



Received: 07-05-2026  
Accepted: 17-06-2026

ISSN: 2583-049X

## **Stakeholders' Perspectives on Universal Design for Learning Implementation: Challenges and Support Across Education**

**Juliana D Peralta**

School of Graduate Studies, Greenville College, Pasig City, Philippines

Corresponding Author: **Juliana D Peralta**

### **Abstract**

This qualitative study investigates the perspectives of educational stakeholders on the facilitators (“bridges”) and barriers (“barriers”) to implementing the Universal Design for Learning (UDL) framework in the Division of Tarlac, Philippines. Despite national mandates such as Republic Act 11650 and DepEd Order No. 2, s. 2019 that promote inclusive education, the gap between policy ideals and classroom realities persists. Data were collected from Grade 1 to Grade 6 general education and special education (SPED) teachers in five public elementary schools across urban, rural, and isolated settings through open-ended interviews and questionnaires, using Bronfenbrenner’s Ecological Systems Theory, Constructivism, and

Vygotsky’s Sociocultural Theory as guides.

The findings indicate that although stakeholders recognize the value of UDL in addressing learner variability and increasing engagement, practical application is significantly limited. Identified key barriers include rigid curricula, large class sizes, administrative overloads, the digital divide, and lack of long-term mentoring beyond superficial webinars. Alternatively, institutional bridges are composed of administrative cooperation, inclusive leadership, and collaborative school cultures. This study highlights the critical need for context-sensitive professional development and localized support to translate inclusive policies into sustainable, equitable instructional practices.

**Keywords:** Universal Design for Learning, Inclusive Education, Bridges and Barriers, Stakeholder Perspectives, Qualitative Study, Educational Leadership, Tarlac Province

### **1. The Problem and its Context**

This Chapter 1 presents the overall plan and foundation of the study. It begins with the introduction and background of the study, describing inclusive education, the principles of Universal Design for Learning (UDL), and the contemporary context of educational institutions navigating diverse learner populations. It then moves through the statement of the problem and research questions, the purpose and objectives of the study, the theoretical and conceptual frameworks, the significance of the study, the scope and delimitations, and the definition of terms used in the dissertation.

### **Background of the Study**

Within the framework of instruction, the Universal Design for Learning (UDL) contexts in Culturally Responsive Teaching include this fundamental principle as it offers a flexible framework that supports diverse learners by promoting multiple means of engagement, representation, and expression. Globally, UDL is recognized by international bodies such as UNESCO as a vital tool for achieving Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG 4), which aims to ensure inclusive and equitable quality education for all. The foreign literature highlights UDL's potential to advance fair education, yet research often reveals that implementation remains inconsistent and is heavily influenced by local circumstances and institutional support.

Nationally, the Philippine government has reinforced its commitment to inclusive education through the 1987 Constitution, the Magna Carta for Persons with Disabilities (Republic Act 7277), the Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013 (Republic Act 10533), and the Inclusive Education Act of 2022 (Republic Act 11650). Locally, Department of Education (DepEd) Order No. 2, s. 2019, emphasizes the value of contextualized learning and differentiated instruction, both of which align with UDL principles. Despite these policy pledges, implementation methods continue to vary by geography, school type, and level of education.

The core problem in this study is the persistent gap between national inclusive education mandates and the lived realities of classroom practice within the Division of Tarlac Province. A significant problem encountered during preliminary observations is that while the COVID-19 pandemic forced a shift toward flexible learning modalities, many teachers remain overwhelmed by the digital divide and a lack of specific UDL training. Specifically, many instructors report having little deep knowledge of UDL, having only heard of it through quick webinars or brief online resources that lack long-term mentoring.

Furthermore, stakeholders face persistent challenges, including large class sizes, a lack of instructional resources, and heavy administrative workloads that pressure teachers to meet curricular standards at the expense of flexibility. While educators realize that the UDL framework may improve education in public institutions, little is known about how these stakeholders view the "bridges" that facilitate adoption versus the "barriers" that stand in their way in this local provincial context. This lack of qualitative information currently limits respondent initiatives that could improve UDL implementation throughout the province. To close this gap, this study examines stakeholders' viewpoints across various educational settings in the Division of Tarlac Province to identify factors that support or hinder the systematic application of UDL.

This research ultimately aims to produce evidence-based insights that can direct policymakers and school administrators in creating plans that are both achievable and sensitive to the contextual realities faced by communities, educators, and students. By putting stakeholder voices front and center, the study seeks to inform the development of professional training and interventions that support truly fair and learner-centered educational environments.

### Statement of the Problem

The general purpose of this qualitative study is to examine the perspectives of stakeholders in the Division of Tarlac Province regarding the bridges and barriers to implementing Universal Design for Learning (UDL).

In particular, the following questions are the focus of this study:

1. How do stakeholders describe their understanding of UDL and its relevance to their roles?
2. What challenges do stakeholders encounter when implementing UDL?
3. What forms of support do stakeholders identify as necessary to strengthen UDL?
4. How do stakeholders perceive the adequacy of existing professional development?
5. How do stakeholders view the alignment between UDL policies and classroom reality?

### Purpose and Objectives of the Study

The primary purpose of this qualitative study is to examine stakeholders' perceptions in the Division of Tarlac Province regarding the factors that facilitate or impede the implementation of Universal Design for Learning (UDL). While UDL is increasingly recognized as a vital framework for inclusive instruction, its adoption remains irregular across local educational contexts. This research seeks to capture the lived experiences of those directly involved in teaching, learning support, and leadership, moving beyond theoretical policy to understand the daily, systemic realities

of the classroom.

A central objective of this study is to identify the "bridges," or the enabling conditions and resources, that make UDL adoption feasible within selected public elementary schools. These facilitators include administrative assistance, cooperative school cultures, opportunities for professional growth, and accessible teaching materials. By documenting these successful practices, the study aims to highlight effective strategies already present within the province. Conversely, the study rigorously examines the "barriers" stakeholders encounter, such as insufficient training, resource scarcity, rigid curricular structures, and conceptual misunderstandings of UDL. Understanding these challenges from multiple perspectives is essential for developing responsive, long-lasting solutions.

Furthermore, this research investigates how stakeholders' unique interpretations of UDL fundamentals influence their instructional choices and explores the degree of alignment between national inclusive education policies and actual classroom practices in Tarlac. The study aims to pinpoint specific capacity-building needs and professional development gaps that must be addressed to strengthen province-wide implementation. Ultimately, this project intends to produce evidence-based insights that are both achievable and context-sensitive. By illustrating the bridges and barriers encountered by stakeholders, the study seeks to inform policymakers and administrators, encouraging the creation of more adaptable, equitable, and learner-centered educational environments throughout the Division of Tarlac Province and beyond.

### Significance of the Study

This research has significant value, as it provides a deeper understanding of how Universal Design for Learning (UDL) is perceived and applied in the public schools of the Division of Tarlac Province. By analyzing the specific bridges and barriers faced by stakeholders, the study offers evidence-based insights to improve inclusive instruction and guide decision-making at the school, training, and policy levels.

**Teachers** are the primary beneficiaries, gaining essential knowledge to implement UDL concepts through adaptable instructional methodologies and evaluation techniques. The study helps them identify creative approaches to make learning more interesting and accessible, ultimately enhancing their professional competency in adopting learner-centered techniques.

**Special Education (SPED) Teachers** specifically benefit by learning how to align customized educational support plans with the larger UDL framework, improving the coordination of Individual Education Plans (IEPs) with general classroom accessibility.

**School Administrators and Principals** are provided with data to inform resource allocation, shape school culture, and develop focused interventions to support teacher development.

**Students** benefit from more responsive and encouraging instruction that addresses their diverse learning styles, eliminates obstacles to participation, and allows them to access knowledge through multiple media while maintaining motivation.

**The Department of Education (DepEd) and Future Researchers** benefit from the localized data, which can be used to refine training materials and monitoring

**frameworks and to** provide a basis for further qualitative exploration of UDL in the Philippine context.

### Theoretical Framework

This study is anchored on three major theories that provide a comprehensive lens for examining the implementation of Universal Design for Learning (UDL). These theories are arranged alphabetically and are specifically aligned with the research objectives to ensure a cohesive analysis of stakeholder perspectives.

**Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Systems Theory.** This theory posits that an individual's development is influenced by various levels of their environment, ranging from the immediate classroom to broad national policies. In this research, it serves as the primary lens for identifying the "bridges and barriers" across different layers of the educational system. It aligns directly with SOP 5, as it provides a framework for evaluating alignment or misalignment between national UDL policies (the Macrosystem) and the actual resource-constrained conditions of the local classroom (the Microsystem).

**Constructivism** emphasizes that individuals construct their own understanding and knowledge of the world through experience and reflection. This theory is essential for exploring how educators and administrators internalize the concept of inclusivity. It aligns with SOP 1 and SOP 2, as it allows the researcher to analyze how stakeholders describe their unique understanding of UDL and how their personal teaching contexts shape the specific challenges they encounter when implementing flexible instruction.

**Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory** Vygotsky's theory highlights that learning is a social process deeply rooted in culture and facilitated by "scaffolding" or support from more knowledgeable others. This theory focuses on the collaborative nature of educational growth. It aligns with SOP 3 and SOP 4, as it provides a basis for identifying the forms of social and professional support stakeholders deem necessary. By using the concept of "scaffolding," the study can evaluate whether existing professional development opportunities effectively bridge the gap between a teacher's current capacity and the successful systematic application of UDL.

### Scope and Delimitations

This study examines stakeholder perspectives on the bridges and barriers to implementing Universal Design for Learning (UDL) across different contexts. Using a qualitative research design, the study aims to gather in-depth insights from key educational stakeholders, such as regular and special education teachers involved in curriculum planning and instructional delivery.

The research focuses on understanding how stakeholders perceive factors that facilitate or hinder the effective implementation of UDL principles in teaching and learning environments. Data will be collected through qualitative methods, including open-ended interviews and questionnaires, to capture participants' experiences, perceptions, and recommendations.

The study will examine themes related to instructional practices, institutional support, professional development, resources, and policy considerations that influence the adoption of UDL in educational settings. Findings from this research aim to contribute to understanding the practical

challenges and enabling conditions that affect UDL implementation and may inform strategies to improve educational practices.

Additionally, this qualitative study focuses on Grade 1 to Grade 6 teachers and SPED teachers across 5 selected elementary public schools in the Division of Tarlac Province. This includes urban, rural, and geographically isolated settings to capture diverse resource realities. The study is limited to participant perceptions and does not measure student test scores.

### Limitations of the Study

This study is subject to several delimitations that define boundaries. First, the study focuses only on selected stakeholders directly involved in the educational process: regular teachers and Sped Teachers. Other stakeholders, such as students, parents, or policymakers, may not be included in the participant pool.

Second, the research is limited to specific educational institutions or contexts selected by the researcher. Therefore, the findings may reflect participants' experiences and perceptions within those settings and may not be generalizable to all educational institutions.

Third, the study focuses specifically on stakeholders' perceptions and experiences of UDL implementation rather than on the actual effectiveness or outcomes of UDL practices on student performance.

### Definitions of Terms

The following terms are defined to provide a common understanding of the concepts used in this study:

**Assistive Technology:** Refers to tools, software, or devices that support students in accessing the curriculum, participating in learning activities, and demonstrating knowledge.

**Barriers to UDL Implementation:** Barriers are challenges or obstacles that impede the effective implementation of UDL practices in the classroom. These can be structural (e.g., rigid curriculum), technological (e.g., lack of access to assistive devices), instructional (e.g., flexible teaching methods), or attitudinal (e.g., lack of teacher awareness or resistance to inclusion) (Al-Azawei, Serenelli, & Lundqvist, 2016) <sup>[1]</sup>. These may include limited professional development, insufficient resources, policy misalignment, and lack of stakeholder involvement. This study explores the barriers as perceived by teachers, school heads, and administrators.

**Bridges to UDL Implementation:** Bridges refer to strategies, supports, or resources that facilitate successful UDL implementation. Examples include teacher training, administrative support, availability of learning materials, flexible curriculum design, collaborative school culture, and positive stakeholder engagement. (Rose & Dalton, 2009) <sup>[6]</sup>. In this study, bridges represent the conditions that help stakeholders apply UDL effectively across diverse educational contexts.

**Curriculum Adaptation** involves modifying teaching materials, lesson plans, or assessment methods to accommodate diverse learner needs without compromising learning outcomes. UDL promotes proactive adaptation rather than retroactive modification.

**Curriculum Rigidity:** Curriculum rigidity refers to strict or inflexible curriculum structures that limit teachers' ability to

adapt lessons to meet diverse learners' needs. In this study, curriculum rigidity is identified as a potential barrier to UDL implementation.

**Department of Education:** The Department of Education is a national government agency responsible for basic education in the Philippines. In this study, DepEd's policies, directives, and training programs form part of the macrosystem influencing UDL implementation in Tarlac Province.

**Educational Contexts:** Educational contexts refer to the varied school environments where teaching and learning occur. These include urban, rural, and geographically isolated public schools in Tarlac Province. This study examines how these contexts shape stakeholder experiences and influence UDL implementation.

**Implementation:** Implementation refers to the process of applying UDL principles in instructional planning, teaching strategies, assessment practices, and school decision-making. In this study, implementation is examined through stakeholder perceptions of experience in public schools.

**Instructional Flexibility:** Instructional flexibility refers to teachers' ability to adapt teaching methods, materials, and assessments to meet diverse learning needs. In this study, instructional flexibility is examined as a core component of UDL and a factor influenced by school resources, teacher training, and policy support.

**Learner Variability** is the recognition that each student has unique strengths, challenges, learning styles, and needs, which may be proactively addressed in curriculum design and instruction (CAST, 2018).

**Stakeholders:** Stakeholders are individuals or groups who influence or are affected by UDL implementation. In this study, stakeholders include teachers, school heads, principals, and administrators. Their perspectives form the core of the qualitative data used to understand UDL implementation in Tarlac Province.

**Policy Alignment:** Policy alignment refers to the consistency between UDL-related educational policies and actual classroom practices. This study examines how stakeholders perceived the alignment or misalignment between DepEd directives, school-level policies, and the real-world implementation of UDL.

**Professional Development (PD):** Professional development refers to training programs, workshops, seminars, and coaching opportunities designed to enhance educators' knowledge and skills. In this study, PD specifically pertains to training on UDL principles and strategies, as well as to how teachers perceive the adequacy and relevance of these opportunities.

**School Administrators,** including principals and supervisors, are responsible for providing support and ensuring that policies, resources, and professional development opportunities align with inclusive educational practices, such as UDL.

**School Leadership:** School leadership refers to the roles of principals, school heads, and administrators in guiding instructional practices, allocating resources, and supporting teacher development. In this study, leadership is examined as a factor that can either support or hinder UDL implementation.

**Special Education Teachers** are educators who are trained to work with students with disabilities. They provide tailored instruction, develop Individualized Education Programs (IEP's), and collaborate with general education

teachers to implement teaching strategies aligned with frameworks such as UDL.

**Teachers/General Education Teachers** are responsible for delivering the standard curriculum to all students, including those students with disabilities. In UDL implementation, they adapt instructional strategies, assessment methods, and classroom materials to ensure inclusiveness.

**Stakeholder Engagement:** Stakeholder Engagement refers to the active involvement of teachers, parents, learners, and school leaders in planning, decision-making, and evaluating educational practices. In this study, stakeholder engagement is explored in relation to how UDL initiatives are planned and implemented across schools.

**Universal Design for Learning (UDL):** It is a framework for designing educational environments, curricula, and instruction that proactively address the diverse needs of all learners. It emphasizes flexibility in teaching methods, representation, engagement, and assessment to ensure equitable access and participation, particularly for students with disabilities. (CAST, 2018, Meyer; Rose & Gordon, 2014).

## 2. Review of Related Literature

### Introduction

The Review of Related Literature provides an understanding of the intricate factors that affect the application of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) across various educational settings. As Universal Design for Learning (UDL) continues to gain international recognition as a framework for fostering flexible, learner-centered education, greater attention has been paid to how its principles are understood and implemented in actual school environments. Although the theoretical strength, UDL implementation is nevertheless inconsistent and influenced by local circumstances, institutional support, teacher preparation, and policy alignment. The current study is situated within broader scholarly and practical discourses on educational practices, stakeholder engagement, and systemic issues influencing UDL adoption, as this chapter's literature synthesis.

To address learner diversity, the paper first examines the theoretical foundations of Universal Design for Learning (UDL), including its roots in cognitive neuroscience and its focus on a variety of engagement, representation, and action-expression strategies. This part provides the conceptual foundation required to comprehend the way in which UDL is supposed to operate in classrooms. This chapter next examines research on UDL implementation at the local and global levels, highlighting both effective strategies and enduring challenges. The study's first and second research questions are strongly related to these studies' insights into how educators, administrators, and school leaders understand Universal Design for Learning (UDL) concepts and how their viewpoints affect instructional decision-making. The literature also examines and discusses the contextual and systemic elements that either facilitate or hinder the use of UDL. The variables that help or hinder teachers' implementation of UDL tactics are examined through research on curriculum flexibility, professional development, school leadership, and resource availability. Regarding stakeholder-identified barriers and the sufficiency of UDL-related training, this conversation aligns with issues three and four.

To comprehend how national directives and DepEd

recommendations effectively or ineffectively transfer into classroom practice, the chapter also examines research on the implementation of educational policies, specifically in the Philippine context. This part bolsters the fifth research question, which investigates whether policies and real-world instructional realities align. Drawing on the existing literature, the chapter highlights the limitations the current study aims to address, particularly the dearth of qualitative studies that capture the viewpoints of multiple stakeholders in Philippine public schools. The evaluation emphasizes the importance of educators, administrators, principals, and school heads in the Division of Tarlac Province, providing context-specific insights to better understand how real-world circumstances influence the application of UDL. In the end, this chapter provides the academic context that enhances the study's contribution to the field of education, guides its methodological decisions, and clarifies its goal.

### Theoretical Framework

The cornerstone of this study lies at the intersection of Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Systems Theory and Weick's Theory of Sensemaking, with qualitative inquiry being the primary methodological lens. This dual theoretical approach reflects the complex reality that the implementation of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) is neither a completely mechanical policy implementation nor an isolated person's act. But it happens in multi-layered, concentric institutional settings, drawing at the same time on how different educational actors subjectively process, negotiate and make meaning of systemic expectations. By combining an environmental mapping framework with an organizational cognitive theory, this framework systematically addresses how macro-level mandates and localized institutional dynamics become actual challenges and structural supports from the specific perspectives of educational stakeholders.

### Bronfenbrenner's Theory of Ecological Systems

According to Bronfenbrenner's (1979) <sup>[2]</sup> Ecological Systems Theory, human practices, professional behaviors, and systemic interventions cannot be evaluated or understood independently of the nested, interrelated ecosystems in which they are embedded. The theory envisages the social world as a series of concentric, interacting systems, from the immediate setting of face-to-face interaction to broad national policy architectures, which constantly influence individual agency and are actively shaped by the actors within them. A holistic mapping of the implementation challenges and supports of Universal Design for Learning across education reveals that institutional factors split into several ecological layers of operation.

The microsystem is the immediate operational layer where UDL principles multiple means of engagement, representation, and action or expression are directly played out in day-to-day instructor-learner interactions, localized classroom accommodations, and direct pedagogical adjustments.

The mesosystem describes the important interactions and connections across these immediate environments, with particular attention to the functional relationship, coherence, or operational friction experienced among general basic education tracks, special education units, and mechanisms for home-school coordination.

The exosystem encompasses the administrative structures, institutional protocols, and localized regulatory networks that do not directly restrict the day-to-day learner yet decisively prescribe the concrete realities of the classroom. This study points to division level strategies, instructional supervision practices, management of school head resources, specific tracking mechanisms and institutional training provisions as isolated exosystem.

The macrosystem refers to the overarching legal, socio-cultural and philosophical environment that molds the inclusive education landscape, directly embedding national legal frameworks such as the Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013 (Republic Act No. 10533), the Inclusive Education Act of 2022 (Republic Act No. 11650), the Magna Carta for Persons with Disabilities (Republic Act No. 7277) and the Department of Education's specific guidelines on curriculum contextualization under DepEd Order No. 21, s. 2019.

The study assumes that UDL implementation obstacles and institutional supports are not isolated instances of human failure or achievement, but rather are influenced by this ecological arrangement. Rather, they are seen as the logical, structural outcomes of alignment or divergence throughout these concentric systems, demonstrating where macro-level policy expectations either merge seamlessly with or conflict with micro-level realities.

### Sense-Making Theory by Weick

Weick's (1995) Theory of Sensemaking provides the internal cognitive engine of this framework, shifting the focus from structural geography to the specific socio-cognitive processes through which organizational stakeholders perceive, manage, and act upon ambiguous structural demands. Sensemaking is the active human process by which people make meaning from fluid, complex, or contradictory organizational contexts and relies heavily on professional identity, retrospective evaluations, and social conversations that transform institutional mandates into functional daily operations. The idea assumes that the educational leaders, specialists and instructors do not passively reproduce the macro-level inclusion measures but actively decode what these metrics signify with regard to their particular professional responsibilities and localized material restrictions.

This inquiry's sensemaking process is guided by three interrelated dimensions. Identity formation is what drives educational stakeholders to continually re-examine and rebuild their professional identity from standardized curriculum implementers to ultra-flexible facilitators who must balance bureaucratic consistency with the varied individual needs of the student population.

When faced with unexpected instructional vulnerabilities or a deficit in localized teaching tools, stakeholders engage in retrospective cue extraction, looking back at historical teaching outcomes and student engagement signs to isolate workable cues to justify their present UDL adaptations and structural interventions.

Sensemaking is an inherently collaborative and relational process, which is evident in social and conversational interaction during formal planning sessions, peer mentoring loops, and multi-stakeholder exchanges in which ambiguous policy goals are collectively debated and translated into shared, practical actions on the ground.

The study uses Weick's framework to systematically evaluate stakeholders' cognitive processing when facing systemic tension and describes how they bridge the gap between the rigid expectations of top-down compliance frameworks and the flexible, highly adaptive methodologies required in real-world UDL environments.

### Methodological Lens: Qualitative Inquiry

External environmental structures are linked to internal cognitive processes through the practical-methodological lens of qualitative inquiry, which supplements these substantive frameworks. In this sense, this qualitative approach is the systemic mechanism for capturing, analyzing, and presenting the human experiences of stakeholders operating within the educational machinery, rather than an independent variable. This approach gathers deep, narrative material from the practitioners themselves, making observable the structural configurations mapped by Bronfenbrenner and the cognitive patterns outlined by Weick. The methodology foregrounds stakeholder voices, such that structural hurdles, policy compliance pressures, and resource deficits are not judged as abstract systemic elements, but as lived operational weaknesses and significant organizational victories.

### Integration of the Theory Matrix

The combination of these theoretical components builds a comprehensive, multidimensional matrix in which each element embodies a dimension of the research title. Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Systems Theory provides the external, spatial boundaries for the research, accurately charting the emergence of particular issues and the failure of institutional supports across the multilayer educational environment. Within those mapped layers, Weick's Theory of Sensemaking applies, providing the behavioral logic for how stakeholders think, interact, and react as they negotiate structural pressures. Finally, the lens of qualitative inquiry grounds the entire architecture by capturing these systemic realities through genuine practitioner perspectives, making an empirical, contextually based contribution to inclusive educational leadership.

### Review of Related Literature

The Universal Design for Learning (UDL) framework is globally recognized as an essential instructional design that promotes flexible learning environments. On a global scale, organizations such as UNESCO (2020) and the World Health Organization explain that UDL is a proactive approach to diversity. Their reports emphasize that instead of forcing students to fit into a rigid "one-size-fits-all" curriculum, the curriculum itself must be flexible enough to accommodate the 1.3 billion people worldwide living with disabilities. This global perspective shifts the focus from "fixing the student" to "fixing the environment," which is a core tenet of this study.

In the international context, Espada-Chavarría *et al.* (2023) found that UDL is most effective when integrated into the classroom's initial design. Their study found that by providing multiple means of engagement and representation, educators can reduce the need for later "retrofitting" or special accommodations, thereby making the learning process more efficient for all students. Similarly, King-Sears *et al.* (2024) explain in their systematic review that, while the UDL theory is widely accepted internationally, its

practical application often fails due to a lack of "sustained professional development." Their findings suggest that one-time workshops are ineffective, highlighting a specific barrier that this study seeks to examine in Tarlac.

Expanding on these international challenges, Zhang *et al.* (2024) conducted a systematic review highlighting that despite UDL's 40-year history, it still faces significant critiques regarding a lack of definitional clarity and practical application barriers in preschool through secondary education settings. Recent findings from 2026 demonstrate that when implemented effectively, UDL can lead to a 20% increase in academic achievement for students with disabilities, provided that high implementation costs and limited faculty training are addressed. Furthermore, a 2024 white paper on UDL in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) emphasizes that implementation is uniquely influenced by local technology levels, suggesting that evaluation must focus on shifts in school environment and teacher behavior rather than just test scores.

Furthermore, Wea *et al.* (2025) explain that in primary education settings, UDL serves as a bridge for teachers to manage diverse learner needs through varied instructional materials. Their research demonstrates that when teachers use flexible methods, student engagement increases significantly. In higher education, Yuwono *et al.* (2024) explain that UDL is not just for children; it is a cross-cutting framework that promotes active learning and accessibility for adult students with diverse abilities. These international findings justify the present study's inclusion of various educational settings, as UDL's benefits are shown to be universal across different age groups.

At the national and local level, the Philippine context presents unique challenges and opportunities. Catama (2025) explains that while Filipino teachers have a positive attitude toward inclusive education, there is a significant gap in their "instructional competence" regarding UDL strategies. This is further supported by a 2026 study on Junior High School Chemistry in the Philippines, which found that while UDL-based instruction significantly improved student concept knowledge and reduced anxiety, its effects on deep motivation were limited in the short term, indicating a need for more context-sensitive professional development.

Additionally, Navarro *et al.* (2021) explain that during the COVID-19 pandemic, Filipino teachers' self-efficacy was the biggest predictor of their success. Their study found that teachers who felt confident in their technology skills were more likely to use inclusive strategies, which explains why the "digital divide" is such a critical barrier.

Locally, research into the effectiveness of instructional coaching (2022) found that primary and secondary teachers are better able to implement UDL when supported by continuous mentoring rather than one-time workshops. In addition, Rodríguez-Valerio and Segura-Castillo (2025) explain that UDL requires "systemic collaboration," in which school leaders provide the time and resources for teachers to plan together. This explains why this study includes school administrators as key stakeholders: their leadership style can act as either a bridge or a barrier to the framework's success.

### Synthesis and Disparities

The reviewed literature provides a comprehensive understanding of the implementation of Universal Design

for Learning (UDL) across various educational landscapes. Specifically, foreign studies such as those by Espada-Chavarría *et al.* (2023), King-Sears *et al.* (2024), and Zhang *et al.* (2024) establish that UDL is a globally recognized framework that effectively reduces learning barriers. However, these studies—including the most recent 2026 data—point out that while the framework is conceptually strong and yields high academic returns, its practical application is often hindered by high costs, curriculum rigidity, and a lack of long-term institutional support.

Similarly, local research by Catama (2025), Navarro *et al.* (2021), and the 2026 study on Philippine JHS science supports these findings within the national context. These studies note that Filipino educators' self-efficacy and specific "instructional competence" are critical determinants of success. The literature reveals a shared struggle regarding professional development. At the same time, global perspectives emphasize systemic change, local findings—buttressed by 2022 research on coaching—highlight that "quick webinars" fail to provide the deep, sustained mentoring required for mastery.

Furthermore, the literature suggests that the digital divide and resource scarcity are not merely local issues in Tarlac but are also evident in various inclusive settings worldwide (Blasco-Marchan *et al.*, 2025; LMIC White Paper, 2024). This intersection of data confirms that the "bridges" to UDL—such as administrative support, continuous coaching, and collaborative culture—are universal requirements, just as the "barriers"—such as administrative overloads and lack of sustained mentoring—are persistent global and national challenges.

Consequently, a significant disparity exists between the abundance of UDL research in high-resource Western environments and the scarcity of empirical data in the Philippine provincial context. Most international studies focus on classrooms with advanced technological infrastructure. In contrast, there is a conspicuous lack of qualitative evidence regarding how UDL is interpreted in schools within the Division of Tarlac Province, where resources are unevenly distributed. Therefore, the current study bridges this gap by focusing on stakeholders' localized lived experiences. By doing so, it moves from the specific classroom challenges identified in the literature to a general understanding of how localized support systems can be developed to sustain inclusive education in the Philippines.

Although qualitative research on Universal Design for Learning (UDL) is expanding, several significant gaps remain that this study directly addresses. Specifically, there is a notable shortage of empirical studies focused on UDL implementation within Southeast Asia and the Philippines. Much of the existing foundational research, including seminal works by Marino *et al.* (2014), Katz (2013), and Rappolt-Schlichtmann *et al.* (2012), was conducted in high-resource Western environments. Consequently, evidence on how UDL is understood and operationalized in the Philippine public school system is conspicuously lacking, particularly in provincial settings such as the Division of Tarlac, where classrooms often face resource scarcity and a persistent digital divide.

Furthermore, many existing studies rely solely on teacher-supplied data, often overlooking the perspectives of the broader educational ecosystem. For instance, research by Smith *et al.* (2017) and Rao *et al.* (2014) primarily focuses

on classroom instructors, rarely including the voices of school administrators or education officials. This creates a knowledge gap regarding how leadership practices and institutional policies influence the sustainability of inclusive strategies. Moreover, while studies by Zhang *et al.* (2024) and Ok *et al.* (2017) identify various barriers to UDL adoption, they frequently treat these barriers as isolated variables. This study, grounded in Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Systems Theory, fills this vacuum by examining how these barriers and bridges interact across multiple levels from national policy to local school culture and community expectations.

In addition, current research often examines professional development, policy alignment, and classroom practice as independent silos. While Rusconi and Squillaci (2023) focus on training efficacy and Basham *et al.* (2010) study systemic transformation, very few investigations combine these dimensions into a single, comprehensive analysis. This study advances a more holistic understanding by integrating stakeholder knowledge, planning procedures, and the specific challenges encountered in the field. Similarly, while Catama (2025) provides a rare glimpse into the Philippine UDL context, much of the local literature remains limited to narrative reviews rather than empirical field studies involving diverse locations.

Therefore, the uniqueness of this research lies in its multi-stakeholder approach across ten different schools, including remote and rural settings that are often underrepresented in qualitative UDL investigations. By synthesizing the perspectives of teachers and administrators within the specific ecological framework of Tarlac, this study moves from the specific gaps identified in international literature toward a general, context-responsive understanding of inclusive education. It ultimately seeks to provide a localized evidence base that can bridge the divide between national inclusive mandates and the practical realities of the Philippine classroom.

### 3. Methodology

#### Research Design

Since the goal of this study is to comprehend the actual experiences, opinions, and insights of general and Sped teachers as stakeholders regarding the implementation of the Universal Design for Learning (UDL), a qualitative research approach was used. Since the goal of the study is to examine how people see, feel, and interpret UDL in their own educational environments, a qualitative technique is most suited. With this design, the researcher can collect rich, nuanced descriptions of the bridges and barriers stakeholders face, rather than relying solely on statistics.

This enables evaluation of experiences across various settings and comprehension of how educational environments impact the implementation of UDL. Finding patterns and variations in the understanding and application of UDL is another benefit of using multiple examples. Semi-structured interviews, document reviews, and focus groups will all be used to gather data. The regular and Sped teachers, as the primary focus in this study, can freely share their experiences during semi-structured interviews while still directing the discussion toward the study topics. Discussions in focus groups, particularly amongst educators, are used to facilitate the collection of common knowledge and experiences. Reviews of documents, including policy guidelines, training materials, and school memos, bolster the

interview data and give the researcher insight into how UDL is communicated throughout the educational system. This qualitative approach aligns with the study's goals, which include understanding the bridges, identifying the barriers stakeholders encounter, and investigating their perspectives on UDL implementation. Using a qualitative methodology, this study will document the breadth and complexity of UDL implementation across many educational contexts in the Division of Tarlac Province.

### **Locale of the Study**

In the Division of Tarlac Province, which lies in Central Luzon, 5 selected elementary public schools will serve as the sites of this study: Dolores Elementary School, Magurul-gurol Elementary School, Cristorey Elementary School, Capas East Central Elementary School, and Gabaldon Elementary School. The Division of Tarlac Province is an ideal place to study how Universal Design for Learning (UDL) will be interpreted and applied across various educational settings. Schools in the province's centers enable the researcher to record a variety of stakeholder experiences. The participating schools were selected from several districts to reflect a range of resource situations and learning settings. Under the direction of the Tarlac Schools Division of the Department of Education (DepEd), which implements national policies in teacher preparation and education, these schools operate. Teachers can examine the bridges and barriers by looking at Tarlac's diverse educational landscape. This is because the school's location, available resources, leadership support, and community characteristics can all affect UDL implementation. This study's location in the Division of Tarlac Province will allow the researcher to collect valuable data on how UDL is perceived and applied in actual classroom environments, how stakeholders view its implementation, and which external factors facilitate or hinder its adoption in public basic education.

### **Population and Sample**

The study's population comprises 10 participants in the Division of Tarlac Province, selected public elementary schools that have adopted Universal Design for Learning (UDL). These schools will be selected because they directly witness, impact, or encourage UDL practices in their local school communities. This study will not require a large sample size because it uses a qualitative research design. Instead, individuals who are familiar with UDL or have firsthand experience with instructional strategies will be purposively sampled. This kind of sampling will ensure that the data collected are rich, pertinent, and significant to the study's topics.

### **Sampling Design**

The design of this study will utilize purposive sampling, a method frequently used in qualitative research to select participants who can provide rich, meaningful, and relevant information. This sampling technique was chosen because the study's goal is not to gather data from a large population, but rather to focus on individuals with firsthand experience implementing Universal Design for Learning (UDL). Only those directly involved in educational activities and possessing specific knowledge of UDL were invited to participate.

A total of ten (20) participants from selected elementary public schools in the Division of Tarlac Province are included in the sample. To ensure a comprehensive understanding of the research problem, the sample is equally divided into five (10) regular classroom teachers and five (10) Special Education (SPED) teachers. These groups were specifically chosen because they represent diverse responsibilities and viewpoints, enabling them to share vital knowledge about school policies and classroom procedures. To ensure the quality of the data, the researcher established the following criteria for the selection of participants: (1) they must express voluntary willingness to participate in this study; (2) they must possess the literacy skills to read and write for the purpose of responding to queries and reviewing transcripts; (3) they must be active teaching personnel in public elementary schools within the Division of Tarlac Province, specifically from Dolores Elementary School, Magurul-gurol Elementary School, Cristorey Elementary School, Capas East Central Elementary School, and Gabaldon Elementary School; and (4) they must be knowledgeable in the principles and applications of Universal Design for Learning.

Furthermore, the data saturation approach will be employed, meaning the researcher will continue gathering data until no new themes, ideas, or insights emerge from the interviews and discussions. Consequently, the sample size is deemed adequate to address all research topics and to obtain a thorough understanding of the barriers and facilitators to UDL implementation across the various educational contexts of the Division of Tarlac Province.

### **Data Collection Procedure**

For the convenience and accessibility of all participants, internet communication forms will be used to collect the study's data. The researcher's primary instruments for collecting qualitative data will be Zoom and Facebook Messenger interviews, as the stakeholders have varying schedules and availability. After preparing everything needed to conduct interviews, the researcher will contact potential participants via Zoom or Messenger to invite them to participate in the study. In the communication, the researcher will explain the study's goal, that participation is voluntary, and that confidentiality will be guaranteed. Those who consent to participate will be prompted to select their preferred interview style.

The researcher will conduct interviews via Facebook Messenger or Zoom for those who prefer real-time interaction. The researcher would have the opportunity to examine non-verbal indicators and pose insightful questions during these virtual interviews. To ensure accuracy during transcription, Zoom or Facebook Messenger sessions will be audio-recorded with participants' consent. Depending on the participants' comfort level, voice calls or chat-based interviews will take place via Messenger. Voice conversations will be recorded with authorization, and chat interviews will be scheduled and stored. Apart from conducting interviews, the researcher will seek pertinent papers via email or messenger, including training materials, school memos, and UDL-related standards. The information that the participants have supplied will be validated and supported by these papers. Only researchers will have access to the files containing all the collected data, which are safely

stored. Once all the replies have been gathered, the researcher will organize the data for thematic analysis and will transcribe the interviews.

### Research Instrument

The primary research instrument in this study is a semi-structured interview guide composed of Research Guide Questions (RGQ) and Research Questions (RQ), which are designed to elicit rich, detailed accounts regarding the teachers' experiences with Universal Design for Learning (UDL). The RGQ provides broad, experience-based prompts that encourage participants to narrate their understanding, practices, and perceptions of UDL. At the same time, the RQ offers more specific, targeted questions that probe into the bridges and barriers they encounter, the contextual factors influencing implementation, and the different experiences across school settings. Complementing the interview guide, a focus group discussion protocol is used to gather collective insights and shared interpretations among teachers, allowing the researcher to validate and deepen the themes emerging from individual interviews. This instrument ensures a comprehensive and credible exploration of UDL implementation in the Division of Tarlac Province.

### Data Analysis

This study employs thematic analysis to interpret qualitative data gathered from stakeholders, specifically teachers involved in implementing Universal Design for Learning (UDL) in selected elementary public schools in Tarlac Province. Thematic analysis is appropriate because it allows the researcher to identify recurring patterns, meaningful insights, and variations in participants' experiences across diverse educational contexts. To ensure a systematic and rigorous analysis, the researcher will follow the six-phase framework of Braun and Clarke.

The process begins with transcription and familiarization, during which all interview recordings and chat transcripts from Zoom and Messenger are transcribed verbatim by the researcher, using the Braun and Clarke thematic analysis framework to maintain structural integrity. Furthermore, the researcher will immerse themselves in the dataset through repeated readings and initial note-taking to develop a comprehensive understanding of the participants' experiences. Following this, initial coding will be conducted using an inductive approach to identify meaningful units of data related to teachers' experiences, perceived bridges, and barriers.

Moreover, these initial codes will be grouped into broader categories to facilitate the generation of themes that capture patterned responses across the dataset. Subsequently, the researcher will review and refine themes, ensuring they are validated against the coded data and the full dataset to accurately represent stakeholders' voices.

Additionally, the stage of defining and naming themes allows the researcher to refine the specifics of each theme, ensuring they clearly explain how teachers perceive and implement UDL within their specific school contexts.

Finally, the process concludes with the production of the report, which involves interpreting the themes and linking the findings to UDL principles, existing literature, and the realities of Philippine public schools. To ensure trustworthiness throughout this analysis, the study will utilize member checking, maintain an audit trail, and

provide thick descriptions of the findings. Ultimately, this analytic process will yield major themes and subthemes that illuminate the bridges and barriers to UDL implementation while offering insights for strengthening inclusive practices.

### Ethical Considerations

This study adheres to strict ethical standards to ensure the protection, dignity, and rights of all participants. Prior to data collection, informed consent will be obtained from all teacher-participants, clearly explaining the study's purpose, the voluntary nature of participation, and the right to withdraw at any time without penalty. Participants will also be informed that they may decline to answer any question that makes them uncomfortable.

Given that the data collection will be conducted through online platforms such as Zoom and Facebook Messenger, additional precautions will be taken to safeguard privacy. Interviews conducted via video call, voice call, or chat will be audio-recorded or saved only with explicit permission, consistent with the procedures described in the methodology ("Zoom or Facebook Messenger sessions will be audio recorded with the consent of the participants"). All digital files, including audio recordings, chat transcripts, and documents, will be stored in password-protected and secure folders accessible only to the researcher, ensuring confidentiality ("Only the researcher will have access to the safely stored files containing all the data that has been collected").

To protect participants' identities, pseudonyms will be assigned, and no real names, school identifiers, or personal information will appear in transcripts, analyses, or the final manuscript. Data will be used solely for academic purposes and will not be shared with school administrators or any external parties. The study also ensures that participants are not harmed by maintaining strict confidentiality and avoiding disclosures that could affect their professional standing.

These ethical measures collectively ensure that participants can share their experiences openly and safely, supporting the integrity and trustworthiness of the research.

### 4. Analysis and Findings

This chapter presents the qualitative findings from the thematic analysis of participants' lived experiences and perspectives on the implementation of **Universal Design for Learning (UDL)** within the Division of Tarlac Province. The analysis focuses on how regular and Special Education (SPED) teachers navigate the systemic "bridges" that facilitate UDL adoption and the "barriers" that impede its systematic application in the classroom. By centering on stakeholder voices, this chapter aims to address the gap between national inclusive education mandates and the practical realities of local public elementary schools.

The researchers adopted the recursive six-phase model of thematic analysis proposed by Braun and Clarke, as detailed in the methodology. This involved a rigorous process of transcribing Zoom and Messenger interviews, data familiarization, generating initial codes, and systematically searching for and reviewing themes. To ensure the trustworthiness of the findings, the analysis incorporates member checking and an audit trail, reflecting the diverse resource realities of the five selected elementary schools—ranging from urban centers to geographically isolated settings.

**Qualitative Findings**

Responses	Codes	Category	Themes
<p>RQ#1 How do stakeholders describe their understanding of Universal Design for Learning and its relevance to their educational roles?</p> <p><b>IGQ1:</b> <u>How do you understand Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and which UDL principles are most familiar or meaningful to you?</u></p> <p><i>Respondent 1: "Uhm, basically, I see UDL as a framework—you know, a set of principles—that's really designed to provide equal learning opportunities for every student. It's all about creating those flexible learning environments that can actually accommodate individual differences and, well, remove those barriers to education."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 2: "For me, UDL is understood more as a set of inclusive objectives or goals we set for the students. But the most meaningful part for me? It's the actual practice—the application of these inclusive goals inside the classroom."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 3: "UDL is like a framework for creating flexible, barrier-free learning. I'd say the principle of flexibility is what's most meaningful to me, although... honestly, it's quite difficult to apply consistently because of how rigid our curriculum pacing is."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 4: "Well, I identify UDL with those general inclusive quality guidelines. Promoting flexible learning sounds really meaningful in theory, you know? Even if it's a bit hard to actually reflect that during our actual contact hours."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 5: "Uhm, UDL is a policy intended to promote flexible and barrier-free learning. Flexibility is really central to how I understand it, but there are challenges, especially with overcrowded classes and the limited materials we have."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 12: "I understand UDL as a specific approach to teaching that—siguro—requires both administrative and instructional support. It's most meaningful when the approach is actually aligned with what's happening in the school setting."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 17: "For me, it's a framework that ensures all learners can participate, engage, and really</i></p>	<p>c1. UDL Framework</p> <p>c1. UDL on inclusive objectives and goals</p> <p>c.1 Barrier-free setup</p> <p>c.1 UDL with general inclusive quality guidelines</p> <p>c.1 UDL as a policy for flexible and barrier-free learning</p> <p>c.1 A specific teaching approach that requires both administrative and instructional support</p> <p>c.1 Student's Experience: Engagement and Participation</p> <p>c.1 UDL is helpful</p> <p>c.1 Flexible instructional materials</p> <p>c.1 UDL as a design thinking framework</p> <p>c.1 Training as a necessary tool to remove barriers</p> <p>c.1 UDL as a set of inclusive objectives</p>	<p><b>Category 1: Frameworks for Inclusive and Flexible Learning</b> Principles Accomodate Guidelines Policy Specific approach to teaching Engagement Helpful Checklist Remove Barriers Accessible UDL preparation. Inclusive objectives School-level Flexible learning. Barrier-free setup Flexible practices UDL strategies 'Aim of flexibility, Divisional guidelines</p> <p><b>Category 2: Policy Awareness, Directives, and Administrative Mandates</b> Insistence on practice Formal educational policies and school mandates. Policy guidelines Inclusive education Administrative briefings Department mandates Performance ratings School-level guidelines Seminars Divisional guidelines Stakeholder briefings. Priority 'Top-down' mandate Administrative accountability Formal educational policies Policy-driven guidelines. Policy documents Internal and external stakeholder support</p> <p><b>Category 3: The Performative Compliance Gap</b> Monitoring Compliance side Professional workshops Pressure Big gap Limited materials Compliance on paper No accountability Collective support Stronger collaboration Checking boxes for compliance Actual practice Cultural shift External stakeholders Heavy workload</p> <p><b>Category 4: Environmental,</b></p>	<p><b>Theme 1: Conceptualization and Institutional Value of UDL</b>  Category 1: Frameworks for Inclusive and Flexible Learning  Category 2: Policy Awareness, Directives, and Administrative Mandates  Category 3: The Performative Compliance Gap</p> <p><b>Theme 2: Systemic, Environmental, and Resource Obstacles</b>  Category 4: Environmental, Spatial, and Classroom Pressures  Category 5: Technological Infrastructure and Material Deficits  Category 6: Time Poverty and Rigid Curricular Frameworks</p> <p><b>THEME 3: Strategic Pathways for Sustainable UDL Implementation</b>  Category 7: Stakeholder Collaboration and Peer Networks  Category 8: Leadership Adaptation, Coaching, and Professional Support  Category 9: Financial Allocation and Ground-Up Policy Planning</p>

<p><i>enjoy learning. Engagement and participation are the principles that mean the most to me, because it focuses on the quality of the student's experience."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 18: "Uhm, UDL is really helpful for me po."</i></p> <p><i>Respondents 19: We see this as one of the instructional materials and flexible as well.</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 20: "I see UDL more as a design thinking framework rather than just a checklist to follow. The most meaningful application for me is providing students with multiple options so they can demonstrate their understanding of a learning target in their own way."</i></p> <p><b>IGQ2:</b> <u>How did you first learn about UDL, and how has this shaped your interpretation or practices?</u></p> <p><i>Respondent 1: "I actually learned about UDL through our professional development sessions and some school-level workshops. That training really shaped how I see it—as a necessary tool to remove barriers for the kids—but honestly, my actual practice is still pretty restricted by the resources we have on hand."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 2: "I was first introduced to it through school seminars. It definitely shaped my view of UDL as a set of inclusive objectives that we must practice, though I'll admit, I feel a lot of pressure because of the accountability tied to it."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 3: "Uhm, I learned about UDL through formal educational policies and school mandates. It made me want to prioritize flexibility in my teaching, but I find it so difficult to maintain that because our curriculum pacing is just so rigid."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 4: "I gained some knowledge about UDL through a training that was... well, 'somewhat relevant,' I guess. But it didn't really reflect the reality of my actual contact hours and workload. Because of that, I feel like the practice is just hard to adapt to my specific role."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 5: "I first heard about UDL through policy guidelines for inclusive education. It led me to really value the idea of barrier-free learning, but hmmm... I still struggle to actually apply it when my classroom is so overcrowded."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 6: "I learned about it through administrative briefings. It shaped my understanding of UDL as</i></p>	<p>c.2 Formal educational policies and school mandates</p> <p>c.6 Less realistic workload tracking</p> <p>c.2 Policy guidelines for inclusive education</p> <p>c.2 Administrative briefings and monitoring</p> <p>c.2 UDL through school-level training and monitoring processes</p> <p>c.2 A useful principle</p> <p>c.1 Flexible learning constraints</p>	<p><b>Spatial, and Classroom Pressures</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Time constraints</li> <li>Guidelines</li> <li>Large class sizes</li> <li>Actual conditions</li> <li>Overcrowded classes</li> <li>School culture</li> <li>Resource-poor rooms</li> <li>Poor infrastructure.</li> <li>Classrooms lack</li> <li>Guidelines</li> <li>Available resources</li> <li>'Meaningful information</li> <li>Lack clarity</li> <li>Instructional spaces</li> <li>Daily classroom struggles</li> </ul> <p><b>Category 5: Technological Infrastructure and Material Deficits</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lacks the necessary technology</li> <li>Accessibility of the technology</li> <li>Overcrowding</li> <li>Internet materials</li> <li>Basic digital resources</li> <li>Training</li> <li>Big UDL goals</li> <li>Inclusive learning</li> <li>Technology gaps</li> <li>Infrastructure issues</li> <li>Accessible classrooms</li> <li>Resource-poor environments</li> <li>Instructional help</li> <li>Supplemental resources</li> <li>Limited resources</li> <li>Large class sizes</li> <li>Time constraints</li> <li>"one-size-fits-all"</li> <li>Policy's intention</li> <li>Actual classroom conditions</li> <li>Rigid curriculum</li> <li>Clearer guidelines</li> <li>Adequate resources</li> </ul> <p><b>Category 6: Time Poverty and Rigid Curricular Frameworks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Curriculum pacing</li> <li>Actual contact hours</li> <li>Workload</li> <li>Heavy workload</li> <li>Planning time</li> <li>Less realistic</li> <li>Time-consuming</li> <li>Whole process</li> <li>Administrative burdens</li> </ul> <p><b>Category 7: Stakeholder Collaboration and Peer Networks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stronger collaboration</li> <li>More beneficial.</li> <li>Ongoing support</li> <li>Feasible</li> <li>Key improvement</li> <li>Learning barriers</li> <li>Vital structure</li> <li>Sustain practices</li> <li>School leadership</li> <li>Actual classroom conditions</li> <li>Consistent assistance</li> </ul>	
--	---	---	--

<p><i>a major priority, but the problem is the monitoring—it focuses more on compliance rather than actual support. That really impacts how I practice it."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 7: "Hmmm... I was introduced to UDL through school-level training and those monitoring processes. It's encouraged me to stay accountable to the practices, even if I'm constantly feeling that pressure to just comply with the rules."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 8: "I first learned about UDL through policy documents about accessibility. It made me interpret it as a very useful principle, but in reality, our limited resources make full implementation in the classroom quite a challenge."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 9: "Actually, I learned about UDL through teacher training sessions. While it gave me that desire to have more flexible learning, the reality of technology gaps and time constraints makes the actual implementation a bit of a struggle."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 10: "I gained awareness through the school division guidelines. It shaped my view that UDL is useful in principle, especially for teaching, but with such large class sizes? It's just hard to follow those guidelines to the letter."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 11: "I learned about UDL through department mandates and performance ratings. I'm actually very passionate about the method! But you know, infrastructure issues—like the lack of Wi-Fi—really hinder my ability to practice it the way it's supposed to be."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 12: "It was introduced to us as a specific instructional approach that administrators monitor. I think the training would be much more meaningful if it were just better aligned with what we actually experience in the school setting."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 13: "I learned about UDL through professional workshops and monitoring. It shaped how I see UDL as a means for inclusive learning, but sometimes it feels like the focus is just too much on the compliance side of things."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 14: "I got my understanding of UDL through school-level guidelines and seminars. I do value the flexible learning aspect, but the pressure of administrative monitoring definitely influences how I end up following the guidelines."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 15: "I learned about it through training sessions that presented it as a principle for accessibility. It made me see it as</i></p>	<p>c.4 Large class sizes as a barrier to guideline compliance</p> <p>c.2 UDL as a component of department mandates and performance ratings</p> <p>c.1 Specific instructional approach</p> <p>c.3 UDL through professional workshops and monitoring</p> <p>c.2 Administrative Monitoring as a driver of UDL Guideline Compliance</p> <p>c.4 Time Constraints as a Barrier to Full Implementation</p> <p>c.3 The Gap between the Goals and Conditions inside the</p>	<p>Departmental support Actual workflow Administrative burdens Accountable Flexible learning Lack of department support Continuous support Professional development School-level workshops Professional pressure</p> <p><b>Category 8: Leadership Adaptation, Coaching, and Professional Support</b> Leadership Sustained professional development Compliance monitoring Coaching Support Clearer guidelines Meaningful information Building structures Alignment ng support Regular training Flexible teaching Performance evaluations. Specific instructional approach Removing barriers Flexible learning Highly passionate Regular teacher training, Department-level support Instructional help Equal opportunities</p> <p><b>Category 9: Financial Allocation and Ground-Up Policy Planning</b> School setting Whole implementation Feasible Material preparation Budget line item Dedicated budget line Zero planning time</p>	
---	--	---	--

<p><i>something useful, yet I really struggle with how 'time-consuming' it is to actually implement it fully."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 16: "I first learned about UDL through the policy intentions shared by our school. It shaped my goal to have inclusive learning, but I honestly observe a big gap between those goals and the actual conditions inside my classroom."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 17: "I learned about UDL through divisional guidelines and stakeholder briefings. I see it as a framework for engagement and making learning enjoyable, but I believe sustainability depends on aligning these policies with our actual school conditions."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 18: "Same po sa kanila po, ma'am/sir."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 19: "It was introduced through school mandates that signal it as a priority. This has shaped my practice to focus mostly on 'compliance on paper,' simply because it's so hard to implement with such limited materials."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 20: "I learned about UDL through my own professional experience and current school mandates. I interpret it as a design thinking framework, and honestly? I believe it should be co-created with teacher input rather than just being this 'top-down' mandate."</i></p> <p><b>IGQ3:</b>  <u>In what ways does UDL relate to your responsibilities in your school, and which aspects of it are most relevant to your role?</u></p> <p><i>Respondent 1: "Actually, UDL relates quite a bit to my responsibility of supporting flexible teaching and making things accessible. For me, the most relevant part is really creating that barrier-free learning environment... though, of course, things like limited resources and these large class sizes make it a real challenge."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 2: "I see it as a set of inclusive objectives that I'm responsible for practicing and applying inside the classroom. So, siguro, the actual application of these inclusive goals is really the most relevant aspect of my role right now."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 3: "Well, UDL is tied to my duty of providing flexible learning. The most relevant part for me is the intention to promote that flexible, barrier-free setup... but honestly, it's often restricted because the curriculum pacing is just so rigid."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 4: "For me, in my specific role, it comes through those general inclusive quality guidelines. Promoting flexible learning is definitely the most relevant aspect,</i></p>	<p>Classroom</p> <p>c.2 Divisional Guidelines and Stakeholder Briefings</p> <p>c.3 limited materials</p> <p>c.2 Teacher Input and Co-creation over Top - Down Mandates</p> <p>c.1 Supporting flexible and accessible UDL strategies amid limited resources and large class sizes</p> <p>c.1 Practicing and Applying Inclusive Objectives Inside the Classroom</p>		
---	---	--	--

<p><i>although—to be honest—I find it really difficult to adapt to my actual contact hours and my current workflow."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 5: "Hmm, it's in following the policies to promote flexible and barrier-free learning. Flexibility is definitely the most relevant aspect for me, but it's just so hard to apply it consistently when you're dealing with overcrowded classes."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 6: "In my role, it's about implementing those guidelines for inclusive education. The most relevant part is removing learning barriers, though I've noticed the administrative focus is more on compliance than actual support, which really impacts how I practice it."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 7: "UDL is definitely tied to my responsibility of maintaining inclusive and flexible practices. The most relevant part is adapting my teaching to meet various student needs, especially since I need to stay accountable to our school-level monitoring."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 8: "It's part of my responsibilities to provide flexible teaching and accessibility. For me, accessibility is the most relevant aspect, even with the constant time constraints and the large class sizes we have."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 9: "It involves using UDL as an approach for inclusive and flexible learning. Reducing those barriers to learning is what's most relevant to me, but the lack of technology and enough planning time are major hurdles, parang ang hirap i-balance."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 10: "Hmmm, I'd say it relates through policies that support flexible teaching. The principles of accessibility are definitely the most relevant for me when I'm trying to reach all the different learners in my classes."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 11: "UDL is seen as a method for inclusive, flexible learning—it's even something they look at during our performance evaluations. The inclusive nature of the delivery is most relevant to me, though infrastructure gaps, like the lack of Wi-Fi, really hinder that."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 12: "Siguro... it's about using the instructional approach that is monitored by our administrators. The most relevant aspect for me is the support and help provided by the admins to actually make the implementation feel meaningful."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 13: "My responsibility is really to achieve inclusive and flexible learning through these UDL practices. The goal of removing barriers is the most relevant part,</i></p>	<p>c.1 UDL: Providing a Flexible and Barrier - Free Setup</p> <p>c.6 Promoting flexible learning within contact hours and workflow constraints</p> <p>c.1 Policies to promote flexible and barrier – free learning</p> <p>c2. Implementing guidelines for inclusive education</p> <p>c1. Maintaining inclusive and flexible practices</p> <p>c1. Providing flexible teaching and accessibility</p> <p>c1. Utilizing UDL for Inclusive</p>		
--	---	--	--

<p><i>though the resource constraints we face make it so hard to actually achieve."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 14: "It relates to the responsibility of implementing a framework for flexible learning. Flexibility is definitely the most relevant aspect of my role, but—you know—large class sizes make full implementation very difficult."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 15: "UDL provides these useful guidelines for my teaching and accessibility responsibilities. The most relevant aspect for me is flexible teaching, although I'll be honest, it's often seen as quite time-consuming."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 16: "It relates to my responsibility of meeting policy goals for inclusive and flexible learning. Flexibility is the most relevant aim, I think, despite the huge gap between policy intentions and the actual classroom reality we face."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 17: "My responsibility is to ensure that all learners can participate, engage, and really enjoy learning. Engagement and participation are the most relevant aspects for me, focusing on making the learning realistic and sustainable for my students."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 18: "Same po."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 19: "It relates to the responsibility of promoting that flexible, 'barrier-free' learning. The most relevant part is the removal of barriers, though sometimes I feel pressured to just demonstrate this 'on paper' for the sake of compliance."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 20: "I view UDL as a design thinking framework that relates to my responsibility of providing students with options. The most relevant aspect for me is allowing students multiple ways to demonstrate their understanding of a learning target."</i></p> <p><b>IGQ4:</b>  <u>How confident do you feel in applying UDL concepts, and what examples can you share that show how you use or adapt UDL in practice?</u></p> <p><i>Respondent 1: I feel confident in the principle of removing barriers but struggles with full implementation due to large class sizes and limited materials.</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 2: I feel confident in the inclusive objectives, but feel significant pressure due to administrative accountability and the insistence on practice.</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 3: Hmm.. I value the goal of flexibility but finds it difficult to apply consistently or at the required depth because of rigid curriculum pacing.</i></p>	<p>and Flexible Learning</p> <p>c2. Policies that support flexible teaching</p> <p>c1. UDL as a method for inclusive and flexible learning</p> <p>c8. Using an administrator-monitored instructional approach</p> <p>c8. The goal of removing barriers despite resource constraints</p> <p>c4. Large class sizes make full implementation very difficult</p> <p>c5. Teaching and Accessibility Responsibilities</p>		
---	---	--	--



<p><i>classes make the actual practice challenging.</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 20: Views UDL as a design thinking framework; an example of practice is providing students with at least two options to demonstrate understanding of a learning target.</i></p> <p><b>IGQ 5:</b> <u>What challenges or misunderstandings about UDL have you personally encountered when trying to apply it to your own role and what motivates you to support or use UDL despite these?</u></p> <p><i>Respondent 1: The primary challenges are limited resources, large class sizes, and time constraints. Despite these, they are motivated by the goal of supporting flexible teaching and providing equal learning opportunities.</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 2: Most of us are slightly pressured by the accountability and "compliance on paper" required by the administration. They remain motivated by the inclusive objectives set for students and the belief in the practice of these goals.</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 3: Hmm, the challenge is the gap between UDL intentions and the reality of rigid curriculum pacing and overcrowded classes. They are motivated by the school's priority signal and the desire to create barrier-free learning.</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 4: We find it difficult to adapt UDL to their specific workflow and contact hours. Motivation comes from an awareness of inclusive quality guidelines and the theoretical benefits of flexible learning.</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 5: Some challenges include a lack of materials and a rigid curriculum that makes consistent application difficult. They are motivated by the belief that UDL is a priority for creating realistic, sustainable, inclusive practices.</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 6: The focus of monitoring on compliance rather than meaningful support is a major hurdle. They are motivated by the intention to promote flexible, barrier-free learning despite overcrowded conditions.</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 7: Encountered gaps due to a lack of technology and training time. They are motivated by school-level monitoring that encourages accountability and the potential for stronger collaboration.</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">barriers</p> <p>c.4 Significant pressure on administrative accountability and the insistence on practice</p> <p>c.1 Valuing the goal of flexibility</p> <p>c.1 Struggling to adapt UDL to their specific role</p> <p>c.4 Overcrowded classes make consistent application difficult</p> <p>c.8 Achieving the intended depth is hard when monitoring focuses primarily on compliance</p> <p>c.8 School - level monitoring</p> <p>c.1 Supporting the principle of accessibility</p> <p>c.5 Desiring to implement inclusive learning</p> <p>c.1 The usefulness of UDL in principle for reaching all learners</p> <p>c.8 Highly passionate</p>		
---	--	--	--

<p><i>Respondent 8: Time constraints and large class sizes are significant barriers to full implementation. Motivation stems from the principle of accessibility and the belief that UDL is useful for all students.</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 9: Challenges include a lack of technology and enough planning time. They are motivated by the goal of reducing barriers and the hope that regular training will eventually improve implementation.</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 10: Found that classrooms often lack the necessary materials and technology to support UDL. They are motivated by the fact that UDL supports reaching all learners in principle.</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 11: Infrastructure issues, such as the absence of Wi-Fi and poor classroom conditions, are major challenges. Their motivation comes from a deep passion for teaching and a desire to deliver inclusive lessons despite the lack of department support.</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 12: The main challenge is the "one-size-fits-all" nature of policies that don't match individual school settings. They are motivated by the possibility of making UDL more realistic through clearer administrative expectations.</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 13: They encounter a gap between policy goals and the practice of teaching in rooms that lack training and resources. Motivation is driven by the desire to stay accountable and apply inclusive practices.</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 14: Large class sizes and time constraints make full implementation feel nearly impossible. They are motivated by the belief that stronger collaboration and clearer guidelines will eventually make the practice feasible.</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 15: Applying UDL is seen as very time-consuming given the current classroom realities. They are motivated by the usefulness of accessibility principles and the support offered by school-level monitoring.</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 16: Observe a clear gap between the policy's intention and actual classroom conditions. They are motivated by the idea that UDL, if properly supported, can sustain more flexible learning environments.</i></p>	<p>c.9 Administrative support in the school setting</p> <p>c.8 Goal of removing barriers</p> <p>c.1 Flexibility as a core principle</p> <p>c.1 UDL as a useful guideline for accessibility</p> <p>c.1 The aim of flexibility</p> <p>c.7 Sustainable practice</p> <p>c.3 UDL for compliance</p> <p>c.1 UDL as a design thinking framework</p>		
---	--	--	--



<p><i>time necessary to meet inclusive and flexible learning goals.</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 8: There is large scale spaces, limited resources, and time constraints make full implementation difficult in their role.</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 9: Challenges include a lack of technology, limited materials, and not having enough time for planning within the daily schedule.</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 10: Experiences difficulty due to large class sizes and time constraints, noting that classrooms often lack the materials and technology to support UDL.</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 11: Mentions that not all schools have Wi-Fi or accessible classrooms in good condition. Lack of planning time is also a major hurdle to delivering inclusive lessons.</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 12: Identifies big classes, limited resources, and rigid curriculum pacing as the primary gaps between policy intentions and school conditions.</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 13: Finds that large class sizes and a lack of training for teachers in rooms that lack resources make achieving inclusive learning hard.</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 14: Experiences challenges with large class sizes and time constraints that make full implementation feel difficult to achieve.</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 15: The implementation of UDL is very "time consuming" due to large class sizes and a lack of planning time.</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 16: Challenges include a lack of materials, technology, and training, alongside the pressure of large class sizes.</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 17: Emphasizes that current school conditions, such as limited resources and the need for more internal/external support, make it difficult to apply UDL realistically.</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 18: Same po.</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 19: Points to the reality of overcrowded classes and rigid curriculum pacing as conditions that make it difficult to apply UDL consistently.</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 20: Identifies "one-size-fits-all" mandates and a lack of accountability for resources as major challenges, particularly when policies aren't differentiated by subject or school context.</i></p>	<p>overcrowded condition</p> <p>c.3 School – level monitoring that encourages accountability and collaboration</p> <p>c.4 Time constraints and large class sizes</p> <p>c.5 Lack of necessary materials and technology</p> <p>c.4 Absence of Wi-Fi, poor classroom conditions, and lack of department support</p> <p>c.5 One-size-fits-all</p> <p>c.3 Gap between policy goals and the practice of teaching in rooms</p>		
<p><b>IGQ 7:</b></p> <p><u>How do resource limitations such as materials, time, and workload affect your ability to plan and implement UDL-aligned lessons?</u></p> <p><i>Respondent 1: "Hmmm... to be honest, the limited resources and time constraints just make full implementation of UDL really difficult. It's useful in principle,</i></p>	<p>c.3 Collaboration and clearer</p>		

<p><i>definitely, but the reality on the ground is just different."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 2: "With such a high workload and having a large number of classes, it creates this significant gap, you know? There's the objective of inclusive learning on one side, and then there's our actual practice on the other."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 3: "The reality is that overcrowded classes and limited materials make it so hard to apply UDL at the depth they envision in the guidelines. We want to do it, but we're restricted."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 4: "Actually, my current workflow and this heavy workload make it quite difficult to adapt UDL concepts to my actual contact hours. There's just not enough time in the day to make it all fit."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 5: "I really feel that gap between the policy intentions and reality. It's mostly due to the overcrowded classes and the fact that we have very limited materials to work with."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 6: "I'd say the limited materials and our overcrowded conditions really restrict us. It's hard to apply UDL consistently when you're just trying to manage the sheer number of students."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 7: "In our classrooms, we really lack the necessary materials and, honestly, enough time for planning. It creates this gap where our goals and our actual practices just don't meet."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 8: "Limited resources and time constraints are definitely the biggest factors. They make the full implementation of flexible teaching very difficult, even if we're trying our best."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 9: "I'd specifically point to the lack of materials and not having 'enough time for planning.' Those are the major hurdles for me when I try to implement inclusive learning properly."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 10: "You know, UDL is useful in principle, but the time constraints and the lack of materials in the classroom really hinder the practice. It's hard to be flexible when you have so little to work with."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 11: "I really want to emphasize that we teachers need more planning time. The lack of materials and technology in the classroom creates a real gap in achieving those UDL goals."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 12: "I think the limited resources and the administrative burdens make UDL implementation feel less realistic. It's hard to focus on flexible teaching when the paperwork and resource issues are so heavy."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 13: "It's really the large</i></p>	<p>guidelines</p> <p>c.6 Time - consuming</p> <p>c.5 Policy's intention and actual classroom conditions</p> <p>c.1 Motivation comes from learner's participation and engagement</p> <p>c.1 Motivation</p> <p>c.5 One-size-fits-all mandate and accountability</p>		
--	---	--	--

<p><i>class sizes and the time constraints. They make it so difficult to fully implement UDL-aligned lessons the way they're supposed to be done."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 14: "It's the same for me—limited resources and time. Those are the primary reasons why full implementation is just so hard to achieve right now."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 15: "Actually, the whole process of implementing UDL is very 'time-consuming.' When you combine that with our limited resources, it just makes everything a struggle."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 16: "Our classrooms often lack the materials and the planning time we need to fulfill the policy's intention. We want to provide flexible learning, but the support just isn't there."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 17: "I feel that policies are often not aligned with the resources we actually have. It makes planning time difficult and the whole implementation feels less sustainable in the long run."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 18: "Same po, ma'am/sir. Hirap talaga sa resources."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 19: "The limited materials and daily teaching demands make it so hard to move beyond 'compliance on paper.' We want to do more, but we're stuck just trying to meet the requirements."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 20: "The real issue is the 'no accountability for resources.' Every UDL requirement should have a corresponding budget line item to be feasible. Without that, it's just not realistic for us."</i></p> <p><b>IGQ 8:</b>  <u>In what ways do technology limitations or access issues hinder your use of UDL strategies?</u></p> <p><i>Respondent 1: "Actually, while UDL is really useful in principle, the problem is our classrooms. We often lack the necessary technology to support it, and that's what makes full implementation so difficult for us."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 2: "For me, I'd say 'accessibility on the technology' is a main problem. It's a huge factor that creates this gap between our inclusive learning goals and what we can actually do in practice."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 3: "I've observed a real gap between policy intentions and the reality of our limited materials and technology. It really restricts how consistently we can apply UDL in our lessons."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 4: "I'd specifically mention 'overcrowding and internet materials' as the main barriers. It makes it so hard to promote flexible learning when you don't even have the basic digital resources."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 5: "I definitely experience a gap in implementation.</i></p>	<p>c.4 Time constraints</p> <p>c.4 Large number of classes and a heavy workload</p> <p>c.3 Gap between overcrowded classes and a rigid curriculum</p> <p>c.6 Specific workflow and contact hours</p> <p>c.4 Curriculum and overcrowded classes</p> <p>c.3 Reality of overcrowded classes and limited materials</p> <p>c.5 Lack of materials, technology training, and planning</p> <p>c.4 Large scale spaces and limited resources</p> <p>c.5 Lack of technology and limited materials</p>		
---	--	--	--

<p><i>Because of the limited materials and technology, it's hard to reach the depth that the UDL guidelines envision."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 6: "The thing is, our classrooms lack both the technology and the training required. We can't really apply UDL consistently at that 'envisioned depth' if we don't know how to use the tools—if the tools even exist."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 7: "I'd highlight that we often lack 'technology training' and even just adequate materials. It creates a gap between those big UDL goals and our daily practices."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 8: "I'd identify the 'lack of technology' as the primary reason for the gap. There's a big difference between the aim of inclusive learning and the actual conditions we have in school."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 9: "Honestly, the lack of technology and limited materials are just major hurdles. They really hinder us from successfully implementing UDL the way it's meant to be."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 10: "In my experience, classrooms often lack technology and proper training. It creates a very noticeable gap between the goals of flexible learning and what actually happens in class."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 11: "You know, 'not all schools have Wi-Fi.' That's the reality. And many don't even have accessible classrooms in good condition to support any technology-based UDL."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 12: "I'd say 'limited resources' is the major factor here. If we don't have the technological tools, it makes the whole UDL implementation feel a bit unrealistic, seguro."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 13: "It's the lack of technology and training in the actual rooms. It creates a gap between the policy intentions of inclusive learning and our actual daily practice."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 14: "Our classrooms just lack the materials and tech. That's really what prevents us from fully achieving those UDL goals they set for us."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 15: "I've noticed that the lack of technology and training in the classroom really hinders our ability to provide that flexible and accessible learning we're aiming for."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 16: "The lack of technology is definitely one of the key factors creating that gap. The policy intentions are good, but the actual school conditions just don't match up."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 17: "We need 'available resources' rather than just 'limited'</i></p>	<p>c.4 Difficulty due to large class sizes and time constraints</p> <p>c.6 Lack of planning time and major hurdle of delivering inclusive lessons</p> <p>c.5 Limited resources and rigid curriculum</p> <p>c.8 Lack of training for teachers</p> <p>c.4 Challenges with large class sizes</p> <p>c.6 Time consuming</p> <p>c.3 Lack of materials and technology</p> <p>c.5 Limited resources</p> <p>c.4 Points the reality of overcrowded</p>		
--	---	--	--

<p>ones. The lack of internal or external technological support makes UDL very difficult to apply in a real way." Respondent 18: "Same po. Hirap talaga pag walang tech." Respondent 19: "The 'reality of overcrowded classes' usually goes hand-in-hand with limited materials and technology. It makes that 'barrier-free' learning goal very hard to achieve." Respondent 20: "It comes down to a lack of accountability for resources. Without a specific 'budget line item' for technology and materials, these UDL mandates just stay one-size-fits-all and, frankly, impractical."</p> <p><b>IGQ 9:</b>  <u>What difficulties do you encounter when preparing multiple instructional materials or assessment options, and how does collaborating with colleagues influence this process?</u></p> <p>Respondent 1: Mentions that preparing diverse materials is difficult due to large class sizes and limited resources. They emphasize that stronger collaboration between administrators and teachers is necessary to sustain these practices.</p> <p>Respondent 2: Notes that the "workload of the teachers" and a large number of classes make it hard to move from objectives to actual practice. They believe collaboration between admin, teachers, and stakeholders is beneficial to sustain UDL.</p> <p>Respondent 3: Finds it difficult to apply UDL at the necessary depth due to a rigid curriculum. They suggest that structures reducing administrative burdens and fostering professional development would make preparation more realistic.</p> <p>Respondent 4: States that the current workflow and contact hours make it "difficult to adapt" and prepare various materials, specifically noting a lack of internet-based resources.</p> <p>Respondent 5: Experiences difficulties due to overcrowded classes and limited materials. They advocate for ongoing support and collaboration to help align policies with actual classroom conditions.</p> <p>Respondent 6: Highlights that the depth of preparation envisioned in guidelines is hard to achieve alone. I call for stronger collaboration and planning time to make implementation feasible.</p> <p>Respondent 7: I think that out a lack of "technology training and enough time for planning." Some teachers here in your school believe that stronger collaboration between administrators and teachers would</p>	<p>c.5 One-size-fits-all mandates and lack of accountability</p> <p>c.1 UDL is difficult</p> <p>c.1 Objective of inclusive learning</p> <p>c.4 Overcrowded classes and limited materials</p> <p>c.6 Workflow and heavy workload</p> <p>c.3 Gap between policy intentions and reality</p> <p>c.3 Limited materials and overcrowded conditions</p>		
---	--	--	--

<p>help sustain the creation of inclusive materials.</p> <p><i>Respondent 8: I found that time constraints and large spaces make it difficult to prepare multiple options. I suggest that stronger collaboration is a key improvement needed for feasible implementation.</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 9: I struggle with a lack of technology and "enough time for planning." I want that collaboration with other teachers would help sustain UDL practices.</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 10: I found that a lack of materials and training creates a gap. I want ... emphasize that stronger collaboration between administrators and teachers is vital for meaningful implementation.</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 11: There is a need for greater departmental support for teachers and stronger collaboration with administration to overcome planning-time hurdles.</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 12: I think preparation is difficult when policies aren't aligned with the "actual setting." They believe support that reduces administrative burdens would help teachers focus on meaningful material design.</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 13: I think there is a lack of training for teachers in resource-poor rooms, which makes preparation hard. I call for stronger collaboration to help situation and sustain practices.</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 14: Siguro may experience difficulty due to large class sizes and time constraints. We need stronger collaboration between administrators and teachers as a necessary improvement.</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 15: Meron sa preparation of multiple options was "time-consuming." I believe stronger collaboration would help sustain these practices despite limited resources.</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 16: Maari po may ahh a lack of training and planning time. Maari siguro ... suggest that stronger collaboration is essential to move beyond "compliance on paper" to actual classroom practice.</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 17: I suggest that preparing multiple options is only sustainable if the policies align with available resources. So that .. advocate for consistency of support from internal and external stakeholders.</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 18: Same po.</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 19: Kinakaharap ay ang with the pressure to demonstrate UDL on paper. Naniniwala ako that prioritizing inclusion and reducing burdens through collaboration would make preparation more realistic.</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 20: Maari sa "top-down</i></p>	<p>c.5 Lack the necessary materials</p> <p>c.5 Limited resources and time constraints</p> <p>c.7 Lack of materials and time</p> <p>c.1 UDL being useful in principle</p> <p>c.6 Teachers need more planning time</p> <p>c.5 Limited resources and administrative burdens</p> <p>c.9 Difficulty of implementation</p>		
--	--	--	--

<p><i>mandates" and "one-size-fits-all" policies. Kaya nagiging haalng siya sa preparation na magiging mas effective kung may co-created policies na may teacher input sa bawat stage.</i></p> <p><b>IGQ 10:</b>  <u>How do curriculum pacing guides, standardized assessments, and broader school-level or systemic issues limit your flexibility to implement UDL, and what emotional or professional pressures arise from these constraints?</u></p> <p><i>Respondent 1: "Uhm, honestly? Preparing diverse materials is just so difficult when you have these huge class sizes and almost no resources. I really think we need way stronger collaboration between the admins and us teachers if we're ever going to keep these practices going."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 2: "The 'workload of the teachers' is just too much. With so many classes, it's hard to move from those nice objectives to actual practice. Siguro, if the admin, teachers, and stakeholders actually collaborated, it would be much more beneficial."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 3: "I find it really hard to go deep into UDL because the curriculum is just so rigid. If we had structures that actually reduced our administrative burdens and gave us real professional development, preparing materials would feel a lot more realistic."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 4: "Actually, my current workflow and contact hours make it so 'difficult to adapt' and prepare different things. Especially when you don't even have internet-based resources to pull from."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 5: "It's hard, you know? Overcrowded classes and limited materials everywhere. I really advocate for ongoing support and collaboration... we need to align these policies with what's actually happening in our rooms."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 6: "You can't really achieve the 'depth' they want in the guidelines if you're doing it alone. We need stronger collaboration and, more importantly, real planning time to make this feasible."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 7: "There's just a lack of technology training and not nearly enough time for planning. I truly believe that if the admin and teachers worked together more, we could actually sustain the creation of these inclusive materials."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 11: "I have the passion, definitely, but passion isn't enough. We need more support from the department and stronger collaboration with the administration to help us get over these planning time hurdles."</i></p>	<p>c.5 Limited resources and time</p> <p>c.1 Implementing UDL is time consuming</p> <p>c.4 Lack of materials and planning time</p> <p>c.9 Whole implementation is less sustainable</p> <p>c.3 Limited materials and daily teaching demands</p> <p>c.9 UDL should have a corresponding budget line item</p> <p>c.5 Lack the necessary technology and support</p>		
---	---	--	--

<p><i>Respondent 12: "Preparation is just difficult when the policies don't match the 'actual setting' of the school. Support that actually reduces our administrative burdens would let us focus on designing meaningful materials for once."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 15: "Preparing multiple options is just so 'time consuming.' I think stronger collaboration is the only way we can sustain these practices given how limited our resources are."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 18: "Same po, mahirap talaga mag-prepare mag-isa."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 20: "I'm not a fan of these 'top-down mandates' and 'one-size-fits-all' policies. Material preparation would be so much more effective if the policies were co-created with teacher input from the very start."</i></p> <p><b>IGQ 11:</b>  <u>What types of support such as materials, resources, or technology would help you implement UDL more effectively in your classroom role?</u></p> <p><i>Respondent 1: "I really want to emphasize that having adequate resources—I mean actual instructional materials and the right technology—is just essential. It's the only way we can really overcome the challenges of these huge class sizes."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 2: "For me, it's about accessibility. Better technology and more materials are the main factors we need to bridge that gap between our goals and what we actually do in practice."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 3: "We really need policies that don't just tell us what to do, but actually include provisions for resources and tech. That's the only way to promote a truly flexible, barrier-free learning environment, 'di ba?"</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 4: "There's a specific need for internet-based materials and resources that we can actually adapt to our workflow. Right now, it's hard to make it fit into our actual contact hours."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 5: "Providing enough resources and materials is a must. It's the only way to make UDL implementation feel more realistic, especially when we're dealing with overcrowded classes every day."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 6: "We need the materials and technology to move past just 'checking a box.' We want to move from mere compliance to a meaningful, deep implementation, but we can't do that empty-handed."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 7: "Ako siguro masasabi ko to the lack of technology training and materials... I honestly think that if they provided these, we'd be able to meet those UDL goals so much</i></p>	<p>c.5 Accessibility on technology</p> <p>c.3 Real gap between policy intentions and limited materials</p> <p>c.5 Overcrowding and internet materials</p> <p>c.3 Gap in implementation</p> <p>c.5 Classrooms lack both the technology and training</p> <p>c.5 Lack of technology, training, and big UDL goals</p> <p>c.5 Lack of technology as the primary reason for the gap</p> <p>c.5 Lack of technology and limited materials are just major hurdles</p>		
--	--	--	--

<p><i>more effectively than we do now."</i>  <i>Respondent 8: "I'd say supplemental resources and updated technology are the critical improvements we need. It's what would actually make the whole implementation feasible for us."</i>  <i>Respondent 9: "I'm specifically requesting better technology and materials. It's what we need to actually reduce learning barriers and make flexible teaching a real thing, not just a concept."</i>  <i>Respondent 10: "Our classrooms just lack the basics—materials and tech. Providing these would finally close that gap between what the policy intends and what we actually practice."</i>  <i>Respondent 11: "There's a critical need for infrastructure. I mean, let's be real—we need Wi-Fi and classrooms that are actually in good condition. That's what's necessary for UDL delivery."</i>  <i>Respondent 12: "I argue for resources that are actually aligned with our school setting. It would reduce the administrative burden and make our work much more realistic, kumbaga."</i>  <i>Respondent 13: "Teachers in resource-poor rooms really need the right materials. We need technology if we're ever going to achieve the real aim of inclusive learning."</i>  <i>Respondent 14: "Adequate resources and technology... those are the primary supports we need. Without them, full implementation is just not going to be possible."</i>  <i>Respondent 15: "I'm asking for better resources to help manage the 'time-consuming' side of UDL. Preparing all of this takes so much out of us, we need all the help we can get."</i>  <i>Respondent 16: "The lack of materials is the key gap here. We need them to be provided so we can actually support flexible learning the way the policy describes it."</i>  <i>Respondent 17: "We need 'available resources'—not just limited ones—and consistent support. We need everyone, from internal to external stakeholders, to be on the same page with us."</i>  <i>Respondent 18: "Same po. Yun talaga ang kailangan namin."</i>  <i>Respondent 19: "Providing actual sources and materials is essential. Otherwise, UDL implementation will always just be 'compliance on paper' and nothing more."</i>  <i>Respondent 20: "I propose a 'budget-driven' approach. Every single UDL requirement should have a corresponding budget line item. If there's no budget for the materials, the mandate isn't feasible."</i></p>	<p>c.5 Classrooms lack of technology and proper training</p> <p>c.5 Not all schools have Wi-Fi</p> <p>c.5 Limited resources</p> <p>c.5 Lack of technology and training in actual rooms</p> <p>c.5 Classrooms lack of materials and tech</p> <p>c.5 Lack of technology and training</p> <p>c.3 One of the key factors of creating the gap is the lack of technology</p> <p>c.2 Lack of internal or external technological support</p> <p>c.5 No technology</p> <p>c.4 The reality of overcrowded</p>		
--	---	--	--

<p><b>IGQ 12:</b>  <u>How can school leadership better assist you in implementing UDL, including communications and provisions of follow-up support after training?</u></p> <p><i>Respondent 1: "I think leadership can really assist us by providing clearer guidelines and, yun nga, ongoing coaching. We also need dedicated planning time so we can actually move beyond just checking off a compliance list."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 2: "I'd suggest that leadership provide continuous support. We need clearer guidelines on how to actually apply UDL, regular meetings to check in, and of course, the right resources to back it up."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 3: "Leadership should definitely provide clearer expectations. It would be a big help if they shifted the focus from just monitoring compliance to providing meaningful support and sustained professional development."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 4: "For me, leadership support is most helpful when it actually aligns with our workflow. We need prioritized assistance, especially when it comes to adapting materials for our specific contact hours."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 5: "I believe leadership can help by aligning their expectations with our actual school conditions. Ongoing support to reduce those heavy administrative burdens would be a great start."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 6: "Leadership really needs to offer sustained professional development. They should focus on giving us meaningful support rather than just being there for compliance monitoring."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 7: "Leadership should provide clearer guidelines and ongoing coaching. Fostering stronger collaboration is what we need to actually sustain these UDL practices in the long run."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 8: "I think they can assist us through clear guidelines and coaching. Also, ensuring there's stronger collaboration between the administration and us teachers is key."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 9: "Leadership should provide regular teacher training and ongoing coaching. And of course, providing adequate resources is what makes the whole implementation feasible, 'di ba?"</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 10: "Leadership can better assist by giving us much clearer guidelines and coaching. But more importantly, they need to ensure there's enough planning time allocated for us."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 11: "We're calling for</i></p>	<p>classes</p> <p>c.5 Accountability for resources</p> <p>c.5 Large class sizes and limited resources</p> <p>c.6 Workload of the teachers</p> <p>c.7 Reducing administrative burdens</p> <p>c.5 Lack of internet-based resources</p>		
--	--	--	--

<p><i>more support from the department and admin. We really need coaching and clear guidelines, but we also need that sense of stronger collaboration to get things done."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 12: "I argue that leadership must provide clear expectations and resources that are based on our actual setting. It's hard to follow mandates that don't match our classroom conditions."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 13: "Leadership should provide ongoing coaching to help us—especially those in resource-poor rooms. Clearer guidelines would help us achieve those inclusive goals despite the challenges."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 14: "I believe school leadership should foster stronger collaboration. We need that regular training and coaching to really sustain the practice, hindi yung pakitang-tao lang."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 15: "Leadership should provide clear guidelines and coaching to help us manage how time-consuming UDL preparation is. It's hard to do it all alone without proper guidance."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 16: "I suggest leadership assists us by moving away from just focusing on compliance. Instead, they should provide the training and the planning time that's actually necessary for real practice."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 17: "Administrators and stakeholders really must be fully adept with the actual school conditions. They need to provide consistent, realistic support that fits what's happening on the ground."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 18: "Same po. Sana talaga maging realistic ang expectations."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 19: "Leadership can better assist by providing clearer expectations and ongoing support. We need structures that prioritize actual inclusion over just filling out administrative paperwork."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 20: "Leadership should really move away from these top-down mandates. They should co-create policies with teacher input and ensure there's a specific budget line item for every UDL requirement."</i></p> <p><b>IGQ 13:</b>  <u>How can collaboration among teachers be strengthened to support UDL planning, sharing of materials, and consistent implementation?</u></p> <p><i>Respondent 1: "I really believe that stronger collaboration between</i></p>	<p>c.4 Overcrowded classes</p> <p>c.7 Stronger collaboration and planning time</p> <p>c.5 Technology training and enough time for planning</p> <p>c.4 Time constraints and large spaces</p> <p>c.5 Struggle with a lack of technology</p> <p>c.3 Lack of materials and training creates a gap</p> <p>c.7 Greater departmental support</p>		
--	---	--	--

<p><i>administrators and us teachers is essential. It's the only way we can actually sustain UDL and finally move beyond, you know, just simple compliance."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 2: "For me, I think collaboration between the admin, the teachers, and even the stakeholders is so beneficial. It's how we can actually sustain the practice and reach those inclusive objectives we set."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 3: "Siguro, our school structures should really prioritize inclusion and—sana—reduce those administrative burdens. That would actually give us the space we need for professional collaboration."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 4: "Uhm, support should be prioritized to help us adapt materials together. It needs to reflect our actual workflow and those heavy contact hours we deal with every day."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 5: "I'm really advocating for ongoing support and collaboration. We need to align these UDL policies with the actual conditions we face, like our overcrowded classrooms."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 6: "We really need stronger collaboration and, yun nga, shared planning time. That's the only way teachers can apply UDL at the depth they're envisioning in the guidelines."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 7: "I want to emphasize that stronger collaboration between the admin and teachers would help us sustain these practices. It's a big help in overcoming that constant lack of planning time."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 8: "I'd identify stronger collaboration as a key improvement. Honestly, it's what's needed to make the implementation of UDL-aligned lessons actually feasible for us."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 9: "Collaboration with other teachers is just necessary, 'di ba? It's how we sustain UDL and effectively reduce those learning barriers for our students."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 10: "I truly believe that stronger collaboration between administrators and teachers is a vital structure. It's the only way to really improve how we implement UDL."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 11: "I'm specifically calling for more support from the department and the admin. Collective support is what we need to sustain our passion for teaching, especially when things get hard."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 12: "Collaboration should really focus on making the approach realistic to our school setting. It has to be supported by actual instructional help from the administration, hindi lang puro utos."</i></p>	<p>c.2 Policies aren't aligned with the actual setting.</p> <p>c.7 Stronger collaboration to help situation and sustain practices</p> <p>c.4 Experience difficulty due to large class sizes</p> <p>c.6 Time-consuming and limited resources</p> <p>c.3 Lack of training and planning</p> <p>c.2 Policies align with available resources</p> <p>c.1 Prioritizing inclusion and reducing burdens</p>		
--	--	--	--



<p><i>should be prioritized and adapted to reflect our real situation—you know, our actual workflow and those heavy contact hours. It has to be realistic for the teachers."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 5: "I believe effectiveness would really improve if policies were aligned with what's happening in our rooms. We need provisions for ongoing support and the resources to actually make it happen."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 6: "We're calling for structures that offer sustained professional development. We also need to reduce the administrative burdens just to make the whole implementation feel more realistic for us."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 7: "I'd point to the need for much clearer guidelines and regular training. We need structures that make it easier for administrators and teachers to actually collaborate, hindi 'yung kanya-kanya."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 8: "I recommend policies that give us clearer guidelines and maybe some supplemental resources. Ongoing coaching would also be a big help to keep us on the right track."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 9: "Siguro, regular teacher training and adequate resources should be formalized within the school structures. That's the only way to improve the feasibility of UDL in the long run."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 10: "I'm advocating for clearer guidelines and structures that actually ensure we have enough planning time. A little bit of ongoing coaching for us teachers would go a long way, too."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 11: "I really want to emphasize the need for departmental support. We need structures that ensure basic things—like Wi-Fi and classrooms in good condition—are actually available to everyone."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 12: "I'd suggest that school-level structures should focus more on providing meaningful support rather than just monitoring compliance. We really need to reduce the administrative burdens we're carrying."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 13: "I'd recommend clearer guidelines and stronger collaboration. We need those structures to help us sustain UDL practices, especially for those of us working in resource-poor environments."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 14: "We need regular teacher training and adequate resource allocation built directly into the school-level guidelines. It shouldn't be an afterthought, 'di ba?"</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 15: "I believe that clear</i></p>	<p>c.7 Ongoing support and collaboration</p> <p>c.7 Stronger collaboration and planning time</p> <p>c.5 Lack of technology training</p> <p>c.7 Support from the department</p> <p>c.7 Support that reduces administrative burdens</p> <p>c.6 Preparing multiple options</p> <p>c.9 Preparing alone</p> <p>c.5 One-size-fits all</p>		
---	---	--	--

<p><i>guidelines and ongoing coaching would really help mitigate the 'time-consuming' nature of UDL preparation. It's hard to manage all of that alone."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 16: "Policies would be so much more effective if they provided specific planning time. We need to move away from this 'compliance on paper' culture and focus on actual practice."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 17: "I'm arguing for policies that are fully adept with our actual school conditions. We need available resources—real ones, not limited—if they want us to succeed."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 18: "Same po sa kanila. Structure and support talaga ang kailangan."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 19: "I'd recommend structures that reduce the administrative load and offer us sustained professional development. That's what's going to make UDL sustainable for us."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 20: "I propose a major shift. We need co-created policies with teacher input at every step. There should be specific, observable guidelines and—this is the most important part—a budget line item for every single UDL requirement."</i></p> <p><b>IGQ 15:</b>  <u>What role should parents, administrators, the community, and the overall school culture play in promoting and sustaining UDL implementation?</u></p> <p><i>Respondent 1: "I really want to emphasize that administrators must provide stronger collaboration. We need to move way beyond just checking boxes for compliance if we want to sustain this practice—and that has to include actual resource provision."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 2: "For me, I believe that collaboration between administrators, teachers, and all stakeholders is so beneficial. It's the only way to ensure our inclusive objectives are actually practiced and sustained, hindi 'yung sa start lang."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 3: "I'd suggest that our school culture should prioritize inclusion and actively work to reduce those administrative burdens. We need that so teachers can actually focus on flexible learning instead of just paperwork."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 4: "Actually, the overall school structure should prioritize support that reflects our actual workflow as teachers. It shouldn't just be about imposing these top-down mandates on us all the time."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 5: "I'd argue that administrators and stakeholders really must align their expectations with the actual conditions of our</i></p>	<p>c.5 Instructional materials</p> <p>c.5 Better technology and more materials</p> <p>c.1 Flexible and barrier-free learning environment</p> <p>c.5 Internet-based materials and resources</p> <p>c.5 Resources and materials for overcrowded classes</p> <p>c.5 Materials and technology</p>		
--	---	--	--

<p>overcrowded classes. That's the only way to make implementation realistic, 'di ba?"</p> <p>Respondent 6: "I believe administrators should offer sustained professional development. We need a culture of meaningful support rather than just being monitored all the time."</p> <p>Respondent 7: "Administrators play such a key role in fostering stronger collaboration. To me, that's exactly what's necessary to sustain our UDL goals over time."</p> <p>Respondent 8: "I'd identify stronger collaboration between the admin and the teachers as the key cultural shift we need. It's what would make feasible implementation finally happen."</p> <p>Respondent 9: "The community and administrators really should support us by providing adequate resources and technology. That's how we're going to effectively reduce those learning barriers."</p> <p>Respondent 10: "I want to emphasize that administrators must provide clearer guidelines and ongoing coaching. We need that to ensure UDL moves from just a principle to an actual practice in the classroom."</p> <p>Respondent 11: "We're calling for more support from the department and a culture that actually provides infrastructure—like Wi-Fi—to support our passion as teachers. Mahirap magturo kung kulang sa gamit."</p> <p>Respondent 12: "I argue that administrators should focus more on instructional help and reducing our burdens. It would make the approach much more realistic to our school's specific setting."</p> <p>Respondent 13: "I believe administrators should provide that 'situation and sustain' support. We need help, especially those of us in resource-poor rooms, if we're going to achieve these inclusive goals."</p> <p>Respondent 14: "In my view, leadership and stakeholder collaboration are honestly the most important factors for sustaining UDL-aligned practices in the long run."</p> <p>Respondent 15: "Administrators should provide the meaningful information and coaching we need. It's the only way to handle the time-consuming nature of UDL preparation."</p> <p>Respondent 16: "Stronger collaboration across the entire school culture is just essential. It's how we bridge the gap between policy intentions and our classroom reality."</p> <p>Respondent 17: "I'd stress that parents, administrators, and external</p>	<p>c.5 Lack of technology and training</p> <p>c.5 Supplemental resources and updated technology</p> <p>c.5 Technology and materials</p> <p>c.5 Classrooms lack of the basics-materials and tech</p> <p>c.4 Critical need for infrastructure</p> <p>c.9 Resources aligned with the school setting</p> <p>c.4 Teachers in resource-poor rooms</p> <p>c.5 Adequate resources and technology</p>		
--	--	--	--

<p>stakeholders must be fully adept with our actual school conditions. That's how we ensure the support is consistent and sustainable."</p> <p>Respondent 18: "Same po sa kanila. Support and understanding talaga from everyone ang kailangan natin."</p> <p>Respondent 19: "I believe the school culture must prioritize inclusion and sustained development over administrative paperwork. That's what's going to make UDL a reality for us."</p> <p>Respondent 20: "I'm advocating for a culture of co-creation. Administrators and stakeholders should include teacher input at every single stage and provide a dedicated budget line item for these requirements."</p> <p><b>IGQ 16:</b>  <u>What UDL-related professional development have you received, and how helpful has it been in improving your understanding of UDL?</u></p> <p>Respondent 1: "Well, I participated in those school-level workshops and PD sessions. They were actually helpful for understanding UDL as a framework for equal opportunity, but... honestly? It lacked that practical depth we need when dealing with these large classes."</p> <p>Respondent 2: "I received training through school seminars. It was okay, I mean, it was helpful in defining inclusive objectives, but I felt like it emphasized accountability and pressure way more than actually making instruction easier for us."</p> <p>Respondent 3: "Uhm, I attended sessions that focused on formal educational policies. It did improve my understanding of flexibility, which is good, but it didn't really solve the problem of our rigid curriculum pacing, 'di ba?"</p> <p>Respondent 4: "To be honest, I'd describe the training as just 'somewhat relevant.' It wasn't really helpful in addressing my specific workflow or the high number of contact hours I have to manage every single day."</p> <p>Respondent 5: "I got my training through those policy-driven guidelines. It helped me grasp the whole 'barrier-free' learning concept, but I felt like it was totally disconnected from the reality of our overcrowded classes."</p> <p>Respondent 6: "I attended the administrative briefings. While it made me see UDL as a priority, I found that it focused way too much on compliance monitoring rather than giving us actual, practical support."</p> <p>Respondent 7: "I participated in the school-level training. It helped me understand how to adapt my</p>	<p>c.6 Time consuming side of UDL</p> <p>c.3 Lack of materials is the key gap</p> <p>c.4 Available resources and consistent support</p> <p>c.5 Same Needs</p> <p>c.5 Providing actual sources and materials</p> <p>c.9 Budget-driven approach</p> <p>c.8 Leadership</p>		
--	---	--	--

<p><i>teaching to student needs, though I still feel there's a huge gap when it comes to technology training."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 8: "I received training on accessibility and those policy documents. It was helpful in theory, but I found it so difficult to actually translate that into our large-scale classroom spaces."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 9: "I went to the teacher training sessions. They were good for understanding how to reduce learning barriers, yet I felt the sessions didn't really account for the fact that we have zero planning time."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 10: "I received training through the division guidelines. It was helpful for conceptualizing how to reach all learners, but it kind of ignored the reality that we lack basic materials in our actual classrooms."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 11: "I was part of the department-mandated training. It definitely improved my passion for inclusive delivery, but I was so frustrated that the training didn't address our infrastructure issues—like the total lack of Wi-Fi."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 12: "I had training focused on instructional approaches. For me, the training is only really 'meaningful' if the administrators actually follow up with support that fits our actual school setting."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 13: "I attended some professional workshops. It clarified how to achieve inclusive learning, but it's just so hard to apply those things when you're stuck in a resource-poor room."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 14: "I received training through school seminars. It helped with understanding the flexible learning framework, but siguro, the whole thing was just hindered by our constant time constraints."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 15: "I participated in sessions focused on accessibility guidelines. The theory was useful, but I found out pretty quickly that it's just very 'time-consuming' to actually put into practice."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 16: "I attended training on policy intentions. It improved my understanding of the 'aim of flexibility,' but I still observe a major gap between those goals and my actual classroom conditions."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 17: "I received the divisional guidelines and briefings. They were helpful for focusing on learner engagement, but the training has to be realistic to be sustainable, 'di ba? Otherwise, it won't work."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 18: "Same po sa kanila. Theory is okay, but we need more help with the actual application."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 19: "I participated in the mandated school briefings. It helped me see UDL as a priority, but in the</i></p>	<p>c.8 Leadership provides continuous support</p> <p>c.8 Leadership should provide clearer expectations</p> <p>c.8 Leadership support is helpful when aligned with the workflow</p> <p>c.8 Leadership can help align expectations with actual school conditions</p> <p>c.8 Leadership needs to offer sustained professional development</p> <p>c.8 Leadership should provide clearer guidelines</p> <p>c.8 Assist through clear guidelines and coaching</p>		
---	---	--	--

<p>end, it just led to a focus on 'compliance on paper' because the curriculum moves too fast."</p> <p>Respondent 20: "I've had extensive experience with UDL as a design thinking framework. I found the current training helpful for the theory of providing student options, but I have to critique its 'top-down' nature—it needs more teacher input."</p> <p><b>IGQ 17:</b>  <u>Which part of the training was most practical or useful, and which aspects were difficult to apply in real classroom situations?</u></p> <p>Respondent 1: "Actually, I found the concepts of flexible teaching really useful, but... uhm, the practical application was just so difficult because of these large class sizes and the limited materials we have."</p> <p>Respondent 2: "For me, the most practical part was setting those inclusive objectives. But the most difficult? Moving those goals from paper to actual practice, especially when you consider the workload we carry."</p> <p>Respondent 3: "The goal of flexibility was definitely the most meaningful for me. However, it was just so difficult to apply it at the depth they want because our curriculum pacing is so rigid."</p> <p>Respondent 4: "The theory was interesting, honestly. But the training was difficult to apply because it just didn't reflect my specific workflow or the high number of contact hours I manage."</p> <p>Respondent 5: "I think the concept of barrier-free learning is very useful. But applying it consistently? That's the hard part, especially in these overcrowded classrooms."</p> <p>Respondent 6: "I found the guidelines for inclusion quite useful, but applying them in-depth is a struggle when the monitoring focuses more on compliance than actual support."</p> <p>Respondent 7: "The focus on adapting teaching was very practical. But the lack of technology training... yun talaga yung naging struggle ko when trying to implement it in the classroom."</p> <p>Respondent 8: "Accessibility principles were the most useful part. The hardest part, though, was applying them within our time constraints and these large-scale spaces."</p> <p>Respondent 11: "The delivery methods for inclusion were useful in theory, but they're almost impossible to apply in schools that lack Wi-Fi or have such poor infrastructure."</p> <p>Respondent 12: "The instructional approach itself was practical, but it</p>	<p>c.8 Leadership should provide regular teacher training</p> <p>c.8 Leadership can give a clearer guidelines and coaching</p> <p>c.7 Calling for more support from the department and admin</p> <p>c.5 Leadership must provided clearer expectations and resources</p> <p>c.8 Leadership should provide ongoing coaching</p> <p>c.7 School leadership should foster stronger collaboration</p> <p>c.8 Leadership should provide clear guidelines and coaching</p> <p>c.3 Leadership must move away from focusing on compliance</p>		
--	---	--	--



<p><i>training didn't really reflect my actual workflow. It didn't account for the high number of contact hours I manage, so it felt a bit disconnected from my daily routine."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 5: "I observed that the training lacked real solutions. It's hard to apply those UDL principles when the reality is overcrowded classrooms and very limited materials to work with."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 6: "I felt the training focused a lot on theoretical depth, but it kind of ignored the fact that administrative monitoring often prioritizes compliance and paperwork over actual practical support."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 7: "The training lacked specific technology training, and it didn't really offer solutions for the lack of planning time. Those are the two biggest challenges we face as teachers."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 8: "I think the training was useful in principle, but it didn't really solve the challenges of our time constraints or how to manage such large-scale instructional spaces."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 9: "Actually, the training sessions didn't account for the lack of technology. It also didn't address the fact that we have almost no planning time available in our daily schedules."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 10: "I noticed a gap between the goals and our actual practice. The training didn't really show us how to implement UDL when our classrooms are lacking even the most basic materials."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 11: "The training was passionate, which I appreciated, but it didn't address infrastructure issues. For example, how can we deliver UDL strategies if the school doesn't even have Wi-Fi?"</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 12: "I believe the training was only partially effective. It just wasn't aligned with our actual school setting or the heavy administrative burdens that we're expected to carry."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 13: "The training failed to address how difficult it is to implement UDL in resource-poor rooms, especially when you're dealing with such a large student population."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 14: "The training gave us the concepts, but it fell short on the 'how-to.' It didn't address how to manage all these strategies when we are under such severe time constraints."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 15: "I found that the training didn't provide enough 'meaningful information' on the logistics. It's extremely time-consuming to prepare UDL, and they</i></p>	<p>c.7 Stakeholders are beneficial</p> <p>c.7 Professional collaboration</p> <p>c.6 Reflect of actual workflow and heavy contact hours</p> <p>c.7 Advocating for ongoing support and collaboration for overcrowded classrooms</p> <p>c.7 Stronger collaboration and envisioning UDL in the guidelines</p> <p>c.6 Lack of planning time</p> <p>c.7 Stronger collaboration for the implementation of UDL</p> <p>c.7 Collaboration with other teachers</p>		
---	--	--	--



<p><i>There needs to be a real shift from administrative monitoring toward meaningful instructional support that actually helps us teach."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 7: "Siguro to a specific need for technology training and ongoing coaching. That's what's really necessary if we want to sustain this practice over the long term."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 8: "I think stronger collaboration and ongoing coaching are the primary follow-up supports we need. It's the only way to make UDL feasible for us."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 9: "I'm specifically requesting regular teacher training, but it has to come with the provision of adequate resources. Learning what to do doesn't help if we don't have the tools to do it."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 10: "I recommend ongoing coaching and clearer guidelines. But honestly? The training must include dedicated planning time, otherwise, we just can't execute it."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 11: "We need more department-level support and training that actually addresses our infrastructure realities—like how to do UDL when you don't even have stable Wi-Fi."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 12: "I suggest that any training be followed up by instructional help from administrators. It needs to be realistic and actually fit our school's specific setting."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 13: "We really need ongoing coaching and clearer guidelines. It would help us 'situate and sustain' these practices, especially for those of us in resource-poor rooms."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 14: "I believe regular training and coaching are essential. It's the only way to overcome these massive barriers like large class sizes and our constant time constraints."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 15: "I'm asking for meaningful information and coaching that actually helps us handle the 'time-consuming' nature of UDL. We need tips on how to prepare efficiently."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 16: "We need stronger collaboration and training that focuses on actual classroom practice. We're tired of 'compliance on paper'; we want to see how it works in reality."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 17: "I'd stress that training must be realistic. It has to be supported by consistent effort from both internal and external stakeholders to actually be sustainable."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 18: "Same po. Sana yung training, hindi lang basta</i></p>	<p>c.8 Inclusion and professional development through collaboration</p> <p>c.2 Move away from top-down mandates</p> <p>c.5 Advocating for clearer guidelines</p> <p>c.7 Continuous support through regular meetings</p> <p>c.8 Structures that prioritize inclusion</p> <p>c.2 Policies should be prioritized</p> <p>c.7 Provisions for ongoing support</p> <p>c.9 Whole implementation</p> <p>c.8 Clearer guidelines and regular training</p> <p>c.5 Clearer guidelines and supplemental resources</p> <p>c.8 Regular teacher training</p>		
---	---	--	--

<p><i>lecture kundi may actual na tulong sa amin."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 19: "I recommend sustained professional development and structures that prioritize actual inclusion over just more administrative paperwork."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 20: "I propose training on how to co-create policies. We should use observation rubrics focused on 'design thinking,' and honestly? Every training mandate should be tied to a specific budget line item."</i></p> <p><b>IGQ 20:</b>  <u>How relevant was the training to your specific school context, and how confident do you feel in applying what you have learned?</u></p> <p><i>Respondent 1: Feels confident in the principle of providing equal opportunities but finds the training not fully relevant because it didn't account for the reality of large class sizes and limited materials.</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 2: "I'd say the training is relevant as an objective, but honestly? I feel more pressured than confident. It just didn't address the problem—how to manage this heavy workload and the high number of classes we have."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 3: "The training is relevant in theory, siguro. But I lack confidence when it comes to feasibility because they didn't address the rigid curriculum pacing or how to handle these overcrowded classes."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 4: "I'd describe it as only 'somewhat relevant.' I'm finding it difficult to adapt confidently because the training didn't really reflect my actual workflow or my contact hours."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 5: "It's relevant to the 'goal' of inclusion, but less relevant to my daily reality. I feel confident in the concept, definitely, but I really struggle with the implementation part in such overcrowded rooms."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 6: "The training has theoretical relevance, yes. But my confidence is undermined by the monitoring—it focuses so much on 'compliance on paper' rather than the actual depth we were taught."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 7: "I feel confident about the need to adapt my teaching, but the training lacked relevance when it came to the specific technology and the actual planning time we have available here."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 8: "The training was helpful in theory, but I feel less confident about applying it realistically. It's hard to fit those ideas into our time constraints and the large spaces in this school."</i></p>	<p>and adequate resources</p> <p>c.8 Ongoing coaching</p> <p>c.8 Departmental support</p> <p>c.8 Monitoring compliance</p> <p>c.8 Clearer guidelines and stronger collaboration</p> <p>c.8 Regular teacher training</p> <p>c.8 Clear guidelines and ongoing coaching</p> <p>c.3 Compliance on paper</p> <p>c.2 Policies that are fully adept to actual school conditions</p> <p>c.7 Structure and support</p> <p>c.8 Sustained professional development</p> <p>c.9 Budget line item</p> <p>c.3 checking boxes for compliance</p>		
---	--	--	--

<p><i>Respondent 9: "It's relevant to reducing barriers, but I lack confidence in its sustainability. The training didn't really account for our lack of technology and the limited planning time at our site."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 10: "There's a gap in my confidence. I understand the guidelines, but the training didn't feel realistic because it ignored the fact that we lack basic materials in our classrooms."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 11: "I feel passionate and confident in delivering inclusive lessons, but the training felt irrelevant to our infrastructure. How do we do this without Wi-Fi or in these poor classroom conditions?"</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 12: "I think the training is only relevant if administrators actually provide follow-up support. My confidence is tied to whether the approach is actually aligned with our real school setting."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 13: "I understand the framework, but my confidence is low when it comes to applying it in resource-poor rooms. The training just didn't adequately prepare us for that reality."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 14: "The concepts are good, but it's hard to apply them confidently when you're facing severe time constraints and these huge class sizes every day."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 15: "The guidelines are useful, but the training wasn't very relevant to the 'time-consuming' reality of my role. It's left me with pretty mixed confidence, to be honest."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 16: "There's a gap in relevance. The training aims for flexibility, but I lack confidence in actually achieving it because the conditions in our school are just so different."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 17: "I'd argue the training wasn't realistic enough for our context. My confidence would definitely increase if the support from stakeholders was more consistent and grounded."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 18: "Same po. Relevant siya on paper, pero sa actual classroom, nakakawala ng confidence pag walang gamit."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 19: "It's relevant as a 'priority,' I guess. But I lack confidence because I'm basically forced to focus on 'compliance on paper' just to keep up with the rigid pacing."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 20: "I'm highly confident in the 'design thinking' side of UDL. But this top-down training feels irrelevant when there's no accountability for the resources we need to actually make it work."</i></p> <p><b>IGQ 21:</b> What UDL-related policies or</p>	<p>c.8 Collaboration between administrators, teachers, and stakeholders</p> <p>c.4 School culture should prioritize inclusion</p> <p>c.7 Reflects actual workflow</p> <p>c.4 Actual conditions of overcrowded classes</p> <p>c.8 Sustained professional development</p> <p>c.7 Administrators for fostering stronger collaboration</p> <p>c.7 Stronger collaboration between the admin and the teachers</p> <p>c.7 The community and administrators</p> <p>c.8 Administrators must provide clearer guidelines and ongoing coaching</p> <p>c.5 Wi-Fi to support the passion of teachers</p> <p>c.7 Administrators should focus on instructional help</p>		
---	---	--	--

<p><u>guidelines are you aware of in your school or division, and how clear are these in terms of expectations for teachers?</u></p> <p><i>Respondent 1: "I'm aware of the school-level guidelines for equal opportunities, and the framework is clear enough in theory. But honestly? The expectations for how we actually implement this in such large classes are a bit blurry."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 2: "UDL is presented as an objective for inclusive learning, but it feels more like an administrative mandate for accountability. It's more of a 'check-this-box' thing than a clear instructional guide."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 3: "I know there are policies aiming for 'barrier-free learning,' but there's a every noticeable gap between those intentions and the reality of our rigid curriculum pacing."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 4: "I'd describe the guidelines as 'somewhat relevant,' but they're pretty vague. They don't really explain how we should adapt them to our specific workflow and those high contact hours we manage."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 5: "I recognize the policy-driven guidelines for flexibility, but they feel totally disconnected from the reality of overcrowded classrooms and our limited materials."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 6: "The expectations focus on the 'depth envisioned' in the guidelines, but in practice, administrative monitoring prioritizes compliance checklists over actual classroom support."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 7: "I'm aware of the guidelines, but the lack of technology training and planning time makes the specific expectations really difficult to actually meet."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 8: "I've seen the policy documents on accessibility, but the expectations aren't clear on how we're supposed to manage these goals within such severe time constraints."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 9: "I know the aim is to reduce learning barriers, but the policy doesn't seem to account for the lack of technology or the fact that we just don't have enough planning time."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 10: "I'm aware of the division-level guidelines, but the expectations lack clarity when the classroom is missing the basic materials you actually need to execute UDL."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 11: "We know the policy for inclusive delivery, but it's unclear how we're supposed to satisfy it in a school that lacks Wi-Fi or has such poor infrastructure."</i></p>	<p>c.7 Administrators should provide situation and sustain support</p> <p>c.7 Leadership and stakeholder collaboration</p> <p>c.4 Meaningful information and coaching</p> <p>c.7 Stronger collaboration across school culture</p> <p>c.7 Actual school conditions</p> <p>c.7 Support and understanding</p> <p>c.4 School culture should prioritize inclusion and sustained development</p> <p>c.9 Budget line for the requirements</p> <p>c.7 School-level workshops</p> <p>c.2 Training through school seminars</p> <p>c.2 Formal educational policies</p> <p>c.8 Training</p> <p>c.2 Policy-driven guidelines</p>		
--	---	--	--

<p>Respondent 12: "Policies are only 'meaningful' if they actually provide instructional help. Right now, the expectations just don't feel aligned with the actual school setting."</p>	<p>c.8 Compliance monitoring</p>		
<p>Respondent 13: "I recognize the aim for inclusive learning, but the expectations are just so hard to achieve when you're working in a resource-poor room."</p>	<p>c.7 School-level training</p>		
<p>Respondent 14: "I'm aware of the flexible learning framework, but the expectations feel unrealistic when you combine large class sizes with such limited time."</p>	<p>c.8 Training on accessibility and policy documents</p>		
<p>Respondent 15: "The policy on accessibility guidelines is useful, but it's very vague on the actual time and resources required to prepare all these different options."</p>	<p>c.9 Zero planning time</p>		
<p>Respondent 16: "The policy intentions are good, but there's a real gap in clarity regarding how to bridge those intentions with our actual, difficult classroom conditions."</p>	<p>c.2 Division guidelines</p>		
<p>Respondent 17: "I've attended the stakeholder briefings, but the policies aren't realistic or sustainable because they aren't fully adept with what's actually happening in the schools."</p>	<p>c.5 Department-mandated training and infrastructure issues</p>		
<p>Respondent 18: "Same po sa kanila. Mahirap i-apply pag hindi malinaw ang guidelines sa situation namin."</p>	<p>c.8 Instructional approaches</p>		
<p>Respondent 19: "UDL is a priority, sure, but the policy often leads to 'compliance on paper' because it doesn't solve the pressure we feel from curriculum pacing."</p>	<p>c.3 Professional workshops and resource-poor room</p>		
<p>Respondent 20: "The current policies are too 'top-down' and 'one-size-fits-all.' Expectations are unclear because they lack teacher input and there's no budget accountability to back them up."</p>	<p>c.7 Training through school seminars</p>		
<p><b>IGQ 22:</b> <u>How well do these UDL policies match the realities of your classroom or role, including which parts are easy or difficult to implement?</u></p>	<p>c.5 Accessibility</p>		
<p>Respondent 1: "I definitely notice a significant gap between the policy of providing equal opportunities and our actual reality. The principles are useful, don't get me wrong, but full implementation is just so hard when you're facing large class sizes and very limited materials."</p>	<p>c.1 Aim of flexibility</p>		
<p>Respondent 2: "The policy objectives for inclusive learning are clear enough on paper, but siguro, the workload and the high number of classes make it really difficult to actually move that into practice."</p>	<p>c.2 Divisional guidelines</p>		
<p>Respondent 3: "I've observed a gap where the 'barrier-free' policy is just hard to implement. The reality of our rigid curriculum pacing and overcrowded classes makes it almost impossible to do it the way they</p>	<p>c.3 Theory for actual application</p>		
<p></p>	<p>c.2 Mandated school briefings</p>		
<p></p>	<p>c.1 Extensive experience with</p>		

<p>want."</p> <p><i>Respondent 4: "Actually, I find that the policy's focus on flexible learning doesn't fully reflect my specific workflow or my actual contact hours. It makes the whole framework really hard to adapt to my daily routine."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 5: "There's definitely a gap. The flexibility envisioned in the policy is one thing, but applying it consistently within the reality of these overcrowded rooms? That's another story."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 6: "The depth of UDL in the guidelines is hard to achieve because of our school conditions. We have limited materials, and honestly, the monitoring seems to focus more on compliance than on actually supporting us."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 7: "The 'aim' is easy enough to understand, but our classrooms just lack the technology and materials needed to meet those goals. The practice is really hindered by the fact that we have no planning time."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 8: "For me, it's the time constraints and these large-scale spaces. Those are the main reasons why the policy for inclusive learning just doesn't match our actual school conditions."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 9: "It's hard to reduce learning barriers—which is what the policy wants—when there's a total lack of technology and just not enough time for planning. The gap is quite obvious there."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 10: "While the guidelines are useful in principle, they just don't match the reality. Our classrooms lack the necessary materials and tech to even get started with most UDL strategies."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 11: "The 'passion' for inclusive delivery is easy to maintain, sure, but the policy is just difficult to implement in a school that lacks Wi-Fi or has such poor infrastructure."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 12: "I find that the policy intentions aren't really realistic. They aren't aligned with our actual school setting, and the administrative burdens placed on us just make it harder."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 13: "The policy aims for inclusive learning, but without proper training for teachers in resource-poor rooms, that aim is just very difficult to achieve."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 14: "The policy framework is good, don't get me wrong, but the large class sizes and time constraints make it difficult to move beyond just theoretical goals."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 15: "I'd describe the policy as very 'time-consuming' to implement. It's hard to provide all</i></p>	<p>UDL as a design thinking framework</p> <p>c.8 Training gave a good enough framework</p> <p>c.8 The training focused on inclusive objectives</p> <p>c.1 Barrier-free learning and overcrowded rooms</p> <p>c.8 Training didn't affect actual workflow</p> <p>c.8 Training lacked real solutions</p> <p>c.8 Training focused on theoretical depth</p> <p>c.5 Lacked specific technology training</p> <p>c.4 Instructional spaces</p> <p>c.5 Lack of technology</p> <p>c.5 Lack of basic materials</p> <p>c.5 Training and infrastructure issues</p> <p>c.8 Training was partially effective</p> <p>c.4 Implement UDL in resource-poor rooms</p> <p>c.4 Time constraints</p> <p>c.4 Meaningful information</p> <p>c.7 Difficult condition of the classroom</p> <p>c.2 Internal and external</p>		
---	---	--	--

<p><i>these flexible options when we aren't given more planning time to create them."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 16: "I've observed a noticeable gap between the intention for flexible learning and our actual conditions—especially when it comes to materials and technology training."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 17: "I'd argue that these policies aren't realistic or sustainable. They just aren't aligned with the resources we actually have or supported enough by external stakeholders."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 18: "Same po. Maganda ang intent, pero hirap sa implementation."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 19: "The policy of barrier-free learning is hard to apply because the curriculum pacing is so rigid. It usually just leads to 'compliance on paper' rather than real change."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 20: "I'd critique the policies for being 'one-size-fits-all.' They're difficult to implement because they lack subject-specific differentiation and, more importantly, accountability for the resources we need."</i></p> <p><b>IGQ 23:</b> <u>How do administrative expectations and school-level monitoring influence your ability to follow UDL guidelines?</u></p> <p><i>Respondent 1: "I mean, monitoring does help with accountability, but I really have to emphasize that we need stronger collaboration. Otherwise, it's just about simple compliance rather than actual classroom practice."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 2: "To be honest, administrative accountability just creates this constant sense of pressure. They insist that these inclusive objectives be practiced, but with this heavy workload? It just creates a gap between theory and what we can actually do."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 3: "I've observed that monitoring often just leads to a focus on 'compliance on paper.' Because our pacing is so rigid and classes are overcrowded, the pressure is really just to show implementation for the records, not for the students' benefit."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 4: "I find that administrative expectations don't always reflect what my actual workflow looks like. It's hard to adapt guidelines to satisfy a monitor when they don't see the reality of my contact hours."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 5: "I definitely feel the pressure from monitoring. It doesn't account for the reality of these overcrowded rooms, so we end up</i></p>	<p>stakeholder support</p> <p>c.4 Classroom struggles</p> <p>c.3 On paper</p> <p>c.2 Top down</p> <p>c.3 Simple Compliance</p> <p>c.7 Continuous support</p> <p>c.8 Professional development and administrative burdens</p> <p>c.7 Actual workflow</p> <p>c.4 Overcrowded</p> <p>c.8 Sustained professional development</p> <p>c.8 Training and ongoing coaching</p> <p>c.8 Ongoing coaching and the primary follow-up supports</p> <p>c.8 Regular teacher training</p> <p>c.6 Training includes dedicated planning time</p> <p>c.7 Department-level support and training</p> <p>c.5 Instructional help</p> <p>c.4 Resource-poor rooms</p> <p>c.8 Regular training and coaching</p> <p>c.4 Meaningful information</p> <p>c.7 Stronger collaboration and training</p> <p>c.2 Internal and external stakeholders</p> <p>c.8 Lecture</p> <p>c.8 Sustained professional development</p> <p>c.1 Design thinking</p> <p>c.1 Principle of providing equal opportunities</p> <p>c.3 Pressured than confident</p>		
---	--	--	--

<p><i>just emphasizing implementation for the sake of complying with the rules."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 6: "The problem is that monitoring focuses way too much on compliance and not enough on meaningful support. That administrative focus makes it so difficult to actually apply UDL at the depth they're asking for."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 7: "Administrative expectations feel pretty detached from our lack of planning time and tech. Monitoring reminds us of the goals, sure, but it doesn't actually provide the means to reach them."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 8: "Administrative monitoring can be a real burden, honestly. Too much focus on compliance just creates professional pressure instead of making the implementation feel feasible."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 9: "Expectations are high, but the monitoring doesn't address the fact that we don't have the technology or the time. It leads to a situation where we're just focused on meeting administrative requirements."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 10: "Monitoring often creates a lot of professional pressure, especially when our classrooms lack the materials we need to actually meet the standards they're checking for."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 11: "I really feel the influence of monitoring through our performance ratings. There's this constant pressure to deliver inclusive lessons even when basic infrastructure—like Wi-Fi—is completely missing."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 12: "I'd argue that monitoring should shift toward actual instructional help. Right now, administrative expectations just add to the 'burden' because they aren't aligned with our actual school setting."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 13: "Focusing so much on compliance just creates pressure for those of us in resource-poor rooms. We're expected to meet these inclusive goals without any of the adequate support."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 14: "I find that administrative monitoring prioritizes accountability over the reality of our large class sizes. It makes the whole implementation feel a bit performative, to be honest."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 15: "I've noticed that monitoring focuses on compliance but lacks 'meaningful information' or coaching. It doesn't help us manage just how time-consuming UDL preparation really is."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 16: "Monitoring usually just results in 'compliance on paper.' The actual materials and training aren't there to support real practice,</i></p>	<p>c.7 Lack of Confidence</p> <p>c.6 Actual workflow and contact hours</p> <p>c.5 Goal of inclusion</p> <p>c.8 Training that has theoretical relevance</p> <p>c.8 Training lacked relevance</p> <p>c.4 Time constraints and large spaces</p> <p>c.5 Lack of technology and the limited planning time</p> <p>c.5 Lack basic materials in our classroom</p> <p>c.8 Training is irrelevant to infrastructure</p> <p>c.7 Follow-up support</p> <p>c.4 Resource-poor rooms</p> <p>c.4 Time constraints and huge class sizes</p> <p>c.6 Time-consuming</p> <p>c.8 Lack of confidence</p> <p>c.6 Support from stakeholders</p> <p>c.8 Lack of confidence</p> <p>c.1 Design thinking</p> <p>c.2 School-level guidelines for equal opportunities</p> <p>c.1 Objective for inclusive learning</p> <p>c.1 Barrier-free learning</p> <p>c.6 Contact hours</p> <p>c.4 Reality of overcrowded classrooms and limited materials</p> <p>c.3 Depth envisioned</p> <p>c.5 Lack of technology training and planning time</p> <p>c.4 Time constraints</p> <p>c.5 Learning barriers and lack of technology</p> <p>c.4 Lack of clarity and missing materials</p>		
---	--	--	--

<p>so we just do what's needed for the records."</p> <p>Respondent 17: "I have to stress that administrative expectations are often unrealistic. They just aren't aligned with the available resources or the context of our school."</p> <p>Respondent 18: "Same po. Monitoring is okay, but sana may kasamang gamit at suporta, hindi lang checklists."</p> <p>Respondent 19: "Monitoring really encourages that 'compliance on paper' mindset. Our rigid curriculum pacing leaves almost no room for the kind of flexibility that UDL policies are demanding."</p> <p>Respondent 20: "I'd critique the monitoring for being too 'top-down' and just focused on checklists. Observation rubrics should really focus on 'design thinking' rather than just checking off compliance mandates."</p> <p><b>IGQ 24:</b>  <u>What gaps do you observe between UDL policy intentions and actual classroom or school conditions?</u></p> <p>Respondent 1: "I honestly observe a significant gap. The policy intention of providing equal opportunities is great, but the reality of large class sizes and limited materials... it really hinders full implementation."</p> <p>Respondent 2: "There's definitely a gap between the goal of inclusive learning and the reality of our heavy workload. With so many classes to handle, it's just really difficult to move beyond 'on-paper' compliance."</p> <p>Respondent 3: "I'd say there is a clear gap between the intention of barrier-free learning and what we actually deal with—which is rigid curriculum pacing and overcrowded classes."</p> <p>Respondent 4: "The policy intentions just aren't fully reflective of our actual workflow. There's a real disconnect between the guidelines and the high number of contact hours we manage daily."</p> <p>Respondent 5: "I see a gap where the flexibility envisioned in UDL is basically stifled. It's hard to be flexible when you're facing the reality of overcrowded rooms and very limited resources."</p> <p>Respondent 6: "The depth of UDL intended in the guidelines is so hard to achieve. In reality, school monitoring focuses way more on compliance than on providing the actual support we need."</p> <p>Respondent 7: "There's a gap due to the lack of planning time and technology. The policy aims for adaptation, but the school just lacks the infrastructure to actually support that."</p>	<p>c.4 Poor infrastructure</p> <p>c.4 Meaningful and aligned with the actual school setting</p> <p>c.4 Resource-poor room</p> <p>c.1 Flexible learning framework</p> <p>c.2 Policy on accessibility</p> <p>c.5 Actual difficult classroom conditions</p> <p>c.2 Stakeholder briefings</p> <p>c.1 Guidelines on the situation</p> <p>c.3 Compliance on paper</p> <p>c.2 Top-down, one-size-fits-all, and lack of teacher input</p> <p>c.4 Large class sizes and limited materials</p> <p>c.6 The workload and high number of classes</p> <p>c.1 Barrier-free</p> <p>c.1 Framework</p> <p>c.1 Flexibility</p> <p>c.3 Limited materials</p> <p>c.5 Lack of technology and materials</p> <p>c.4 Time constraints and large-scale spaces</p> <p>c.5 Lack of technology and not enough time for planning</p> <p>c.1 UDL Strategies</p> <p>c.4 Lacks Wi-Fi and poor infrastructure</p> <p>c.2 The policy intentions</p> <p>c.2 The policy aims for inclusive learning and teachers in resource-poor rooms</p> <p>c.2 Policy framework</p> <p>c.6 Time-consuming</p> <p>c.5 Materials and technology training</p> <p>c.2 External stakeholders</p> <p>c.9 Difficulty on implementation</p>		
--	--	--	--

<p><i>Respondent 8: "I'd identify the gap as being created by time constraints and these large-scale instructional spaces. It makes the policy's inclusive goals feel pretty unfeasible most of the time."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 9: "Actually, the policy intention of reducing learning barriers is at odds with our reality. We have a total lack of technology and just not enough planning time."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 10: "I've noticed a gap where the guidelines are useful in theory, but they fail in practice because our classrooms lack even basic materials and technology."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 11: "There's a gap between the policy's inclusive goals and the reality of our poor infrastructure. I mean, we don't even have Wi-Fi in the school to support these strategies."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 12: "The policy intentions aren't realistic because they just aren't aligned with the actual school setting or the administrative burdens we have to carry."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 13: "I see a gap in training and tools. The policies expect inclusive results, but teachers in resource-poor rooms aren't given the tools to actually achieve them."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 14: "The flexible learning framework is really undermined by the reality of large class sizes and severe time constraints. It's hard to balance both."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 15: "I observe a gap because of how time-consuming the work is. Policy expects multiple options for students, but our school structure doesn't give us the planning time to create them."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 16: "I'd call it a 'noticeable gap' between the aim of flexibility and our actual conditions—especially regarding materials and the lack of technology training."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 17: "To me, these policies just aren't sustainable. They aren't aligned with available resources, and we don't get consistent support from external stakeholders."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 18: "Time-consuming din po talaga sa part namin, kaya may gap talaga."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 19: "Same po sa kanila po. Maganda ang policy pero mahirap sa actual practice."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 20: "Ako rin po, ramdam ko 'yung gap lalo na sa resources na kailangan."</i></p> <p><b>IGQ 25:</b>  <u>What improvements in policies, guidelines, or school-level structures would make UDL implementation more feasible and sustainable?</u></p>	<p>c.3 Compliance on paper</p> <p>c.5 One-size-fits-all</p> <p>c.7 Stronger collaboration</p> <p>c.2 Administrative accountability</p> <p>c.4 Rigid and overcrowded classes</p> <p>c.7 Actual workflow</p> <p>c.7 Overcrowded rooms</p> <p>c.8 Monitoring on compliance</p> <p>c.6 Lack of planning, time, and, tech</p> <p>c.7 Administrative monitoring and professional pressure</p> <p>c.2 Meeting administrative requirements</p> <p>c.3 Lot of professional pressure and lack of the materials</p> <p>c.5 Basic infrastructure</p> <p>c.5 Actual instructional help</p> <p>c.4 Pressure in resource-poor rooms</p> <p>c.4 Large class sizes</p> <p>c.1 UDL preparation</p> <p>c.3 Compliance on paper</p> <p>c.4 Available resources</p> <p>c.8 Monitoring</p> <p>c.3 Compliance on paper mindset and flexibility that UDL demands</p> <p>c.3 Monitoring on top-down and focused checklists</p> <p>c.4 Large class sizes and limited materials</p> <p>c.3 On-paper compliance</p> <p>c.5 Rigid curriculum pacing and overcrowded classes</p> <p>c.6 Disconnect between the guidelines and high number of contact hours</p>		
--	--	--	--

<p><i>Respondent 1: "I'm really advocating for regular teacher training and actual ongoing coaching. We need that—and the provision of adequate resources—if we're ever going to move beyond just simple compliance."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 2: "I'd suggest that providing enough resources and real planning time would help. Continuous support through regular meetings would also go a long way in bridging that gap between our goals and our actual practice."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 3: "We need policies that actually prioritize inclusion and reduce our administrative burdens. It's important to ensure that these mandates are aligned with our actual school conditions, not just a 'perfect' scenario."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 4: "I'd recommend that support and policies be prioritized and adapted. They really need to reflect the actual workflow and the heavy contact hours we teachers manage every day."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 5: "I believe effectiveness would improve if policies were just aligned with our actual conditions—like class sizes—and if they provided ongoing resource support instead of just the initial push."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 6: "I'm suggesting a real shift from compliance monitoring to meaningful instructional support. Offering sustained professional development would be much more helpful than just checking our papers."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 7: "I'd recommend clearer guidelines and regular training. We also need to foster stronger collaboration between administrators and teachers to really sustain these UDL practices."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 8: "I'd identify the need for 'adjuvant' or supplemental resources and clearer guidelines. That, combined with ongoing coaching, is what would actually make implementation feasible for us."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 9: "Regular teacher training and the provision of technology and materials are just essential. We can't effectively reduce learning barriers without the right tools in our hands."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 10: "I'm advocating for clearer guidelines and ongoing coaching. But seguro, the most important thing is ensuring that enough planning time is actually allocated for UDL preparation."</i></p> <p><i>Respondent 11: "I really want to emphasize the need for departmental support. We need a focus on providing basic infrastructure, like stable Wi-Fi and classrooms that are</i></p>	<p>c.4 Reality of overcrowded rooms and limited resources</p> <p>c.7 Actual support</p> <p>c.5 Lacks of planning, time, technology, and infrastructure</p> <p>c.7 Unfeasible</p> <p>c.5 Lack of technology and not enough planning time</p> <p>c.5 Classrooms</p> <p>c.4 Poor infrastructure</p> <p>c.9 School setting</p> <p>c.4 Resource-poor rooms</p> <p>c.1 Flexible learning framework</p> <p>c.2 Policy expects multiple options</p> <p>c.5 Materials and lack of technology training</p> <p>c.2 Policies are not sustainable</p> <p>c.6 Time-consuming</p> <p>c.3 Actual practice</p> <p>c.3 Gap on resources</p> <p>c.8 Regular teacher training and actual ongoing coaching</p> <p>c.8 Continuous support through regular meetings</p> <p>c.7 Administrative burdens</p> <p>c.7 Reflect the actual workflow and heavy contact hours</p> <p>c.7 Ongoing resource support</p> <p>c.8 Sustained professional</p> <p>c.8 Clearer guidelines and regular training</p> <p>c.5 Adjuvant or supplemental resources</p> <p>c.8 Regular teacher training and the provision of technology</p> <p>c.1 Enough planning time for UDL preparation</p>		
---	--	--	--

<p><i>actually in good condition."</i>  <i>Respondent 12: "I suggest that school leadership should focus on giving us instructional help. They need to ensure the approach is relevant to our specific school setting to help reduce our burdens."</i>  <i>Respondent 13: "I'd recommend ongoing coaching and much clearer guidelines. This would help us 'situate and sustain' UDL practices, especially for those of us in resource-poor environments."</i>  <i>Respondent 14: "I believe that regular training, coaching, and stronger collaboration between all stakeholders are the primary improvements we need to see."</i>  <i>Respondent 15: "We need meaningful information—not just more checklists—and coaching. It's the only way to help teachers manage the very time-consuming nature of UDL preparation."</i>  <i>Respondent 16: "Actually, stronger collaboration is vital. We have to bridge that gap between policy intentions and our actual classroom conditions for this to be sustainable."</i>  <i>Respondent 17: "I'd argue that policies must be realistic. They need to be supported by consistent assistance from both internal and external stakeholders to really work."</i>  <i>Respondent 18: "Same po. Siguro yung alignment ng support sa reality ng classroom yung pinaka-importante."</i>  <i>Respondent 19: "I suggest building structures that prioritize inclusion over administrative paperwork. Sustained professional development would be much more realistic for us."</i>  <i>Respondent 20: "I propose a total shift to co-created policies with teacher input. We need specific, observable guidelines and—most importantly—a budget line item for every UDL requirement."</i></p>	<p>c.7 Departmental support and providing basic infrastructure</p> <p>c.7 School leadership</p> <p>c.8 Ongoing coaching and clearer guidelines</p> <p>c.8 Regular training, coaching, and stronger collaboration</p> <p>c.4 Meaningful information not just checklists and coaching</p> <p>c.3 Bridge the gap between policy intentions and actual classroom conditions</p> <p>c.2 Consistent assistance from internal and external stakeholders</p> <p>c.8 Alignment ng support</p> <p>c.8 Prioritize inclusion over administrative paperwork and sustained professional development</p> <p>c.2 Co-created policies with teacher input</p>		
---	---	--	--

**Summary of Findings**

Through the eyes of teachers and administrators navigating the promises and systemic pressures of strategic Universal Design for Learning (UDL) implementation every day, qualitative data came together as a living portrait of what that looks like in public elementary classrooms. Less a neat set of categories, what emerges is a textured story of meaning-making, structural constraints, and the collaborative ingenuity needed to translate an educational framework into the inclusive reality of the classroom. Instead, the researcher interviewed educators who described UDL not just as an abstract concept but an active design thinking framework – one that inherently seeks to provide equitable learning opportunities, remove typical learning barriers and replace retroactive adjustments with proactive and flexible learning environments.

This framework is played out daily as a constant negotiation with systemic, environmental and resource constraints. The educators indicated that national policy directives, department mandates and divisional guidelines point to inclusive education as an administrative priority but a separate “performative compliance gap” often prevails. Teachers described the structural friction of trying to apply UDL principles within the stark realities of overcrowded classrooms, large class sizes, and severe material deficits, such as the complete lack of school Wi-Fi and accessible infrastructure. Moreover, the ubiquitous experience of time poverty, caused by the rigid pace of the curricular framework, heavy workloads, and demanding administrative paperwork, often leaves educators in a state of “compliance on paper,” feeling obliged to tick boxes for monitoring rather than to foster deep classroom flexibility.

In response to these systemic frictions, the strategic pathways toward sustainable UDL implementation are explicitly anchored in relational work, professional coaching, and ground-up institutional shifts. Educators continuously emphasized that individual effort is insufficient to achieve the instructional depth envisioned by policy guidelines; instead, sustainable practice demands a collaborative school ecosystem. This requires administrators to foster active peer networks and cross-role collaborations among special education (SPED) teachers, general education teachers, families, and community stakeholders.

Crucially, the data shows a collective demand for leadership adaptation to be changed. Participants called for school heads and the department to shift from compliance monitoring to sustained professional development, clear instructional guidelines and ongoing coaching. Finally, the findings emphasize the need for ground-up policy planning and dedicated financial allocation to bridge the gap between policy intentions and classroom realities. Educators passionately advocated for a culture of co-creation that actively involved teacher voice in shaping mandates, coupled with a critical structural requirement: a dedicated budget line item for every UDL material requirement. In the end, the stories of the participants show that UDL does not work through dictates from above; rather, it works when a school culture embraces shared leadership, resource accountability, and systemic collaboration to meet the diverse needs of all learners.

## 5. Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

This chapter presents a summary of the study's findings, the conclusions derived from the qualitative data analysis, and context-sensitive recommendations to strengthen the implementation of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) within the Division of Tarlac Province. The discussions are systematically structured to provide evidence-based insights that bridge the gap between macro-level educational policies and the localized realities of public elementary classrooms.

### Discussion

The study population comprised 20 respondents from the Division of Tarlac, Philippines. The researcher conducted qualitative, one-on-one interviews with 20 key stakeholders: Grade 1 to Grade 6 teachers in general education and SPED from the five selected elementary public schools. This was done to gather diverse, localized perspectives on the systemic challenges and support mechanisms surrounding UDL implementation.

The participants' identities were protected by using structured pseudonyms (e.g., Respondent 1-20), and all personal information and specific school assignments were kept strictly confidential. All transcribed records, qualitative matrices, and audio data were securely stored in encrypted digital formats and were only accessible to the researcher.

The educator who participated in the interview said that all the educators participated voluntarily. Participants were explicitly assured that their decision to participate, refuse, or withdraw from the study at any time would not affect their employment status, performance ratings, or their relationship with the school administration and the Department of Education.

For Emotional and Psychological Safety, the researcher acknowledged that conversations about systemic pressures, structural deficits, time poverty, and heavy administrative

workloads might invoke feelings of professional stress, exhaustion, or vulnerability. In the interviews, the researcher fostered a safe, non-judgmental, and empathetic environment where participants felt comfortable speaking openly about their instructional burdens without fear of professional reprisal.

The researcher was highly aware of the local and professional cultural context of the participants within the Philippine public school system. The researcher conducted interviews using culturally relevant terms, localized pedagogical contexts, and appropriate language (English, Tagalog, and localized expressions) to make the qualitative inquiry inclusive, realistic, and respectful of Filipino educators' day-to-day customs and systemic practices.

For the sake of data integrity, the researcher presented the qualitative findings, thematic matrices, and verbatim codes honestly and accurately and did not fabricate, alter, or misrepresent the participants' actual accounts. The researcher also recognized the study's qualitative limitations in Tarlac Province and deliberately avoided overgeneralizing the results to other educational divisions nationwide.

Regarding the ethical review, the researcher presented the full research proposal to the dissertation committee at the pre-oral defense for institutional approval, prior to data collection. This provided a baseline that ensured adherence to well-established ethical standards, administrative permissions, and responsible educational research practices. The researcher offered to present the final synthesized findings and structural recommendations to the participating teachers, school heads, and elementary institutions involved for their feedback. The researcher believes that the open sharing of these findings will contribute to a shared sense of professional ownership, inform local, ground-up policy planning, and reinforce the deep value of educators' contributions to inclusive education research.

The qualitative data collected from Grade 1 to Grade 6 general education teachers and Special Education (SPED) teachers across urban, rural, and geographically isolated schools within the Division of Tarlac Province yielded critical insights into the real-world execution of inclusive education mandates. The findings are organized according to the three core thematic clusters established during the data analysis process:

### Theme 1: Conceptualization and Institutional Value of UDL

- **Frameworks for Inclusive and Flexible Learning (Category 1):** Participants perceive UDL as an active instructional design framework built on equitable learning opportunities and removal of environmental barriers. UDL's proactive principles (multiple means of engagement, representation, and expression) are widely recognized by educators as essential strategies for addressing learner variability in varied public-school contexts.
- **Policy Awareness, Directives, and Administrative Mandates (Category 2):** Stakeholders have a high level of basic awareness of national inclusive mandates (e.g., Republic Act 11650 and DepEd Order No. 2, s. 2019). This consciousness is largely shaped by top-down administrative briefings, school division directives, and performance ratings that label the framework as an urgent institutional priority.

- **The Performative Compliance Gap (Category 3):** The gap between the promise of institutional policies and what actually happens in the classroom is clear. As a result of significant environmental constraints, teachers report experiencing administrative pressure to demonstrate UDL implementation “on paper,” leading to a pattern of performative compliance in which administrative monitoring is more about checking boxes than providing meaningful instructional support.

### Theme 2: Systemic, Environmental, and Resource Obstacles

- **Environmental, Spatial, and Classroom Pressures (Category 4):** The pressures of the classroom make it hard to do UDL in depth all the time. Overcrowded classrooms and unusually large class sizes restrict physical mobility, restrict individualized learner interventions, and compromise the delivery of flexible instruction.
- **Technological Infrastructure and Material Deficits (Category 5):** The digital divide profoundly affects public elementary schools, particularly those in rural and geographically isolated areas. Due to the lack of school Wi-Fi networks, a shortage of structural materials, and a lack of functional assistive technologies, teachers cannot use multimedia representation methods.
- **Time Poverty and Rigid Curricular Frameworks (Category 6):** And teachers are in extreme time poverty from administrative workload and extremely inflexible curriculum pacing structures. Traditional lesson delivery’s rigid, inflexible scheduling requirements leave teachers without enough time during contact hours to adapt materials or create multi-tiered lessons.

### Theme 3: Strategic Pathways for Sustainable UDL Implementation

- **Stakeholder Collaboration and Peer Networks (Category 7):** UDL cannot be done in isolation; it requires a truly collaborative school ecosystem in order to be done sustainably.” The primary operational 'bridges' are active peer networks, systematic co-planning, and cross-role partnerships between general education teachers, SPED teachers, school heads, and external community stakeholders.
- **Leadership Adaptation, Coaching, and Professional Support (Category 8):** Short, superficial webinars do not build capacity in the long term. Educators are asking for a change in leadership behavior, asking administrators to move away from compliance monitoring to sustained professional development, focused instructional coaching, and long-term mentoring.
- **Financial Allocation and Ground-Up Policy Planning (Category 9):** To transition UDL from a theoretical mandate to an achievable classroom reality, structural planning reforms are mandatory. Stakeholders advocate for the ground-up co-creation of educational policies with teacher input, alongside the absolute requirement of establishing a dedicated budget line item for all requested UDL instructional materials and classroom modifications.

### Conclusion

This study’s qualitative results led to several important conclusions about the landscape of inclusive education. There is a serious conceptual mismatch between what the administration wants and what happens in the classroom. The teachers value the idea behind Universal Design for Learning as a liberating tool for inclusive education. However, its implementation in the Division of Tarlac Province is undermined by a structural performative compliance gap. This type of policy awareness from the top down is mainly evident in stringent compliance metrics, resulting in superficial, on-paper alignment that masks the real instructional challenges teachers face in their classrooms, day to day. Also, the physical microsystem of the local public school classroom directly constrains macro-system policy ideals, creating infrastructure and spatial contexts as formidable structural barriers. Operational hurdles such as massive class sizes, endemic time poverty, and substantial technological deficits (i.e., a complete absence of reliable Wi-Fi) make a standard, inflexible curriculum highly resistant to the proactive, flexible modifications demanded by the UDL framework.

Beyond the material constraints, there is a need for distributed leadership and continuous mentoring, especially considering that the existing professional development structure, built around short overview webinars, does not offer the deep pedagogical scaffolding required to foster genuine teacher competence. To make UDL truly sustainable across the division, school leadership must move from a superficial bureaucratic accountability stance to an instructional support paradigm that includes active professional learning communities, rich peer networks, and long-term, expert-led coaching.

Finally, a major systemic failure in the province-wide implementation of inclusive policies is the serious disconnect between the budget mandate, which clearly sets out pedagogical mandates, and actual financial allocation. Top-down educational mandates for multimedia learning environments, without ground-up co-creation and an explicit, dedicated budget line item, ultimately constitute an unsustainable material and operational burden placed directly on classroom teachers' shoulders.

### Implications

The qualitative inquiry into the implementation of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) within the public elementary schools of Tarlac Province underscores both the profound promise of inclusive education and the systemic barriers that impede its authentic execution. Across all participant cohorts, educators express a deep theoretical alignment with UDL, viewing it as an active design-thinking framework capable of dismantling learning obstacles and accommodating diverse student needs.

However, the macro-systemic mandates and top-down policy directives—including national inclusive education laws and localized Department of Education guidelines—frequently fracture when coming into contact with micro-systemic classroom realities. This mismatch creates a “performative compliance gap,” in which administrative surveillance and rigid monitoring rubrics inadvertently pressure teachers to demonstrate instructional flexibility “on paper” rather than fostering it in practice.

The main operational challenges are structural, spatial, and material. Serious environmental challenges, such as highly crowded classrooms and large class sizes, limit individual student engagement and spatial adaptability. This physical toll is exacerbated by a stark digital divide, especially in rural and remote areas, marked by an acute shortage of assistive technologies and a complete absence of reliable school Wi-Fi networks. Further, teachers are hamstrung by a strong sense of time poverty, engendered by the twin pressures of inflexible curricular pacing and an onerous clerical workload. These material and structural deficiencies work against the teacher's ability to develop multi-tiered representations, to offer multiple ways of engagement, and to move beyond the standard textbook delivery of the mandated contact hours.

The study illuminates several important pathways to move UDL from being a bureaucratic checkbox to a sustainable pedagogical ecosystem. First, sustainable implementation calls for a school environment that is collaborative and expressly formalizes shared planning blocks that permit cross-role alliances of general education teachers, Special Education (SPED) specialists, and families. Second, there is a pressing need to reform professional support structures; brief overview webinars must be replaced with sustained, localized mentoring and focused instructional coaching. Third, school leadership must actively buffer teachers from time poverty by freeing them of administrative clerical burdens and shifting institutional cultures from rigid enforcement to shared, supportive leadership. Most importantly, macro-level educational policies should address the pervasive disjuncture between pedagogy and finance. True educational equity requires grassroots policy co-creation that incorporates frontline teacher perspectives, and the mandatory creation of a dedicated budget line item for every mandated UDL material and structural change.

### Recommendations

Based on the empirical findings and conclusions of this study, a detailed set of targeted, context-sensitive recommendations is proposed at multiple institutional levels to optimize inclusive education. At the policy level, the Department of Education Central and Regional Offices should deconstruct top-down mandates by moving away from a "one-size-fits-all" approach to implementation and instead directly engage field teachers and Special Education specialists in the bottom-up co-creation of inclusive guidelines. At the same time, it is equally important to create specific Universal Design for Learning (UDL) budget line items to ensure a secured fiscal allocation under Republic Act 11650 for the procurement of assistive technologies, varied printing materials, and physical classroom modifications. Additionally, policy reforms need to redesign current performance evaluation and monitoring metrics to prioritize authentic instructional flexibility, collaborative planning time, and creative resource deployment rather than strict lesson pacing and performative, checkbox-oriented paperwork.

At the contextual level, School Division Superintendents and Division Supervisors are encouraged to institutionalize sustained instructional coaching rather than shallow, one-and-done awareness webinars by deploying traveling teams of senior, specialized mentors to provide ongoing school-based classroom scaffolding. The local digital divide also requires that division-level leadership prioritize resource

allocations to upgrading basic technological infrastructure, with a heavy emphasis on establishing reliable local networks and intranet resources in rural and geographically isolated settings where standard connectivity is unstable.

At the institutional level, School Principals and School Heads should structurally embed protected, formalized planning blocks into the weekly schedule to enable general education and Special Education teachers to co-plan and design proactive curriculum adaptations together. Institutional leadership should also cultivate a supportive school culture by reframing the principal's role from a compliance monitor to an instructional ally who directly alleviates teacher time poverty through minimizing non-teaching clerical burdens. To ease the pressure of overcrowded classes, school heads should vigorously expand stakeholder and peer networks by mobilizing Parent-Teacher Associations and local government units to secure community support for physical learning aids and other material supports.

Finally, to promote scholarly growth, future researchers are encouraged to pursue mixed methods and outcome-based studies that directly associate specific UDL support strategies with quantitative indicators of student engagement in the Philippine setting, while concurrently designing parallel qualitative inquiries that focus on the uncharted perspectives of parents, community leaders, and diverse learners to generate a fully holistic perspective of the local educational ecosystem.

### Limitations of the Study

This study, a qualitative exploration of educators' views on Universal Design for Learning (UDL) implementation barriers and supports, has several limitations that limit the scope, transferability, and interpretive depth of its findings: The first is the limited contextual scope and transferability, as the study was localized in selected public elementary schools in the Division of Tarlac Province, which may not be generalizable to other geographic divisions, private school systems, or other regional policy environments in the Philippines.

Second, purposeful, small-to-moderate sampling of Grade 1 to Grade 6 general education and Special Education (SPED) teachers may have affected sample representativeness, introducing potential self-selection bias whereby educators experiencing the most severe structural or administrative pressures may have disproportionately influenced the findings.

Third, the interpretive nature of thematic data analysis involves subjective interpretation based on the researcher's preconceptions, coding decisions, and qualitative interview prompts. However, systematic data verification and objective reporting were used to preserve data integrity.

Fourth, the use of self-report data from qualitative interviews raises concerns about recall bias and social desirability. Individuals working in a highly supervised public school system, in an environment of professional vulnerability or perceived accountability demands, may modify their responses. The limited direct classroom observation of the reported practices exacerbates this problem.

Fifth, the study's temporal limitation captures a cross-sectional snapshot of current educational realities. It is not representative of how UDL practices develop or change

over time as subsequent amendments to the Department of Education (DepEd) policies unfold.

Sixth, the heterogeneity in baseline classroom conditions (e.g., varying levels of urbanicity, overcrowding, and student diversity across the five participating schools) may pose challenges for cross-case comparisons and data synthesis.

Seventh, access to stakeholders was limited to classroom instructors. The critical perspectives of school division superintendents, regional directors, and learners' families were excluded, thus narrowing the systemic understanding of top-down administrative support and bottom-up community integration.

Eighth, strict ethical and privacy constraints necessitated the use of generic pseudonyms. They limited the sharing of detailed institutional or individual profiles, which reduced the specificity of contextual information on sensitive resource shortages or specific school modifications.

Ninth, the analytical scope is largely limited to thematic descriptions of personal educational experiences, which may underrepresent alternative theoretical lenses, such as implementation science, critical policy analysis, or econometric resource metrics, and thus limit the structural exploration of broader macroeconomic and bureaucratic forces beyond educators' lived realities.

## 6. Dedication

This manuscript is respectfully and wholeheartedly dedicated to the individuals whose steadfast support, enduring faith, and profound influence have sustained and strengthened me throughout the rigor of this academic undertaking.

To my husband, Edgar Q. Peralta, whose unwavering commitment has been a constant source of stability and encouragement. Your quiet patience, your readiness to assume responsibilities during the most demanding phases of my research, and your thoughtful care, especially in preparing meals when my time was consumed by scholarly work, have been indispensable. Your devotion has fortified my resolve, and this achievement stands as a testament to your enduring support, including your help in making my video presentation.

To my brother, Marcelo Dupale, and to my entire family, whose moral support has remained steadfast despite the vast distance that separates us. Your encouragement, though conveyed across thousands of miles, has been deeply felt and profoundly motivating. Your belief in my capacity to persevere has strengthened my determination to complete this scholarly pursuit.

To Cora Santos, whom I consider a sister to me, whose prayers and spiritual guidance have provided grounding and clarity during moments of uncertainty. Your faith has been a quiet yet powerful source of strength throughout this journey.

To my friend who has become like a sister to me, Janet Titar, and her husband Rico, I extend my deepest gratitude for your moral support and the financial assistance you generously offered during critical moments. Your kindness, solidarity, and unwavering belief in my academic aspirations have left an indelible mark on this accomplishment.

To my sisters-in-law, Salve Bazar and Juliet Cortez, whose moral support and financial assistance have contributed meaningfully to the completion of this work. Your

generosity and encouragement have strengthened me in moments when perseverance felt most difficult, and I remain deeply grateful for your presence on this journey.

To my late eldest brother, Laureto Dupale, and to my beloved parents, late Alfredo and Serafina Dupale, whose memory continues to guide my values and aspirations. The principles you instilled, perseverance, humility, and integrity, have shaped the foundation of my scholarly identity. Though you are no longer physically present, your influence remains deeply embedded in every step of this academic journey.

To my late cousin, Francisco Dupale, whose belief in my potential endures in my memory. I hold the certainty that, were you here, you would stand proudly beside me. Your absence is deeply felt, yet your faith in me continues to inspire me.

To all my students, who remain my constant source of inspiration. Your resilience, curiosity, and determination remind me of the purpose behind this scholarly work. You are the reason I continue to strive for excellence, and your presence in my life has shaped the educator and researcher I am today.

This work stands as a tribute to all of you, those who accompany me in life and those whose love transcends the boundaries of time and presence. Your collective support, sacrifices, prayers, and enduring belief have made the completion of this manuscript possible. Each page reflects the profound impact you have had on my life and scholarship.

## 7. Acknowledgement

This research, "Stakeholders' Perspectives on Universal Design for Learning Implementation Challenges and Support Across Education," has been made possible through the collective support, guidance, and intellectual generosity of numerous individuals who have willingly shared their time, expertise, and encouragement. Their contributions have been invaluable to the successful completion of this scholarly work.

The researcher wishes to extend profound and enduring gratitude to the individuals and institutions whose guidance, support, and scholarly influence have been instrumental in the successful completion of this academic endeavor. This manuscript stands as a testament not only to personal perseverance but also to the collective wisdom, generosity, and encouragement of many who contributed to its realization.

The researcher likewise expresses profound gratitude to the President of Greenville College, Engr. Dexter L. Quizon, for the opportunity to extend to graduate students the opportunity to pursue advanced academic training and scholarly inquiry within the institution. His leadership and commitment to academic excellence have created an environment conducive to rigorous research and professional growth.

Deep appreciation is also conveyed to the Dean of the Greenville College Graduate School Department, Dr. Cristeta A. Campos, for her patience, steadfast support, and genuine concern throughout the development of this study. Her encouragement, thoughtful guidance, and commitment to fostering scholarly excellence have played a significant role in the realization of this research work.

The researcher conveys the highest respect and sincere appreciation to Dr. Judito P. Camacho, whose steadfast

encouragement and continuous motivation have been central to sustaining the researcher's commitment to the rigorous pursuit of the Doctor of Education degree. His belief in the researcher's capacity to persevere, coupled with his consistent guidance, provided the intellectual and emotional grounding necessary to navigate the complexities of this scholarly journey.

The researcher offers deep and respectful acknowledgment to the eloquent and highly esteemed Chairman of the Defense Panel, Dr. Cornelio Simon Doloque, Jr., whose scholarly rigor, intellectual clarity, and constructive critique significantly shaped the refinement of this manuscript. The researcher likewise expresses sincere appreciation to the distinguished panel members, Dr. Purita T. Agcaoli, Dr. John Patrick Palad, Dr. Susan Buhay, and Dr. Emiterio Macarubo, for their thoughtful feedback, constructive suggestions, and professional insights. Their collective expertise contributed substantially to the strengthening, deepening, and academic rigor of this research.

Deep gratitude is also extended to the researcher's esteemed colleague and friend, Dr. Emelita Policarpio and husband Redimar Policarpio, for their unwavering support, insightful perspectives, and professional expertise. Their thoughtful guidance, intellectual generosity, and constant encouragement enriched the researcher's understanding and strengthened the conceptual and methodological foundations of this study.

The researcher also expresses heartfelt gratitude to Dr. Erwin Ramos and his wife, Glenda Ramos, whose assistance in establishing contact with teacher participants was vital to the successful completion of data gathering. Their generosity, willingness to help, and commitment to supporting this scholarly endeavor are deeply appreciated.

The researcher is especially indebted to the teachers who participated in this study, whose willingness to share their lived experiences, insights, and professional expertise made this scholarly work possible. Their openness and reflective contributions regarding "Stakeholders' Perspectives on Universal Design for Learning Implementation Challenges and Support Across Education" enriched the study with authentic voices from the field and provided invaluable depth to the research findings.

I want to express my sincere gratitude to Angelo Salas for his invaluable assistance in processing and securing my Transcript of Records (TOR). His support made the entire process smoother and far less overwhelming.

My heartfelt appreciation also goes to Maria Ramona Felix, one of my college friends, whose generosity and patience in traveling back and forth from Olivarez College to Greenville ensured that all necessary documents were delivered on time. Her willingness to help, despite the inconvenience, truly made a significant difference.

Sincere appreciation is extended to the Schools Division Superintendent of the Division of Tarlac Province, Tolentino G. Aquino, for granting permission to conduct the study, as well as to the school principals, especially to Dr. Juliet M. Tangonan, Principal III, whose cooperation facilitated the smooth and efficient administration of the research process. Their support ensured the study was conducted with integrity, respect, and in accordance with institutional protocols.

Above all, the researcher offers profound and reverent gratitude to God Almighty, whose divine wisdom, sustaining grace, and constant guidance provided strength

throughout the challenges of this academic journey. It is through His providence that clarity was found in moments of uncertainty, perseverance was sustained in times of difficulty, and this manuscript ultimately came together as a meaningful scholarly contribution.

## 8. References

1. Al-Azawei A, Serenelli F, Lundqvist K. Universal Design for Learning (UDL): A content analysis of peer-reviewed journals from 2012 to 2015. *Journal of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*. 2016; 16(3):39-56. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.14307/jostl.2016.16.3.39>
2. Bronfenbrenner U. *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Harvard University Press, 1979.
3. Department of Education (DepEd). *Guidelines on the contextualization of the K to 12 curriculum (DepEd Order No. 2, s. 2019)*. Pasig City, Philippines: DepEd Central Office, 2019.
4. Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013, Republic Act No. 10533 (Phil.). Inclusive Education Act of 2022, Republic Act No. 11650 (Phil.).
5. Magna Carta for Persons with Disabilities, Republic Act No. 7277 (Phil.). *Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines*. The Constitution of the Republic of the Philippines. Government of the Philippines, 1987.
6. Rose DH, Dalton B. Learning to read in the digital age: Overcoming barriers with Universal Design for Learning. In D. Gordon, J. W. Gravel, & L. A. Schifter (Eds.), *Universal Design for Learning in the classroom: Practical applications*. Harvard Education Press, 2009, 74-85.
7. UNESCO. *Education 2030: Incheon Declaration and Framework for Action for the implementation of Sustainable Development Goal 4: Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and lifelong learning for all*. United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, 2015.
8. Vygotsky LS. *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press, 1978.