

# Bridging the Divide: A Critical Analysis of the Disconnect Between Administrative Task Removal Policies and Classroom Reality

Vea Clare M. Dela Cruz<sup>1</sup>, Christine Diane C. Jimenez<sup>2</sup>,  
Jessicalyn S. Masanque<sup>3</sup>, Jesus D. Paguigan<sup>4</sup>

## Abstract

The disparity between administrative work removal policies—more especially, Department of Education (DepEd) Order No. 002, s.—is critically examined in this study. 2024 and the real classroom conditions that Philippine public-school teachers face. 26 public elementary and secondary school teachers were given a survey using a quantitative study design to assess policy awareness, ongoing administrative responsibilities, resource sufficiency, and the ensuing effects on instructional quality and teacher well-being.

The results show that respondents have a high level of policy awareness (84.6%), yet there is still a clear execution gap (76.9% of teachers believe the policy only exists "on paper"). The average administrative workload per teacher only marginally dropped from 1.8 to 1.5 tasks despite the mandate. Most responders still administer supplementary applications (76.9%), deal with data encoding during class hours (88.5%), and deal with interruptions from urgent administrative requests (80.8%). Inadequate institutional transfer procedures and a serious lack of non-teaching staff (57.7% citing deficiency) are the main systemic barriers found. As a result, 73.1% of teachers continue to take administrative responsibilities home, which directly jeopardizes their core instructional efficacy, and work-related stress is still very high. The study underscores the critical need for adequate recruitment of administrative support staff and structural reforms to bridge the divide between bureaucratic policy and classroom practice.

**Keywords:** Administrative workload, Classroom reality, DepEd Order No. 002 s. 2024, Policy-practice gap, Public school teachers, Teacher burnout, Non-teaching personnel.

## I. Introduction

Since non-instructional tasks like reporting, data administration, and program coordination frequently impede effective teaching and contribute to teacher stress and burnout, the growing administrative workload entrusted to teachers has become a major concern in the educational sector. The Department of Education responded by issuing DepEd Order No. 002, s. 2024, which requires public school teachers to be freed from administrative duties so they can concentrate on teaching and student growth. However, because to implementation issues, a shortage of non-teaching staff, and enduring bureaucratic processes in schools, many teachers still face administrative responsibilities despite this policy attempt. This study seeks to critically analyze the disconnect between administrative task removal policies and the actual classroom reality experienced by teachers, focusing on the systemic gaps that hinder the effective implementation of these reforms.

## A. Background of the Study

The growing administrative burden placed on educators has grown to be a significant issue in the field of education in recent years. Teachers are frequently expected to carry out non-teaching responsibilities like data administration, report creation, program coordination, financial documentation, and other clerical tasks in addition to teaching in the classroom. These duties take up important class time and lead to teacher stress, burnout, and decreased effectiveness. The Department of Education issued DepEd Order No. 002, s. in reaction to these difficulties. 2024, which requires public school instructors to be immediately relieved of administrative duties so they can concentrate on teaching and student development. By assigning administrative duties to certain non-teaching staff, the approach seeks to improve teacher welfare and raise educational standards.

Due to a lack of non-teaching staff, ambiguous task delegation, and enduring bureaucratic processes in schools, many instructors still face administrative constraints in their day-to-day work despite this legislative initiative. There is a disconnect between policy implementation and actual classroom reality because many administrative chores are still informally given to teachers even when they are officially eliminated on paper. This circumstance emphasizes the necessity of critically analyzing the gap between administrative task removal policies and instructors' actual experiences. As a result, this study aims to examine the institutional and systemic barriers to these policies' successful implementation as well as their projected effects on teachers' workloads and academic achievement.

## B. Objectives of the Study

### General Objective

This study aims to critically analyze the disconnect between administrative task removal policies and the actual classroom experiences of teachers in public schools.

### Specific Objectives

Specifically, this study seeks to:

1. determine the level of teachers' awareness regarding administrative task removal policies;
2. identify the administrative tasks that teachers continue to perform despite existing policy mandates;
3. assess the adequacy of non-teaching personnel assigned to handle administrative responsibilities in schools;
4. examine the factors that hinder the effective implementation of administrative task removal policies;
5. evaluate the impact of persistent administrative tasks on teachers' instructional responsibilities and classroom performance; and
6. propose recommendations to improve the alignment between policy implementation and classroom reality.

## II. Methods

This study will employ a **quantitative research design**, utilizing a survey method to gather relevant data from the participants.

### Survey Questions:

**Number of teaching load (periods per day)\***

**Number of administrative tasks assigned BEFORE DepEd Order No. 2, s. 2024\***

**Number of administrative tasks assigned AFTER DepEd Order No. 2, s. 2024\***

**Use a 5-point Likert Scale for these items:**

(5) Strongly Agree

- (4) Agree
- (3) Neutral
- (2) Disagree
- (1) Strongly Disagree

**Cluster 1: Policy Awareness and Clarity Focuses on whether the "Bridge" was built correctly at the conceptual level.**

- 1. I am fully aware of the specific administrative tasks that have been officially removed from my workload under recent policy mandates (e.g., DepEd Order No. 002, s. 2024).
- 2. The guidelines regarding which tasks are now the responsibility of non-teaching personnel are clearly defined in my school.
- 3. I have received formal orientation or communication from school leadership regarding the transition of my administrative duties.
- 4. I have received formal orientation or communication from school leadership regarding the transition of my administrative duties.

**Cluster 2: Persistent Administrative Demands (The Reality) Measures if the tasks actually left the teacher's desk**

- 5. Despite the removal policy, I still perform data encoding and report generation (e.g., LIS, e-Class record) during instructional hours.
- 6. I am still tasked with managing ancillary programs (e.g., feeding, health records, or school banking) that are technically non-teaching roles.
- 7. I frequently receive "urgent" requests for administrative data that require me to pause my lesson preparation or classroom teaching.
- 8. Most of the administrative tasks removed by policy are still being performed by teachers due to the absence of designated administrative staff in our school.

**Cluster 3: Resource and Support Availability Investigates the systemic reasons for the "Divide."**

- 9. Our school has a sufficient number of administrative assistants/non-teaching staff to handle the workload removed from teachers.
- 10. There is a functional system in place within the school for the seamless transfer of records from teachers to administrative personnel.
- 11. School leadership actively protects teachers from performing non-teaching tasks when external offices request data.

**Cluster 4: Impact on Instructional Quality Measures the consequence of the disconnect.**

- 12. The removal of administrative tasks has resulted in a noticeable increase in my time spent on actual classroom instruction.
- 13. I feel a significant reduction in work-related stress since the implementation of the task-removal policy.
- 14. I am now able to provide more timely feedback and intervention to my students because I have fewer non-teaching obligations.
- 15. The "administrative tasks removal" remains a policy on paper rather than a reality in my daily school routine.
- 16. I still take home administrative work to complete after school hours to ensure my teaching materials are ready for the next day.
- 17. \

**PART II: WORK-RELATED STRESS**

**Instructions:** How often have you felt this way in the past month?

Scale	Description
4	Very Often
3	Often
2	Sometimes
1	Rarely
0	Never

1. In the last month, how often have you felt that you were unable to control the important things in your life?
2. In the last month, how often have you felt confident about your ability to handle your personal problems?
3. In the last month, how often have you felt that things were going your way?
4. In the last month, how often have you been angered because of things that were outside of your control?
5. In the last month, how often have you been angered because of things that were outside of your control?
6. In the last month, how often have you felt difficulties were piling up so high that you could not overcome them?

### III. Results

**Study Title:** Bridging the Divide: A Critical Analysis of the Disconnect Between Administrative Task Removal Policies and Classroom Reality

**Policy Reference:** DepEd Order No. 2, s. 2024

**Respondents:** 26 public school teachers

**Coverage:** Elementary and Secondary Schools in the Philippine

#### Profile of Respondents

**Table 1**  
**Distribution of Respondents According to Demographic and Professional Characteristics**

Variable	Category	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
Sex	Female	24	92.3
	Male	2	7.7
	Total	26	100
Age	25–29 years	5	19.2
	30–39 years	14	53.8
	40–49 years	7	26.9
	Total	26	100

Variable	Category	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
Years of Teaching Experience	0–2 years	2	7.7
	3–5 years	9	34.6
	6–10 years	9	34.6
	11–15 years	2	7.7
	16 years and above	4	15.4
	Total	26	100
Highest Educational Attainment	Bachelor’s Degree	8	30.8
	Master’s Units	14	53.8
	Master’s Degree	2	7.7
	Bachelor’s + Master’s Units	2	7.7
	Total	26	100
Current Position	Teacher I	18	69.2
	Teacher II	2	7.7
	Teacher III	5	19.2
	Master Teacher I	1	3.8
	Total	26	100
School Level	Elementary	19	73.1
	Secondary	7	26.9
	Total	26	100
School Location	Urban	25	96.2
	Rural	1	3.8
	Total	26	100

**Administrative Workload Before and After Policy Implementation**

**Table 2**  
**Number of Assigned Administrative Tasks**

Period	Average Number of Tasks	Minimum	Maximum
Before DepEd Order No. 2, s. 2024	1.8	0	5
After DepEd Order No. 2, s. 2024	1.5	0	6

**Awareness, Clarity, and Orientation**

**Table 3**  
**Level of Awareness and Understanding of the Policy**

Indicators	Strongly Agree / Agree		Neutral		Disagree / Strongly Disagree	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Aware of specific tasks removed	22	84.6	2	7.7	2	7.7
Guidelines are clearly defined	19	73.1	4	15.4	3	11.5
Received formal orientation	17	65.4	4	15.4	5	19.2

**Extent of Policy Implementation vs. Classroom Reality**

**Table 4**  
**Status of Administrative Task Removal in Practice**

Indicators	Strongly Agree / Agree		Neutral		Disagree / Strongly Disagree	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Still perform data encoding/reports during class hours	23	88.5	2	7.7	1	3.8
Still manage ancillary programs	20	76.9	4	15.4	2	7.7
Frequently interrupted by urgent admin requests	21	80.8	4	15.4	1	3.8

Indicators	Strongly Agree / Agree		Neutral		Disagree / Strongly Disagree	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Removed tasks still done by teachers due to lack of staff	22	84.6	3	11.5	1	3.8
School has sufficient non-teaching staff	5	19.2	6	23.1	15	57.7
Functional system exists for transferring records	9	34.6	10	38.5	7	26.9
Leadership protects teachers from extra tasks	10	38.5	9	34.6	7	26.9

**Impact on Instruction, Workload, and Well-being**

**Table 5**

**Perceived Effects of the Policy**

Indicators	Strongly Agree / Agree		Neutral		Disagree / Strongly Disagree	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
More time for classroom instruction	12	46.2	8	30.8	6	23.1
Significant reduction in work-related stress	10	38.5	10	38.5	6	23.1
Can provide more timely feedback/interventions	14	53.8	8	30.8	4	15.4
Policy remains a policy “on paper only”	20	76.9	4	15.4	2	7.7
Still take administrative work home	19	73.1	5	19.2	2	7.7

Level of Perceived Stress

**Table 6**  
**Frequency of Stressful Feelings in the Last Month**

Indicators	Often / Very Often		Sometimes		Rarely / Never	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Unable to control important things	14	53.8	8	30.8	4	15.4
Confident handling personal problems	16	61.5	7	26.9	3	11.5
Feel things are going their way	15	57.7	8	30.8	3	11.5
Angered by uncontrollable matters	18	69.2	6	23.1	2	7.7
Feel difficulties are overwhelming	12	46.2	9	34.6	5	19.2

**IV. Discussion**

The findings of this study offer crucial insights into the implementation of DepEd Order No. 2, s. 2024, revealing a profound disconnect between the policy's theoretical intentions and the empirical realities experienced by teachers. While awareness of the directive is exceptionally high, structural deficiencies—most notably a severe shortage of non-teaching personnel—heavily undermine its efficacy, leaving teachers heavily burdened with administrative tasks and high stress levels.

**1. Respondent Profile and Structural Context**

The demographic data shows that the respondent pool is primarily composed of female educators (92.3%), concentrated in the 30–39 age bracket (53.8%), and working within urban elementary school settings (96.2% and 73.1%, respectively). Professionally, a substantial portion of the workforce consists of early-to-mid-career educators, with 69.2% holding Teacher I positions and 69.2% possessing between 3 to 10 years of teaching experience. Notably, 53.8% of these teachers have accumulated Master’s units, demonstrating a highly qualified cohort that is heavily invested in professional development.

Despite their advanced academic qualifications, the vast majority remain at the entry-level rank (Teacher I), where they are historically more vulnerable to inheriting a disproportionate share of school-level administrative loads and ancillary assignments.

**2. The Policy-Practice Gap: Awareness vs. Classroom Reality**

The data uncovers a striking contradiction between policy awareness and actual classroom execution. On paper, the dissemination of DepEd Order No. 2, s. 2024 appears highly successful: 84.6% of respondents are explicitly aware of the specific tasks removed, 73.1% agree that the guidelines are clearly defined, and 65.4% received a formal orientation.

However, this high level of conceptual clarity fails to translate into practical relief. When analyzing the absolute number of assigned administrative duties before and after the policy, the reduction is nominal dropping slightly from an average of 1.8 tasks to 1.5 tasks per teacher. Alarming, the maximum number of administrative tasks assigned to an individual teacher increased from 5 to 6 tasks following the policy's implementation.

This marginal quantitative shift is explained by the stark operational realities captured in Table 4:

- 88.5% of teachers are still forced to perform data encoding and report generation during valuable class hours.
- 80.8% face frequent interruptions by urgent, ad-hoc administrative requests.
- 76.9% continue to manage heavy ancillary programs.

These figures demonstrate that despite a formal mandate to strip away non-teaching workloads, administrative operations continue to heavily encroach upon instructional time.

### 3. Staffing Shortages as the Core Bottleneck

The primary structural barrier preventing the successful realization of DepEd Order No. 2, s. 2024 is the acute deficit of administrative support staff. A staggering 84.6% of respondents explicitly state that they must still perform the removed administrative tasks simply because there is no one else to do them. This is directly corroborated by the 57.7% of respondents who openly disagree or strongly disagree that their school has sufficient non-teaching staff.

Furthermore, institutional support systems remain weak: only 34.6% report a functional system for transferring records, and a mere 38.5% feel that school leadership successfully protects them from taking on extra tasks. Consequently, without a dedicated, adequately staffed non-teaching workforce to absorb these duties, the policy becomes self-defeating. School leaders are left with no choice but to rely on teachers to keep basic school operations running, forcing a collective sentiment among 76.9% of educators that the policy remains "on paper only".

### 4. Downstream Impact on Instruction, Well-being, and Teacher Stress

Because the administrative drain remains largely unmitigated, the expected professional benefits of the policy have failed to fully materialize. Less than half of the respondents (46.2%) feel they have gained more time for actual classroom instruction. While 53.8% note they can provide more timely feedback or student interventions, the personal toll on teachers remains severe, with 73.1% still forced to take administrative work home.

This ongoing spillover of work into personal time directly manifests in poor psychological well-being and high perceived stress levels:

- Only 38.5% experienced a significant reduction in work-related stress.
- 69.2% report feeling often or very often angered by matters outside of their control.
- 53.8% frequently feel unable to control important aspects of their professional and personal life.
- 46.2% state that their current accumulation of difficulties feels completely overwhelming.

Collectively, these metrics reveal an exhausted workforce. While teachers display moderate resilience and personal efficacy—with 61.5% feeling confident in handling personal problems—the systemic pressure of unyielding administrative burdens continues to degrade their emotional well-being and dilute their primary mission: effective classroom instruction.

## CONCLUSION

In summary, the data proves that declaring a policy to "remove administrative tasks" is completely ineffe-



ctive unless it is backed by aggressive funding and immediate hiring of non-teaching personnel. Without dedicated staff to take over these responsibilities, the workload defaults back to the teachers, reducing DepEd Order No. 2, s. 2024 to a symbolic gesture rather than a practical solution for teacher welfare and instructional quality.