementation of DRRM include not enough human and financial resources (Acierto, Cherlita, & Robas, Jessie & Monte; Shanedree, 2023). These issues hamper the institutionalization of proactive risk management. Therefore, to ensure accountability and sustainability, effective DRRM governance necessitates not only the allocation of funds but also financial capacity-building and monitoring systems.

However, Munyiri, I. N., Edabu, P., & Thinguri, R. W. (2020) found that resource allocation does not affect the implementation of DRRM in public secondary schools. This was mainly because in general, none of the schools in the area had resource allocation.

It is clear from this point that timely allocation and financial transparency are important factors in disaster preparedness. Smaller institutions have budgetary limitations that hinder their ability to engage in proactive risk reduction, whereas schools in transparent budget reporting systems typically execute school DRRM programs easier.

4.3. Influence of School Size and Location

The location and size of schools have a big impact on how well DRRM governance works. Effective DRRM implementation at the school level does not follow a one-size-fits-all model due to varying environmental realities. School locations with unique conditions like flooding, landslides, or earthquakes must be adapted to DRRM plans. A study by Pandapatan, A. M. (2025) recommends a context-based approach in crafting DRRM Plan that supports the idea that school location determines unique conditions such as hazards like coastal flooding, landslides, and earthquakes.

Due to their greater access to human and financial resources, larger schools—which are usually found in metropolitan areas can upgrade their infrastructure and establish organized safety procedures. On the other hand, smaller or more remote schools, particularly those in coastal or mountainous regions face difficulties with funding, logistics, and communication. Moreover, disaster risk management also included biological hazards such as the COVID-19 pandemic. Ojha, J. C., Bhattarai, P. C., & Devkota, B. (2025) revealed that 69.7% of teachers had inadequate perceptions in managing disaster like COVID-19 Pandemic. Teachers who are more experienced and those coming from urban areas have more affirmative to respond during disasters.

Rural schools mainly depend on community partnerships and local government support for DRRM initiatives, according to Alpuerto and Briones (2025), highlighting the value of multi-stakeholder cooperation as a governance instrument.

The above-mentioned studies indicate that school size and capacity of an organization, in terms of its resources, personnel, and organizational structure, enhances governance performance in DRRM. Larger schools benefit from division of labor and resource availability, leading to more coordinated preparedness measures, whereas small schools have limited human resources to constrain response and recovery efforts.

Moreover, geographical exposure shapes both risk levels and administrative priorities. Schools located in hazard-prone areas often develop stronger contingency planning but remain financially disadvantaged, highlighting the need for location-specific funding mechanisms in school DRRM implementation.

4.4. Emerging Factors: Leadership, Capacity, and Participation

Emerging factors that go beyond the financial determinants of program implementation success were stakeholder participation, leadership and level of capacity. Education leaders who set examples of participatory governance significantly improve program effectiveness.

Leadership

School leaders' ability to manage school operations and resources presented a link to public school performance. The competencies in managing school operations and resources include school safety for disaster preparedness, mitigation, and resiliency and management of emerging opportunities. Gatuya (2024) mentioned in a study the importance of leaders who are committed to DRRM. Teachers and School Administrators agreed that the school implement School DRRM programs in disaster prevention, mitigation, preparedness, response, and recovery. The education leaders create a responsive plan based on the ability of the school and its personnel to implement guidelines, and adapt the framework for an effective DRRM implementation at the school level (Pandapatan, 2024).

A study by Comighud, S. M. (2020) found that effective leadership practices of School Heads are strongly linked to successful implementation of the program, that is the overall ability of its personnel in assessing its own strengths and weaknesses, in engaging to new learning, and developing skills and competencies in order for the school personnel to respond effectively to different functions of management during disasters.

Leadership with the right competence directly affects the effectiveness of DRRM implementation because it determines how well policies are translated into action. Schools with strong participatory and transparent leaders often show better preparation, faster recovery, and greater trust among the schools' internal and external stakeholders.

Capacity/ Capability

Comighud, S. M. (2020) established in a study a significant relationship between implementation status and the level of capabilities of school personnel. The study highlighted that public schools are capable to respond to hazards in the occurrence of disasters. School Heads with more training implement the program better than those with a smaller number of trainings, which is mainly due to its accumulated knowledge and developed innovations. In similar findings, 80.39% of teachers are familiar with the evacuation paths in the school. However, only estimated 30% have received training on "Duck, Cover, and Hold" Technique. (Razia, 20225). Dela Cruz, R. D., & Ormilla, R. C. G. (2022) found that the school districts implemented safe learning facilities and environments. DRRM Program was integrated into the curriculum for the learners, teaching and non-teaching personnel, and school stakeholders. Those involved in the implementation of DRRM Program are more prepared during disaster. Abenoja, S., Baog, I. W., Briz, A. C., Bustamante, H. M., Garcia, R., Mongado, R., & Ramos, A. J. B. (2023) assessed the level of preparedness, a measure of capacity and its significant link to School DRRM implementation. Better coordination directly contributes to the school readiness and capacity to manage disaster risks according to the level of coordination of School DRRM coordinators. Relevant training impacts program effectiveness.

The findings suggest that capacity training plays an important role in school DRRM implementation. Schools that regularly conduct DRRM training, drills, and regular updating demonstrate better preparation and coordination responses. This reflects the efficiency and participatory aspects of good governance. Accountability is manifested when trained staff can document and justify actions during emergencies. Otherwise, fragmented efforts and confusing responses could be the result of the absence of training programs, thereby reducing school level resilience.

Capacity building activities do not only provide technical knowledge but also a governance strategy that reinforces leadership, transparency, and accountability.

Participation

According to Valenzuela and Buenvinida (2021), allowing parents and educators to participate in risk-reduction planning improves accountability and sustainability. Participation in the context of DRRM and good governance in school refers to the active involvement of all stakeholders such as administrators, teachers, non-teaching personnel, learners, parents, and community partners, in planning, decision making, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of school DRRM activities. Participation promotes stakeholder engagement, shared decision making, community collaboration, and empowerment among stakeholders.

Participation reflects one of the core principles of good governance, together with transparency, accountability and efficiency.

The findings highlight that stakeholder engagement significantly enhances the effectiveness and sustainability of DRRM initiatives in schools. As school leaders encourage inclusivity, preparedness measures become more responsive and well supported. Therefore, participation functions as both a governance mechanism and a driver of collective resilience, leading to alignment between good governance practices and effective DRRM implementation.

5. Conclusions

This review contributes three key insights to the understanding of good governance and DRRM effectiveness in public schools. First, it establishes that governance principles – transparency, accountability, participation and efficiency directly explain how schools plan and execute DRRM actions. Secondly, it emphasizes how these interactions are moderated by school characteristics such as size and location, that affect resource availability and the ability to coordinate action. Third, it highlights participative leadership and capacity building as key drivers that turn policy compliance into a long-term culture of readiness and resilience.

Education sector, particularly the Department of Education should institutionalize annual DRRM governance audits to ensure transparency and accountability across schools. Continuous capacity building programs for School Heads and DRRM coordinators should be mandated to reinforce leadership and technical competence. Furthermore, to support small and high-risk areas and make sure that preparedness and governance are in line with actual hazard exposure, context-based funding policies must be implemented.

This review is limited by its reliance on secondary and published literature, which may not fully capture the most recent or localized DRRM practices in all regions. To confirm and build upon the governance-DRRM link found in this systematic literature review, further research should include field-based data and mixed-method analyses.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declared no conflict of interest in the conduct and publication of this research. All analyses, interpretations, and conclusions presented in this systematic literature review were carried out independently and without any financial, institutional, or personal influence that could have affected the objectivity of the study.

6. References

1. Abenoja, S., Baog, I. W., Briz, A. C., Bustamante, H. M., Garcia, R., Mongado, R., & Ramos, A. J. B. (2023). The implementation level of disaster risk reduction management and disaster preparedness in selected schools in Davao de Oro. *International Journal of Research Publications*, 128(1), 581–593.
2. Abila, J. G., & Callo, E. C. (n.d.). Good governance in education: A consensus of stakeholders' perspectives.
3. Acierto, Cherlita & Robas, Jessie & Monte, Shanedree. (2023). Extent of Disaster Risk Reduction Management in Selected Elementary Schools: Evidence from the Philippines. *International Review of Social Sciences Research*. 3. 1-19. 10.53378/352981.
4. Almazan, M. T. T. (2023). Disbursement and utilization of Maintenance and Other Operating Expenses (MOOE) funds in schools. *Semantic Scholar*.
5. Alpuerto, M. T., & Briones, E. O. (2025). Disaster management and psychological preparedness in educational institutions. *Journal of Organizational Resilience*.
6. Beronibla, M. R. M. B. (2024). Budget allocation and utilization in local schools and its relationship to governance. *International Journal of Education Studies*.
7. Comighud, S. M. (2020). Implementation of the public schools' disaster risk reduction and management program and level of capabilities to respond. *International Journal of Science and Research*, 9(4), 752–763.
8. Dada, K. S. J., Hamza, J. M., & Mohammed, H. A. (2025). Disaster risk management in libraries and information centers: Global strategies, challenges, policy and recommendations. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Management*, 7(1), 203–214.
9. Dela Cruz, R. D., & Ormilla, R. C. G. (2022). Disaster risk reduction management implementation in the public elementary schools of the Department of Education, Philippines. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Management*, 4(2), 1–15.
10. Department of Education. (2015). DepEd Order No. 37, s. 2015: The Comprehensive DRRM in Basic Education Framework. <https://www.deped.gov.ph>
11. Department of Education. (2024). Policy guidelines on the implementation of DRRM in schools. <https://www.deped.gov.ph>
12. Domingo, S. N., & Manejar, A. J. A. (2021). Policy, institutional, and expenditure review of bottom-up approach disaster risk reduction and management (No. 2021-03). PIDS Discussion Paper Series.
13. Goswami, T., & Ahmad, A. (2025). Integrating disability into disaster management education in India: A critical review. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Management*, 7(1), 163–176.
14. Lassa, Jonatan. (2011). Institutional Vulnerability and Governance of Disaster Risk Reduction: Macro, Meso and Micro Scale Assessment. PhD Diss. University of Bonn. 10.13140/RG.2.2.24672.99845.
15. Ojha, J. C., Bhattarai, P. C., & Devkota, B. (2025). Teachers' perception towards responses of COVID-19 pandemic management in Gandaki Province of Nepal: A cross-sectional survey. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Management*, 7(1), 485–494.
16. Pandapatan, A. M. (2025). Correlates Schools Disaster Risk Reduction and Management (DRRM) Implementation and School Performance in Safety and Readiness: Basis for Enhanced Action Plan. *Indonesian Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*. 5. 223-234. 10.17509/ijomr.v5i1.82752.
17. Pandapatan, A. M. (2024). Assessing select public schools disaster and risk reduction management during pandemic restriction in the Philippines. *Dalat University Journal of Science*, 17(1), 17–24.
18. Pardillo, R. S. (2024). A case study of disaster risk reduction governance in Philippine rural higher education: Toward contextualized policy support. *Learning Gate*, 4(1). <https://learning-gate.com/index.php/2576-8484/article/view/8249>
19. Razia, B. (2025). Guardians of safety: Assessing awareness and preparedness of teachers along with school initiatives for disaster risk reduction. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Management*, 7(1), 325–338.
20. United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific. (n.d.). What is good governance? <https://www.unescap.org>
21. Valenzuela, E. S., & Buenvinida, L. P. (2021). Managing school operations and resources in the context of DRRM. *Journal of Educational Management*.
22. Wadasen, R. F. P. (2024). Financial management challenges and best practices of school heads of public high schools. *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, 6(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.36948/ijfmr.2024.v06i01.1342>