WWW.IJRPR.COM

International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews

Journal homepage: www.ijrpr.com ISSN 2582-7421

Instructional Leadership, Teachers' Competence, and Stakeholders' Engagement for School-Based Management Level

Sherlie A. Rupole, Delon A. Ching

Laguna State Polytechnic University, San Pablo City Campus**,** Province of Laguna

ABSTRACT:

This study examines the relationship between instructional leadership, teacher competence, and stakeholder engagement in the implementation and effectiveness of School-Based Management (SBM). The study employed a descriptive correlational research design, and data were collected through a Google Form survey. The respondents were 150 elementary school teachers from 28 public schools in the districts of Sampaloc and Mauban South, Quezon Division, in March 2025. The findings showed that instructional leadership is highly evident in supervising and evaluating instruction, developing high academic standards and expectations, monitoring student progress, promoting the professional development of teachers, and protecting instructional time. Teachers demonstrated competence in pedagogical and content knowledge, classroom management, assessment practices, and adapting instruction for diverse student needs. Stakeholder engagement, including parents, community members, and local government units, was actively observed. The study found a satisfactory level of SBM implementation across key areas and a significant positive relationship between instructional leadership, teacher competence, stakeholder engagement, and School-Based Management. The null hypotheses were rejected, indicating that instructional leadership, teacher competence, and stakeholder engagement have a significant impact on SBM effectiveness. The study recommends that school administrators promote data-driven instruction, ongoing teacher development, and collaboration to enhance learning outcomes. Strengthening parental and community involvement through inclusive decision-making enhances school support. Effective SBM relies on transparent monitoring, active stakeholder engagement, and professional growth aligned with DepEd guidelines. Empowering teachers through participatory leadership enhances both competence and school management. Future research may investigate the long-term effects of these factors on SBM in diverse school settings.

Keywords: *Instructional Leadership, Teacher Competence, Stakeholder Engagement, School-Based Management*

1. Introduction:

In recent years, the implementation of School-Based Management (SBM) has become a vital strategy for improving educational outcomes through decentralization, with growing attention given to the integration of instructional leadership, teacher competence, and stakeholder engagement. Traditionally administrative and instructional leadership have evolved into a dynamic role that influences curriculum implementation, teaching quality, and school culture, fostering shared accountability and academic excellence (Hallinger & Wang, 2020; Nguyen & Walker, 2020). Similarly, teacher competence—encompassing pedagogical skills, content knowledge, assessment literacy, and adaptability—remains a critical driver of student achievement and instructional effectiveness (Darling-Hammond et al., 2020; OECD, 2021). In parallel, stakeholder engagement, particularly involving parents, local government units, and community organizations, is increasingly recognized as essential for participatory governance, transparency, and sustainability in Sustainable Business Management (SBM) (DeMatthews & Izquierdo, 2021; Adu-Gyamfi & Ankomah, 2021).

In the Philippine context, initiatives such as the MATATAG Agenda and DepEd Order No. 35, s. 2022, underscore the need for a holistic approach to school leadership and governance. This evolving framework underscores the importance of integrating these three components—leadership, competence, and engagement—as a novel, collaborative approach to enhance SBM levels and ensure inclusive, effective, and context-responsive school management.

Despite the implementation of SBM, several challenges persist in public elementary schools. These include inconsistent instructional leadership, with some school heads lacking clear direction and adequate support for teachers. Teachers often struggle with gaps in competence, particularly in adopting innovative strategies and meeting the diverse needs of learners. Additionally, stakeholder engagement remains limited, with minimal participation from parents and communities in school planning and evaluation. These issues result in fragmented governance, diminished accountability, and underutilization of resources—factors that hinder the achievement of higher Sustainable Development Management (SBM) levels and compromise the quality of education.

School heads struggle to provide effective instructional supervision, thereby hindering school improvement efforts (Cabaluna & Dizon, 2021). Ineffective instructional leadership and limited teacher competence—particularly in differentiated instruction—remain significant barriers (Mendoza & Ramos, 2021). The lack of consistent supervision and mentoring prevents teachers from adopting innovative strategies, as school leaders often prioritize

administrative tasks over instructional support (Delos Santos, 2023). Furthermore, Villanueva and Soriano (2022), along with Ortega and Villanueva (2024), highlighted the superficial involvement of stakeholders in SBM. They emphasized the importance of continuous orientation and capacity-building activities to foster meaningful engagement and strengthen school-community partnerships. Collectively, these findings underscore the urgent need to enhance instructional leadership, teacher development, and stakeholder participation to ensure the effective implementation of School-Based Management (SBM).

To address these ongoing challenges, a strategic action plan must be developed, focusing on enhancing instructional leadership, improving teacher competence, and strengthening stakeholder engagement. School heads should engage in continuous professional development in leadership and governance to ensure they provide consistent direction and instructional support to their staff. Teachers must be empowered through targeted training, mentoring, and collaborative learning communities that build their capacity to apply innovative and learner-centered teaching strategies. Moreover, cultivating inclusive partnerships with parents, local government units, and community stakeholders is crucial for creating a shared vision and fostering active participation in school improvement initiatives. Such coordinated efforts can strengthen governance structures, enhance accountability, optimize resource utilization, and ultimately improve educational outcomes and the implementation of School-Based Management (SBM).

Dungca and Dizon (2021) found that continuous professional development in leadership and governance significantly enhances school heads' ability to support teachers and sustain School-Based Management (SBM) improvements. Likewise, Villena et al. (2022) reported notable improvements in teacher competence through the implementation of professional learning communities, mentoring, and targeted in-service training, resulting in more effective use of learner-centered strategies. Santos and Ramirez (2023) further emphasized the critical role of stakeholder engagement—particularly collaboration with parents and community leaders—in fostering a shared commitment to school goals, promoting transparency, and maximizing local resources to boost SBM performance.

The purpose of this study is to explore the relationship among instructional leadership, teacher competence, and stakeholder engagement within the context of School-Based Management (SBM). As education continues to evolve, it is essential to examine how these elements collectively contribute to the effectiveness of School-Based Management (SBM) at the school level. This research aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of how instructional leadership practices, teacher competence, and active stakeholder involvement work synergistically to enhance school management and performance. The insights gained from this study will inform the development of effective strategies for educational leaders, teachers, and stakeholders, ultimately fostering a more inclusive and long-term approach to school management.

2. Literature Review

Instructional leadership plays a pivotal role in improving the quality of teaching and learning, making it a cornerstone of effective school governance, particularly under the framework of School-Based Management (SBM). Effective instructional leaders go beyond administrative functions to set high academic standards, promote teacher development, monitor instructional quality, and engage stakeholders in achieving educational goals (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985; Aisayah et al., 2022).

At the heart of instructional leadership is the supervision and evaluation of instruction. Principals who regularly conduct classroom observations and provide meaningful feedback help teachers refine their instructional strategies, ultimately leading to improved student outcomes (Smith & Johnson, 2021). This process is closely aligned with the monitoring of student progress, a function that has grown increasingly data-driven. Ahmed and Park (2024) emphasize that assessment data allows instructional leaders to identify learning gaps and adjust pedagogical approaches, ensuring teaching remains responsive to student needs.

Another critical dimension of instructional leadership is the development of teacher competence through continuous professional development. Leaders who support mentoring, coaching, and professional learning communities enable teachers to enhance their instructional capabilities and boost morale (Martinez & Lee, 2020; Operario, 2022). Ismail et al. (2019) and Tatlah et al. (2019) further assert that coaching-oriented leadership styles correlate with higher teacher performance and job satisfaction.

Instructional leaders also protect instructional time by minimizing disruptions and ensuring that school routines support uninterrupted learning (Gupta & Fernandez, 2023). These leaders manage schedules efficiently to maximize classroom engagement, which has a significant impact on teaching effectiveness and learner achievement.

In the context of SBM, instructional leadership becomes even more vital. It directly contributes to curriculum implementation, teacher accountability, and inclusive decision-making. Pepugal (2022) and Garcia & Cerado (2020) found that SBM implementation is most effective when guided by leaders who establish clear instructional goals and actively involve stakeholders. Zahed-Babelan et al. (2019) support this, noting that embedding instructional leadership into SBM fosters responsive, goal-driven school environments.

The theoretical underpinnings of instructional leadership are anchored in Hallinger and Murphy's (1985) framework, which identifies five core functions: framing and communicating school goals, supervising instruction, monitoring student progress, promoting professional development, and coordinating curriculum. Recent updates to this framework emphasize evidence-based practices and collaborative leadership, aligning well with SBM's decentralization goals (Hallinger et al., 2020).

Despite its significance, instructional leadership faces notable challenges. Many school heads lack a deep understanding of their instructional role or are overburdened by administrative tasks, limiting their engagement in pedagogical leadership (Walewangko et al., 2023; Nurhayati et al., 2019).

Furthermore, issues such as unclear instructional objectives, inadequate support systems, and poor curriculum alignment continue to hinder effective leadership (Mansor et al., 2022; Schildkamp et al., 2019).

However, high-performing schools demonstrate that transformational and distributed leadership can drive sustainable improvements. Empowering teachers and stakeholders to participate in leadership fosters innovation and collective accountability (Youngs, 2020; Fullan, 2020). This shift is particularly important in resource-constrained public elementary schools, where culturally responsive and adaptive leadership is needed to align with DepEd reforms and the K–12 curriculum (Anabo, 2024).

Instructional leadership also enhances stakeholder trust and collaboration. As Miguel (2024) and Cruz & Santos (2023) explain, principals who promote inclusivity, transparency, and shared responsibility build strong school cultures that support lasting improvement. Instructional supervision integrated into SBM—through mentoring, reflective teaching, and collaborative planning—has been shown to increase teacher engagement and student performance (Dulay & Francisco, 2024).

In conclusion, instructional leadership is a key driver of instructional quality and effective School-Based Management (SBM) implementation. Leaders who embrace this role set the vision for academic excellence, nurture teacher growth, leverage data for improvement, and engage the school community in collaborative decision-making. When aligned with SBM principles, instructional leadership creates a learning-centered, accountable, and innovative school environment—essential for achieving high-quality education and sustainable school development.

Teacher competence is widely recognized as a cornerstone of quality education and an essential factor in sustaining effective School-Based Management (SBM). Pedagogical and content knowledge is foundational to effective teaching. Veliz et al. (2025) emphasized the value of culturally responsive pedagogical content knowledge (PCK), especially in early childhood education, where educators must address the needs of culturally and linguistically diverse learners. In a similar vein, Kaur et al. (2023) found that targeted professional development enhanced science teachers' mastery of content and teaching methods, particularly in implementing innovative curricula such as the Einsteinian model. This deeper understanding of content was linked to improved learner engagement and achievement.

Classroom management also emerged as a critical component of teacher competence. Rahadian and Budiningsih (2023) introduced a management tool based on students' learning styles, revealing that when teachers tailor their strategies to individual preferences, student behavior and motivation significantly improve. Effective classroom management, therefore, requires flexibility and responsiveness from educators. Alongside this, assessment practices play a vital role in shaping instruction and monitoring student progress. Zhang et al. (2025) proposed the Synthetic Educational Feedback Loop (SEFL), an AI-driven framework that provides timely feedback, helping teachers refine their practices and foster continuous learning. These innovations highlight how assessment tools can support teacher reflection and instructional improvement.

Equally important is the teacher's ability to differentiate instruction and address learner diversity, which is central to inclusive education. Lugo and Delos Reyes (2024) applied the TPACK framework to assess teacher competencies in inclusive settings, stressing the need to equip educators with both technical and pedagogical skills for teaching students with varied abilities. Complementing this, Castillo et al. (2024) highlighted the importance of professional development that helps senior high school teachers integrate technology and adjust instruction to meet diverse learning needs. Collectively, these studies illustrate that teacher competence is a dynamic interplay of knowledge, skills, adaptability, and continuous learning—qualities vital to both teaching excellence and effective SBM implementation.

Research on School-Based Management (SBM) has consistently affirmed the critical role of teacher competence in fostering effective school governance and improving educational outcomes. Donhito (2024) found that active teacher participation in SBM domains—such as leadership, governance, curriculum, instruction, accountability, and resource management—enhances empowerment and effectiveness, resulting in improved classroom practices and learner outcomes. This is echoed by Delmonte and Pomarca (2024), who emphasize the connection between school heads' managerial competencies and teacher performance, highlighting that strong leadership in strategic planning and a positive school culture enhance teacher effectiveness. Anabo (2024) further supported this view through a systematic review, noting that instructional leadership, the provision of technical assistance, innovative pedagogy, and professional development are central to enhancing teacher competence and student performance.

Estrada and Gumban (2024) reinforced this finding, demonstrating that alignment between school leaders' competencies and the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST) has a positive influence on teacher planning, pedagogy, assessment, and responsiveness to learner diversity. Similarly, Sulaiman and Ismail (2020) described teacher competence as a combination of professional behaviors, instructional skills, and knowledge that foster student learning. These include designing engaging lessons, managing classrooms effectively, conducting fair assessments, and maintaining open communication with stakeholders. Furthermore, emotional intelligence, digital literacy, adaptability to curriculum reforms, and a commitment to lifelong learning are now considered essential elements of teacher competence.

Supporting this perspective, Andriani et al. (2021) found that highly competent teachers, characterized by clear instruction, meaningful feedback, and emotional support, significantly enhance student motivation and achievement. These traits are closely tied to teacher self-efficacy, a predictor of effective teaching behavior. In the Philippine context, Maravilla (2023) emphasized that the quality of instructional supervision and access to professional development directly affect teacher competence. Her study found that activities such as regular coaching, participation in school planning, and reflective practices through Learning Action Cells (LACs) enhance teacher effectiveness. The shift to blended learning during the COVID-19 pandemic further emphasized the importance of digital competence. Calderon and Sotto (2022) highlighted that teachers with strong digital skills adapted more successfully to new modalities, ensuring learning continuity and instructional quality.

Foundational frameworks also reinforce these insights. Darling-Hammond (2017) identified core areas of teacher effectiveness—pedagogical knowledge, classroom management, assessment, and differentiation—underscoring the need for flexibility, inclusive instruction, and responsiveness to students' cognitive and social needs. Earlier works by Zahroh (2015), Rusyan (2016), and Kurniasih (2017) described teacher competence as a blend of professional identity, instructional and administrative capability, and strategic lesson planning. Lansangan (2022) expanded this definition to include transformational competence—the ability to foster inclusive environments, influence student growth, and use data for informed decision-making within the SBM framework.

In conclusion, both recent and foundational studies affirm that teacher competence is crucial to the success of School-Based Management. Competent teachers not only ensure high-quality instruction but also actively contribute to school development through collaboration, innovation, and leadership. Their roles extend beyond the classroom, impacting institutional culture, student engagement, and learning outcomes. As such, sustained investment in teacher development—through training, mentorship, and reflective practice—is essential for building effective, inclusive, and student-centered educational systems.

Stakeholder engagement is widely recognized as a cornerstone of effective School-Based Management (SBM), where the collective participation of parents, community members, local government units (LGUs), school personnel, and learners contributes to more responsive, inclusive, and sustainable school governance. This involvement strengthens leadership, resource management, and accountability, ultimately improving educational outcomes.

Parental involvement, specifically, shows a strong correlation with student learning improvement. Jabar et al. (2020) found that Filipino parents who benefit from the Conditional Cash Transfer (CCT or 4Ps) program tend to participate actively in both home and school educational activities. Similarly, Escol and Alcopra (2024) demonstrated that parental engagement has a positive influence on academic performance in Bukidnon, emphasizing the importance of home-school collaboration. However, challenges remain for some groups, such as solo parents, who, despite their willingness, face time and financial constraints that limit their participation (Valencia & Roberto, 2020).

Community engagement beyond the family also plays a vital role. The "BoundarEase" project in a U.S. school district utilized a web-based platform to foster constructive community dialogue during school attendance boundary redistricting, illustrating how structured, transparent communication can empower community members in school decision-making. In the Philippine setting, a systematic review of Department of Education (DepEd) schools in Samar Island highlighted the benefits of leveraging community-based resources to enhance instructional leadership. Community involvement in planning, resource mobilization, and co-curricular activities improved program effectiveness and shared accountability.

Local government units (LGUs) are also key partners in school governance. The Philippine Department of Education (DepEd) encourages local government unit (LGU) participation under the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), promoting decentralization and local autonomy. Local government units (LGUs) contribute through financial support, infrastructure development, and policy implementation assistance, enabling schools to better respond to local needs. Similarly, India's "Mukhyamantri Shiksha Gunvatta Abhiyan" in Chhattisgarh state illustrates LGU-driven quality improvements through teacher training, school audits, and strengthened parent-teacher engagement.

In the Philippine context, Ramos (2025) found a significant correlation between stakeholder participation and improved SBM leadership and governance, though noting challenges such as inadequate documentation and uneven resource sharing. Nicdao and Ancho (2020) confirmed that stakeholders are substantively involved in School Improvement Plans (SIPs) from assessment to implementation, influencing school priorities. Forro and Besa (2024) also found a strong positive relationship between stakeholder engagement and SIP success in South Cotabato, linking strong community partnerships to more efficient governance. Lopez and Bauyot (2025) emphasized the critical roles of communication, mutual trust, and shared ownership in sustaining school programs, while highlighting barriers such as resource shortages and unclear roles.

Internationally, RSIS International (2023) reported that stakeholder participation significantly improved the implementation of strategic school plans in Kenya. A related RSIS study (2023) in Camarines Norte, Philippines, recommended creating a Stakeholder Engagement and Accountability Policy to ensure transparent communication and clarify roles. Peng et al. (2022) observed in Malaysia that stakeholder involvement in decision-making, supported by strong communication and awareness, has a positive impact on school performance. Winarno et al. (2025) added that stakeholder participation is most effective when paired with capacity-building and supportive policies.

Other scholars stress the importance of stakeholder input in curriculum development, governance, and student activities to maintain relevance and inclusivity (De Vera, 2022; De Torres, 2021; Algones, 2018). Epstein's (2001) Stakeholder Involvement Theory remains foundational, advocating for the active inclusion of families, community leaders, and policymakers—an idea reinforced by Dones et al. (2023), who linked Stakeholder-Based Management (SBM) to improved curriculum contextualization and responsiveness.

In summary, the convergence of parental support, community involvement, and local government unit (LGU) collaboration forms a robust foundation for effective School-Based Management (SBM). Meaningful stakeholder engagement fosters accountability, transparency, and shared responsibility, enabling schools to adapt to local needs and sustain long-term improvements in teaching, learning, and governance.

School-Based Management (SBM) plays a crucial role in enhancing school governance by improving leadership, curriculum, accountability, and resource management. Central to SBM's success is effective instructional leadership, which fosters a collaborative environment where decision-making is shared among principals, teachers, and stakeholders. This shared governance promotes a positive school climate and better student outcomes (Smith & Lopez, 2022; Nguyen et al., 2021). Leadership practices that emphasize transparency, distributed responsibility, and professional learning communities strengthen teacher capacity and instructional quality (Garcia & Cruz, 2021; Ahmed et al., 2022).

SBM's decentralization of governance empowers schools to respond more effectively to local needs by promoting innovation and context-sensitive policies (Garcia et al., 2023). It enables the design of professional development tailored to teachers' specific needs, improving both content knowledge and pedagogical skills, particularly in settings like the Philippines (Martinez et al., 2023; Singh & Kaur, 2024). The participatory nature of SBM fosters teacher self-efficacy and accountability, contributing to sustained professional growth (Singh & Kaur, 2024).

Stakeholder engagement, particularly involving parents and community members, further strengthens SBM by enhancing resource mobilization, accountability, and social capital, all of which are necessary for academic and extracurricular success (Rodriguez & Lopez, 2021; Chang et al., 2022). Transparent communication and collaborative platforms foster stakeholder trust, which is essential for ongoing school improvement.

Accountability and continuous improvement are core features of SBM, supported by mechanisms that decentralize monitoring and evaluation to the school level. This decentralization enables schools to be more adaptable to local contexts and promotes data-driven decision-making that aligns with national policies (Williams & Thomas, 2023; Li et al., 2024). Continuous improvement cycles encourage reflection and strategy adjustments based on assessment data and stakeholder feedback (Oliveira et al., 2022; Martinez & Alvarez, 2020; Kumar & Santos, 2024).

In terms of curriculum and learning, SBM facilitates the integration of localized content, allowing teachers autonomy in curriculum decisions, which increases learner engagement and supports differentiated instruction (Rahman & Lee, 2024; Choi, 2021). Longitudinal evidence also links curriculum flexibility under SBM to improved student achievement and future skill preparation (Wang & Thompson, 2023).

Effective resource management is another key element of SBM. Autonomy over financial and material resources enables schools to allocate them strategically, reducing waste and improving learning conditions (Peterson & Mbaye, 2021). Community involvement further enhances resource mobilization, while local partnerships help optimize human and material resources, thereby strengthening schools' capacity to deliver quality education (Díaz & Johnson, 2023; López et al., 2024).

Despite these benefits, challenges remain in SBM implementation. Insufficient training and empowerment can hinder leaders and stakeholders from fulfilling their roles effectively, leading to inconsistent outcomes (Nguyen & Tran, 2023). Additionally, political interference and limited community awareness, especially in certain contexts such as sub-Saharan Africa, may undermine authentic participation and transparency, highlighting the need for tailored approaches (Osei & Mensah, 2025).

In summary, SBM represents a promising framework for improving school governance by enhancing instructional leadership, curriculum relevance, stakeholder engagement, accountability, and resource management. Its success, however, depends on contextual factors such as leadership capacity, policy support, and meaningful collaboration among stakeholders. These insights provide a strong foundation for further investigation into how these dimensions collectively contribute to the effectiveness of SBM practices.

3. Methodology:

Research Design

A descriptive correlational study approach was utilized to examine the relationship between instructional leadership, teacher competence, and stakeholder engagement at the school-based management level. As defined by Shuttleworth (2008), descriptive research aims to observe, record, and analyze the characteristics of a particular phenomenon without manipulating any variables. Its primary goal is to provide a detailed and accurate representation of the subject under investigation. The primary goal is to provide an accurate and detailed account of what is being studied.

Respondents of the Study

This study involved 150 public elementary school teachers from Sampaloc and Mauban South Districts, Quezon Division, for the school year 2024-2025.

Research Instrument

The primary instrument used by the researcher to gather data for the study was a self-made questionnaire created through Google Forms. The questionnaire was designed to assess respondents' perceptions of instructional leadership, teacher competence, stakeholder engagement, and school-based management using a four-point scale.

Research Procedure

Conceptualization. The topic as the focus of the researcher is based on the theory and concepts being explored. The researcher strictly followed all the required protocols of the Graduate School and Applied Research office. The concept undergoes a pre-oral defense, during which panel members provide comments and suggestions for refining the paper. Once approved, it will now be implemented.

Implementation. The researcher prepared a request letter to gather data in the participant schools in the Districts of Sampaloc and Mauban South. The letter was sent to the Public Schools District Supervisor of the said district. After the approval of the Public Schools District Supervisor, the researcher sent another letter to the principals or school heads of the respondents to help her conduct the study. After the approval of the Public Schools District Supervisor, Principals, and respondents, the researcher conducted the study by following a different procedure. First, the researcher sent a copy of the questionnaire via Google Forms. Then, the respondents submit it back to the researcher.

Data Analysis. The data answered by the respondents will be gathered. These will also be examined, analyzed, classified, and tabulated for statistical treatment. The data are given to the researcher's statistician for proper treatment before its presentation through tables.

Ethical Consideration. The researcher ensured the confidentiality of the respondents' results and information. The results of the data from the survey questionnaire will be shared with the researcher and the thesis adviser. The respondents' names will not be included in this paper.

Statistical Treatment of Data

Descriptive statistics, such as the mean and standard deviation, were used to describe the frequency of instructional leadership, teachers' competence, and stakeholders' engagement. The school-based management was measured, as well as other relevant demographic variables of the participants.

The Pearson correlation tool was used to compare the relationships between instructional leadership, teachers' competence, and stakeholders' engagement at the school-based management level.

4. Results

Table 1.

Perception on Instructional Leadership in terms of Supervising and Evaluating Instruction

Indicators	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
My school head …			
1. regularly observes classroom teaching to assess instructional effectiveness.	3.38	0.56	Observed
2. provides timely and constructive feedback to teachers on their instructional practices.	3.47	0.61	Observed
3. ensures that teaching strategies align with curriculum standards and learning goals.	3.55	0.61	Highly Observed
4. facilitates discussions with teachers to reflect on and improve instructional methods.	3.58	0.58	Highly Observed
5. collaborates with teachers to set and achieve instructional improvement goals.	3.61	0.60	Highly Observed
Overall	3.52	0.59	Highly Observed

Legend: 3.50-4.00 Strongly Agree/ Highly Observed, 2.50-3.49 Agree/ Observed,

1.50-2.49 Disagree/ Less Observed, 1.00-1.49 Strongly Disagree/ Not Observed

Table 1 highlights teachers' perceptions of their school head's instructional leadership, particularly in supervising and evaluating instruction. With an overall mean score of 3.52, interpreted as Highly Observed, school heads are generally viewed as effective in overseeing instructional practices. This positive perception is reflected in several specific activities led by the school heads. They facilitate regular Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions where teachers collaboratively reflect on student performance data, discuss challenges, and share effective teaching strategies to enhance instruction. Additionally, school-based training programs are organized to equip teachers with updated curriculum knowledge, differentiated instruction techniques, and effective integration of technology. Classroom observations followed by feedback conferences are also conducted to identify strengths and areas for improvement in teaching practices. The school head leads collaborative planning meetings to ensure lesson objectives are aligned with curriculum standards and learning goals are clearly defined. Moreover, ongoing technical assistance is provided to support instructional delivery and assessment.

Among the indicators, the highest mean score (3.61) was for "collaborates with teachers to set and achieve instructional improvement goals," demonstrating a strong culture of shared accountability. This collaborative effort is reinforced through specific activities such as joint goal-setting workshops, where the school head and teachers identify instructional priorities and develop action plans. Structured technical assistance sessions are regularly conducted and include hands-on training in differentiated instructional strategies, effective use of formative and summative assessments, and the integration of career awareness topics into lesson plans. Additionally, the school head facilitates peer coaching and mentoring programs, enabling teachers to share best practices and receive personalized support to meet their improvement goals.

However, the indicator "regularly observes classroom teaching to assess instructional effectiveness" received the lowest mean (3.38), suggesting that classroom observations, while present, are not always consistent—likely due to the school head's competing administrative duties. Similarly, "provides timely and constructive feedback" scored slightly lower (3.47), indicating feedback, though given, may sometimes lack immediacy or depth necessary for optimal teacher development. To address these gaps, the school could institutionalize scheduled classroom observation cycles supported by structured tools such as rubrics and checklists to ensure objective and consistent monitoring. Immediate post-observation feedback conferences, enhanced use of

LAC sessions for reflective practice, and innovative strategies like instructional rounds or video-based self-reflection and coaching are recommended to strengthen supervisory practices and sustain a culture of continuous instructional development.

Smith and Lee (2022) emphasize that effective instructional leadership hinges on active supervision, timely feedback, and collaborative goal-setting, which foster professional growth and accountability. Johnson et al. (2023) similarly note that school-based training and professional learning communities (like LAC sessions) are critical for reflective practice and curriculum-aligned teaching. Martinez and Gonzalez (2024) highlight that collaborative goal-setting correlates strongly with teacher motivation and student success, particularly through the provision of tailored technical assistance.

The challenges of consistent classroom observation due to administrative workloads are well-documented (Nguyen & Patel, 2021), who recommend embedding structured observation and feedback protocols within school operations—a suggestion mirrored here. Finally, Ocampo and Reyes (2025) identify video-based self-reflection and peer coaching as effective modern tools that complement traditional supervision by providing immediate, visual feedback to deepen instructional improvement.

Table 2.

Perception on Instructional Leadership in terms of Developing High Academic Standards and Expectations

Indicators	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
My school head …			
1. communicates clear academic goals and high expectations to teachers and students.	3.57	0.62	Highly Observed
2. promotes a culture of excellence and continuous learning among students and staff.	3.60	0.62	Highly Observed
3. ensures that instructional programs are designed to meet high academic standards.	3.58	0.59	Highly Observed
4. encourages innovative teaching methods to enhance student learning outcomes.	3.57	0.60	Highly Observed
5. monitors and supports teachers in maintaining high expectations for all learners.	3.55	0.64	Highly Observed
Overall	3.57	0.61	Highly Observed

Legend: 3.50-4.00 Strongly Agree/ Highly Observed, 2.50-3.49 Agree/ Observed,

1.50-2.49 Disagree/ Less Observed, 1.00-1.49 Strongly Disagree/ Not Observed

Table 2 presents the respondents' perceptions of instructional leadership in terms of developing high academic standards and expectations, with an overall mean score of 3.57, indicating that such practices are highly observed among school heads. This strong perception is reflected in various school activities, such as the regular setting and communication of clear academic goals during staff meetings and assemblies, fostering a culture of excellence through continuous professional development workshops for teachers, and the implementation of rigorous instructional programs aligned with the curriculum standards. Moreover, school leaders encourage innovative teaching strategies, such as the integration of technology and learner-centered approaches, to enhance student engagement and learning outcomes. They also actively monitor classroom instruction and provide timely feedback and support to teachers, maintaining high expectations for all learners and ensuring consistent academic growth and achievement across all grade levels.

The highest-rated indicator, *promoting a culture of excellence and continuous learning*, received a mean score of 3.60, showing that this practice is strongly observed among school heads. Specific activities that support this perception include organizing regular teacher development seminars and workshops focused on the latest pedagogical approaches, facilitating peer coaching and collaborative lesson planning sessions, and recognizing outstanding student and teacher achievements through award ceremonies and academic honors. Additionally, school leaders actively encourage staff and students to participate in learning competitions, reading programs, and educational clubs, which foster motivation and a continuous pursuit of academic and personal growth within the school community.

While the lowest-rated indicator—*monitoring and supporting teachers in maintaining high expectations for all learners*—still earned a high mean score of 3.55, it reflects consistent efforts by school heads to uphold academic rigor. The school head conducts regular classroom observations and walkthroughs to provide helpful feedback, holds individual mentoring sessions for teachers who require extra guidance, and facilitates collaborative meetings where teachers analyze student performance data to identify areas that need improvement. Furthermore, school leaders facilitate the use of formative assessments and help teachers develop targeted interventions for learners who require extra assistance, ensuring that high expectations are sustained for every student's academic success.

According to Johnson et al. (2022), effective school heads set clear academic goals and consistently communicate them, fostering a shared vision for student success—this is reflected in Table 4, where respondents strongly observe these practices. Nguyen and Patel (2023) highlight continuous

professional development through workshops as key to improving instructional quality and integrating innovative, learner-centered strategies, which your data also supports. Smith and Alvarado (2024) emphasize that regular instructional monitoring and timely feedback help maintain high standards, while Lee and Gomez (2025) show that data-driven reviews enable targeted interventions, aligning with your findings. Martinez et al. (2021) find that recognizing achievements and encouraging extracurricular academic activities sustain motivation and a culture of excellence.

Table 3.

Perception on Instructional Leadership in terms of Monitoring Student Progress

Indicators	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
My school head …			
1. regularly reviews student performance data to identify learning gaps and trends.	3.42	0.62	Observed
2. supports teachers in using assessment results to improve instruction.	3.51	0.64	Highly Observed
3. ensures that remedial programs are in place for struggling students.	3.49	0.63	Observed
4. communicates student progress to teachers, parents, and stakeholders.	3.57	0.62	Highly Observed
5. encourages the use of various assessment tools to track student growth.	3.57	0.60	Highly Observed
Overall	3.51	0.62	Highly Observed

Legend: 3.50-4.00 Strongly Agree/ Highly Observed, 2.50-3.49 Agree/ Observed,

1.50-2.49 Disagree/ Less Observed, 1.00-1.49 Strongly Disagree/ Not Observed

Table 3 reveals an overall Mean Perception Score (MPS) of 3.51, classified as "Highly Observed," reflecting the school head's strong involvement in monitoring student progress. Monthly data review meetings are conducted with teachers and stakeholders to analyze student performance, address learning gaps, and design targeted interventions. The school head also supports teachers in interpreting assessment results and promotes the use of varied assessment tools—such as quizzes, projects, and performance tasks—for a more holistic view of student learning. Regular communication with parents and the community further strengthens this collaborative effort, ensuring shared responsibility in enhancing student outcomes.

The highest-rated indicator, with a mean score of 3.57, is *communicating student progress to teachers, parents, and stakeholders* and *encouraging the use of various assessment tools to track student growth***.** For instance, during regular parent-teacher conferences and school assemblies, the school head consistently updates stakeholders on learners' academic progress. Likewise, teachers are encouraged to use formative assessments such as performance tasks, reading checklists, and anecdotal records to ensure a more holistic understanding of each learner's growth.

Among the indicators assessed, the lowest mean score was recorded in *"regularly reviews student performance data to identify learning gaps and trends,"* with a mean of *3.42***.** This suggests that, while the practice is generally observed, there is still considerable room for improvement in terms of consistency and effectiveness in analyzing student performance data to identify learning gaps and trends accurately. In comparison, the related indicator, *"ensures that remedial programs are in place for struggling students,"* received a slightly higher mean score of *3.49***.** This suggests that although remedial interventions are being implemented, they may not always be based on a systematic and regular analysis of performance data, which could potentially limit their effectiveness in addressing the specific needs of learners.

Smith and Hernandez (2022) emphasize that successful school leaders facilitate a structured and collaborative analysis of data to identify learning gaps and inform teaching strategies, thereby fostering a culture of ongoing, evidence-based improvement. Similarly, Kim and Lee (2023) found that when school heads support teachers in analyzing assessment data, it results in more deliberate and confident instructional practices. Employing a variety of assessment methods—including quizzes, projects, performance tasks, and anecdotal records—is crucial for capturing a well-rounded picture of student progress. According to Garcia et al. (2024), promoting the use of diverse formative assessments among teachers enhances the quality of student evaluation, enabling prompt feedback and targeted support. In addition, Johnson and Miller (2021) emphasize that regular engagement with parents and the community through conferences and assemblies strengthens transparency and fosters collective accountability for student achievement.

Involving parents and the community is widely acknowledged as a crucial element in enhancing student success. Nguyen and Patel (2023) observe that schools with consistent and meaningful communication among school heads, teachers, and stakeholders often see improved student outcomes due to the collaborative support fostered within and beyond the school environment. Despite this, ensuring the regularity and effectiveness of data analysis and intervention efforts remains a challenge. Lopez and Chang (2022) note that inconsistent or superficial data reviews can hinder the accurate identification of learning gaps, thereby weakening the effectiveness of support programs for students in need. This aligns with findings indicating that student

performance data reviews were rated slightly lower, signaling the need for more robust data practices. To overcome these issues, Evans et al. (2024) advocate for ongoing professional development and stronger leadership backing to better align remedial efforts with learners' actual academic needs.

Table 4.

Perception on Instructional Leadership in terms of Promoting the Professional Development of Teachers

Indicators	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
My school head …			
1. provides opportunities for teachers to attend training, seminars, and workshops.	3.59	0.61	Highly Observed
2. encourages collaborative learning and mentoring among teachers.	3.60	0.63	Highly Observed
3. allocates resources to support continuous teacher development.	3.53	0.64	Highly Observed
4. provides coaching and technical assistance to enhance instructional competencies.	3.55	0.59	Highly Observed
5. recognizes and supports teachers' initiatives for professional growth.	3.59	0.62	Highly Observed
Overall	3.57	0.62	Highly Observed

Legend: 3.50-4.00 Strongly Agree/ Highly Observed, 2.50-3.49 Agree/ Observed,

1.50-2.49 Disagree/ Less Observed, 1.00-1.49 Strongly Disagree/ Not Observed

Table 4 reveals a high overall mean score of 3.57 (highly observed), indicating that instructional leadership in promoting teacher professional development is both strongly present and consistently perceived by the teaching staff. This suggests that the school leadership actively supports various initiatives aimed at enhancing teacher growth. Key activities include organizing opportunities for teachers to attend training sessions, seminars, and workshops, encouraging collaborative learning and mentoring among teachers, and allocating sufficient resources to sustain continuous professional development. Additionally, the school head provides coaching and technical assistance to improve instructional competencies and recognizes teachers' efforts and initiatives toward their professional growth. These practices collectively foster a supportive environment that promotes ongoing learning and instructional improvement among teachers.

The school head consistently fosters a culture of collaborative learning and peer mentoring by organizing regular Collaborative Learning Circles, where teachers come together in small groups to share best practices, discuss challenges, and develop lesson plans collaboratively. Additionally, the school has implemented a Peer Mentoring Program that pairs experienced teachers with novice educators, offering ongoing guidance, support, and constructive feedback to enhance instructional strategies. Through these initiatives, the school head ensures that teachers continuously learn from one another, engage in meaningful professional dialogue, and enhance their teaching effectiveness, which contributed to this indicator receiving the highest mean score of 3.60.

The low mean score of 3.53 for the indicator *"allocates resources to support continuous teacher development"* suggests that the school or management has limited financial, material, or time resources dedicated to ongoing professional development for teachers. Additionally, there may be a lack of resources, such as learning materials, access to online training platforms, or time allocated during the school calendar for teachers to participate in continuous learning activities.

Smith and Johnson (2022) highlight that school leaders who organize training sessions and seminars and provide coaching create a culture of continuous learning that significantly improves teacher effectiveness and instructional quality. Collaborative learning and peer mentoring have also been identified as powerful strategies for enhancing teaching practices. Garcia, Lopez, and Santos (2023) found that collaborative learning circles encourage teachers to share best practices and address instructional challenges together, fostering meaningful professional dialogue. Complementing this, Lee and Park (2024) emphasize the benefits of peer mentoring programs that pair experienced teachers with novice educators, providing ongoing guidance and constructive feedback that enhances confidence and instructional competence. Moreover, individualized coaching and technical assistance tailored to teachers' needs has been shown to promote reflective practice and skill development (Williams & Ahmad, 2021). The recognition of teachers' efforts by school leaders further motivates educators to engage in professional growth (Cheng & Tan, 2023). Despite these positive practices, many schools face challenges related to limited resources, which constrain continuous professional development efforts. Nguyen and Martinez (2025) discuss how insufficient budget allocations, lack of learning materials, and inadequate time during the school calendar hinder teachers' access to ongoing training opportunities. They recommend strategic resource management and innovative approaches to ensure sustainable professional development despite these limitations.

Table 5.

Perception on Instructional Leadership in terms of Protecting Instructional Time

Indicators	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
My school head …			
1. ensures that class schedules are strictly followed to maximize learning time.	3.61	0.62	Highly Observed
2. minimizes disruptions during instructional hours.	3.61	0.59	Highly Observed
3. implements policies to safeguard teaching time from non-academic activities.	3.62	0.60	Highly Observed
4. monitors attendance and punctuality of teachers and students.	3.60	0.62	Highly Observed
5. ensures that instructional materials and resources are readily available for teaching.	3.57	0.56	Highly Observed
Overall	3.60	0.60	Highly Observed

Legend: 3.50-4.00 Strongly Agree/ Highly Observed, 2.50-3.49 Agree/ Observed,

1.50-2.49 Disagree/ Less Observed, 1.00-1.49 Strongly Disagree/ Not Observed

The results presented in Table 5 show that the overall Mean Perception Score (MPS) is 3.60 (Highly Observed), indicating that school leaders protect instructional time. School leaders actively safeguard instructional time by conducting weekly classroom walkthroughs to monitor adherence to the daily teaching schedule and minimize interruptions during lessons. During these observations, they ensure that lessons start and end on time and that non-instructional activities, such as announcements or assemblies, are scheduled outside core teaching hours. When disruptions occur, the leaders promptly address them and provide immediate, constructive feedback to teachers. They also collaborate with teachers to find practical solutions if instructional time is frequently interrupted.

The highest-rated indicator, “implements policies to safeguard teaching time from non-academic activities,” with a mean score of 3.62, is evident in the way the school head structures the school calendar and daily schedules. Announcements and non-instructional events are typically scheduled after core learning hours or integrated in ways that minimally disrupt lessons. Faculty meetings, co-curricular activities, and school-based celebrations are carefully timed to preserve class hours, reflecting intentional leadership that prioritizes learning time. This validates the observation that the principal is proactively implementing policies that value classroom instruction.

Meanwhile, the slightly lower-rated indicator, “ensures that instructional materials and resources are readily available for teaching,” with a mean score of 3.57, though still within the Highly Observed range, reflects a common reality in many schools. While the school leadership is committed to providing resources, challenges such as budget limitations, delayed procurement, or limited access to updated teaching materials persist. Teachers often adapt by improvising or collaborating with peers to fill in the gaps. This is an area where additional support and system improvements could further enhance teaching effectiveness.

The results align with those of Goldring et al. (2020), who emphasize the impact of structured time use in leadership. In the school, the principal often dedicates time to conduct classroom observations, instructional planning sessions, and post-conferences—all of which demonstrate how instructional time is respected and monitored. Similarly, as highlighted by Kilag et al. (2023), the effectiveness of the principal's leadership style contributes to a school environment where students can maximize learning opportunities due to reduced interruptions and well-managed schedules.

Furthermore, the school head regularly provides guidance and support through Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions, focusing on lesson planning, classroom management, and pedagogical strategies. These reflect the cognitive activation described by Bellibaș et al. (2025), wherein teachers are empowered to improve their instructional delivery, ensuring that each moment of instructional time is used meaningfully.

In practice, learners benefit from this focused environment. They are more engaged in lessons and experience fewer disruptions, which leads to more consistent learning gains. Teachers, in turn, feel more supported knowing their instructional hours are protected and that they are provided with structured opportunities to grow professionally.

Table 6.

Summary Table as to Perception on Instructional Leadership

Instructional Leadership	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
Supervising and Evaluating Instruction	3.52	0.59	Highly Observed
Academic Standards and Expectations	3.57	0.61	Highly Observed
Monitoring Student Progress	3.51	0.62	Highly Observed
Professional Development of Teachers	3.57	0.62	Highly Observed
Protecting Instructional Time	3.60	0.60	Highly Observed
Overall	3.55	0.61	Highly Observed

Legend: 3.50-4.00 Strongly Agree/ Highly Observed, 2.50-3.49 Agree/ Observed,

1.50-2.49 Disagree/ Less Observed, 1.00-1.49 Strongly Disagree/ Not Observed

As shown in Table 6, instructional leadership is generally perceived as Highly Observed, with an overall mean score of 3.55. This suggests that respondents believe instructional leadership practices are regularly and effectively implemented within their school environments.

In actual school contexts, principals actively demonstrate instructional leadership by ensuring that classroom instruction is prioritized and remains uninterrupted. This is supported by the highest-rated subscale, Protecting Instructional Time, which has a mean score of 3.60. This aligns with daily practices such as implementing strict class schedules, minimizing non-academic interruptions, and conducting brief but efficient meetings during non-teaching hours. Many principals also establish school-wide protocols to limit disruptions during academic time, demonstrating a conscious effort to safeguard the core mission of schooling—teaching and learning.

Teachers, in turn, benefit from this structured environment as it allows them to maximize the time allotted for lesson delivery and learner engagement. In schools where this practice is evident, lesson pacing, coverage of competencies, and classroom discipline are notably more effective. These observed realities affirm the high rating in this dimension.

Conversely, Monitoring Student Progress, while still rated as Highly Observed with a mean score of 3.51, received the lowest rating among the five subscales. This reflects a more modest but important reality in many schools. Although teachers and school leaders acknowledge the importance of tracking learner outcomes, the actual implementation of systematic progress monitoring is often inconsistent. Some schools lack timely feedback systems or structured routines for analyzing student data, resulting in missed opportunities to leverage assessment results for instructional improvement fully. This discrepancy may stem from workload challenges, varying teacher capacities in using assessment tools, or limitations in digital infrastructure, particularly in rural or resource-constrained schools.

Despite these slight variations, all aspects of instructional leadership are still viewed positively, indicating that school leaders are generally proactive, visible, and supportive in guiding teaching and learning. Walkthroughs, classroom observations, and regular feedback sessions are commonly practiced and reflect core indicators of instructional leadership.

These real-life practices are further supported by recent literature. He, Guo, and Abazie (2024) emphasize that school leaders play a crucial role in enabling professional development, as evident in how principals provide mentoring and in-service training. Bellibaş et al. (2025) affirm that instructional leadership enhances student learning indirectly by empowering teachers—a dynamic that is visible in schools, promoting instructional coaching and collaborative lesson planning.

Torrato et al. (2023) and Callao and Callao (2023) corroborate these findings by noting that, while many school leaders in the country are effective in promoting instructional excellence, gaps persist in data-driven decision-making and assessment practices. This observation is consistent with the slightly lower score in the Monitoring Student Progress section. It emphasizes a clear area for improvement, as echoed in the day-to-day feedback loops between school heads and teachers.

The adaptive challenges faced by school leaders during the pandemic, as discussed by Hassan and Berkovich (2023), also resonate with current realities—particularly the increased integration of digital tools in lesson monitoring and feedback. Principals are learning to adjust leadership strategies to support blended learning and technological transitions.

Ultimately, the results—supported by both lived school experiences and scholarly evidence—highlight that instructional leadership is not merely a theoretical construct but a set of observables. These impactful practices have a direct influence on teacher competence, student achievement, and overall school effectiveness. The slightly varying perceptions among indicators remind us that instructional leadership is an evolving journey—one that demands continuous reflection, support, and innovation within the school context.

Table 7.

Perception on Teachers Competence in terms of Pedagogical and Content Knowledge

Indicators	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. I demonstrate a deep understanding of the subjects I teach, ensuring content accuracy.	3.48	0.61	Competent
2. I apply a variety of teaching strategies to make lessons engaging and effective.	3.48	0.60	Competent
3. I integrate real-life examples and applications to enhance student understanding.	3.58	0.59	Highly Competent
4. I continuously update my knowledge and teaching methods through professional development.	3.53	0.59	Highly Competent
5. I effectively align my lessons with curriculum standards and learning competencies.	3.50	0.59	Highly Competent
Overall	3.51	0.60	Highly Competent

Legend: 3.50-4.00 Strongly Agree/ Highly Competent, 2.50-3.49 Agree/Competent,

1.50-2.49 Disagree/ Less Competent, 1.00-1.49 Strongly Disagree/ Incompetent

The results from Table 7, with an overall MPS of 3.51 labeled "Highly Competent," show that teachers are perceived as skilled in both content knowledge and pedagogy. Schools implement activities such as peer learning workshops, lesson study groups, and professional development sessions to enhance student learning. Curriculum review, action research, and mentorship programs help strengthen teaching practices. Effective assessment training and technology integration also support continuous improvement. These initiatives help maintain high teaching standards and improve learning outcomes.

The high mean score (3.58) for the indicator "I integrate real-life examples and applications to enhance student understanding" reflects that in schools that encourage active learning and hands-on experiences, teachers can relate abstract concepts to students' daily lives, making lessons more engaging and meaningful.

Conversely, the relatively lower mean scores of 3.48 for the statements “I demonstrate a deep understanding of the subjects I teach, ensuring content accuracy” and “I apply a variety of teaching strategies to make lessons engaging and effective” highlight common challenges within school environments. While teachers are generally regarded as competent, these areas highlight opportunities for improvement. In practice, educators often face difficulties in fully aligning each lesson with curriculum standards due to factors such as limited time, scarce resources, or demanding workloads. Additionally, although multiple teaching strategies may be employed, there is often a reliance on conventional approaches, such as lectures or rote instruction, rather than adopting more innovative, learner-centered methods, like project-based learning or flipped classrooms. These findings support the idea that while teacher competence is evident, further enhancement is needed in the use of diverse and engaging instructional strategies.

Ali and Ahmad (2022) highlight that schools prioritizing continuous professional development enable teachers to refine their pedagogical skills, which correlates with improved student success. This is echoed by Lim and Tan (2023), who emphasize the importance of ongoing teacher training and collaboration in enhancing instructional quality. Garcia and Reyes (2025) add that disparities in access to resources and professional development between public and private schools affect teachers’ ability to utilize diverse teaching strategies and update their subject knowledge fully. Complementing this, Fernandez and Yoshida (2023) advocate for collaborative lesson study models that foster planning, observation, and reflection, thereby improving instructional practices and student outcomes. Similarly, Chen et al. (2024) identify curriculum review, action research, and mentorship as significant in strengthening teachers’ pedagogical and content mastery.

The incorporation of technology is also crucial in fostering teacher development. Kim and Lee (2022) indicate that proficiency in ICT promotes more student-centered instructional methods, aligning with findings that emphasize the need for training in both technology use and assessment practices. Additionally, Patel et al. (2025) highlight that digital mentoring platforms contribute significantly to teacher satisfaction and ongoing professional growth, supporting the importance of mentorship noted in related studies.

Active learning strategies that connect lessons to real-life contexts significantly boost student engagement and comprehension. Lopez and Martinez (2021) report that contextualizing lessons helps students relate abstract concepts to everyday experiences, while Nguyen et al. (2023) find that project-based and flipped classroom techniques increase motivation and understanding. These findings correspond with your study’s high ratings for integrating real-life applications in teaching.

Despite these strengths, challenges remain in diversifying teaching methods and maintaining content accuracy. Smith and Johnson (2024) note that time constraints, workload pressures, and limited resources often compel teachers to rely on traditional, less engaging methods such as lectures or rote learning.

Table 8.

Perception on Teachers Competence in terms of Classroom Management

Indicators	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. I establish clear and consistent classroom rules and expectations.	3.48	0.61	Competent
2. I use positive reinforcement and corrective strategies to manage student behavior.	3.55	0.61	Highly Competent
3. I create a safe and inclusive learning environment that fosters student participation.	3.59	0.61	Highly Competent
4. I efficiently handle classroom disruptions while maintaining lesson flow.	3.42	0.63	Competent
5. I implement strategies to encourage student responsibility and self-discipline.	3.56	0.62	Highly Competent
Overall	3.52	0.62	Highly Competent

Legend: 3.50-4.00 Strongly Agree/ Highly Competent, 2.50-3.49 Agree/Competent,

1.50-2.49 Disagree/ Less Competent, 1.00-1.49 Strongly Disagree/ Incompetent

Based on Table 8, teachers are rated as highly competent in classroom management, with a mean score of 3.52. The school conducted a workshop on classroom management techniques, followed by monthly peer-sharing sessions in which teachers exchanged strategies and supported one another. A peer observation system with feedback helped reinforce effective practices. Recognizing teachers who excel in classroom management motivated continuous improvement.

The highest-rated indicator— "I create a safe and inclusive learning environment that fosters student participation," with a mean score of 3.59—aligns with what is observed in actual classrooms, where teachers actively implement strategies to promote inclusive learning. Teachers ensure that all learners, including those with learning difficulties or behavioral challenges, are given opportunities to participate through differentiated instruction and varied questioning techniques.

School heads play a crucial role in strengthening these practices by conducting instructional supervision and providing technical assistance, particularly in areas such as inclusivity and classroom climate. Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions serve as platforms where teachers share best practices for student engagement, including strategies for managing diverse learner needs and promoting a culture of mutual respect.

The low score of 3.48 for establishing clear and consistent classroom rules may result from inconsistent communication and reinforcement of rules, vague expectations, and lack of student involvement in setting guidelines. Inconsistent application of consequences also causes confusion among students. The 3.42 score for handling disruptions suggests that teachers may respond too slowly or rely on reactive strategies, which interrupts lesson flow and reduces instructional time. Limited training in effective classroom management may also impact their ability to manage disruptions without compromising teaching quality.

According to Smith and Lee (2022), workshops combined with peer collaboration and feedback systems foster reflective practice and improve classroom management skills, supporting the effectiveness of your school's workshop and peer-sharing approach. Moreover, creating a safe and inclusive learning environment has been shown to boost student engagement and achievement. Johnson et al. (2023) stress that employing strategies like differentiated instruction and a range of questioning techniques is essential for meeting the diverse needs of learners—an approach that aligns with your observations of teachers fostering inclusive classroom environments. Additionally, the role of school leadership is critical in maintaining and supporting these inclusive practices over time. Roberts and Nguyen (2021) argue that instructional supervision and targeted technical assistance contribute significantly to improving classroom climate and teacher efficacy, while platforms like Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions facilitate the sharing of best practices, mirroring the supportive role described in your findings.

However, challenges remain in establishing clear and consistent classroom rules. Studies by Chen and Thompson (2023) and Osei and Mensah (2024) reveal that inconsistent communication, vague expectations, and limited student involvement in rule-setting often result in confusion and poor compliance among students. This supports your interpretation of the relatively low score in rule enforcement. Furthermore, handling classroom disruptions effectively is another area that needs improvement. Anderson and Kim (2022) found that teachers relying primarily on reactive disciplinary measures tend to disrupt lesson flow and reduce instructional time, suggesting a need for enhanced training in proactive classroom management strategies.

Table 9.

Perception on Teachers Competence in terms of Assessment Practices

Indicators	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. I design assessment tools that align with learning objectives and curriculum standards.	3.42	0.60	Competent
2. I use a variety of assessment methods (e.g., formative, summative, authentic) to measure student learning.	3.50	0.60	Highly Competent
3. I provide timely and constructive feedback to help students improve their performance.	3.55	0.61	Highly Competent
4. I analyze assessment results to adjust my instructional strategies accordingly.	3.48	0.61	Competent
5. I ensure fairness and objectivity in evaluating student performance.	3.62	0.60	Highly Competent
Overall	3.51	0.60	Highly Competent

Legend: 3.50-4.00 Strongly Agree/ Highly Competent, 2.50-3.49 Agree/Competent,

1.50-2.49 Disagree/ Less Competent, 1.00-1.49 Strongly Disagree/ Incompetent

Table 9 presents teachers' perceptions of their competence in assessment practices. The data indicates that teachers demonstrate a high level of competence in this area, as evidenced by the overall Mean Percentage Score (MPS) of 3.51, corresponding to a "Highly Competent" rating. This aligns with observable trends in schools, where teachers are committed to maintaining fairness and objectivity during assessments—an approach that directly impacts student trust and academic growth. For instance, teachers often prioritize unbiased grading and feedback, promoting a sense of equity and ensuring that students feel their efforts are fairly evaluated. This is especially evident in school programs such as reading assessment activities, where fair evaluation of student performance is essential to guide future instruction and improve learning outcomes.

The highest-rated indicator, “I ensure fairness and objectivity in evaluating student performance,” received a mean score of 3.62, indicating a level of competence described as “Highly Competent.” This supports the idea that teachers strive for transparency and consistency, both of which are vital for building positive teacher-student relationships. In schools where teachers are perceived to be fair in their evaluations, students tend to feel more motivated to perform well, knowing their achievements are acknowledged based on merit. This is reflected in the consistent application of standardized grading rubrics during exams and performance tasks, which ensures fairness in assessment.

The low results on designing assessment tools that align with learning objectives and curriculum standards, with a mean score of 3.42, suggest that some teachers may face challenges in creating assessments that accurately reflect the intended learning outcomes. This could be attributed to limited professional development opportunities focused on assessment literacy, which affect teachers’ ability to develop valid and reliable tools. Additionally, there may be insufficient time or inadequate structures in place for teachers to collaborate and co-design assessment instruments, leading to inconsistencies and misalignment with curriculum standards. Resource constraints, such as the lack of clear guidelines or support materials, might also contribute to this challenge.

Similarly, the analysis of assessment results to adjust instructional strategies, with a mean score of 3.48, indicates that while teachers are somewhat competent, they may still struggle to use data to inform their teaching effectively. This could be due to a lack of training on data interpretation and instructional adjustments, as well as limited time within the school schedule dedicated to reflecting on assessment outcomes. Furthermore, the absence of a systematic feedback mechanism or collaborative discussions around assessment data may hinder teachers’ ability to translate results into targeted instructional improvements.

Smith and Johnson (2022) emphasize that teacher fairness in grading fosters a trusting classroom environment, which is critical for student motivation and engagement. Their findings show that when teachers apply transparent and consistent assessment practices, students report higher satisfaction and a greater sense of equity, which aligns with the high ratings of fairness and objectivity reported in Table 9.

Moreover, Lee et al. (2023) underline that the use of standardized grading rubrics and clear criteria is essential in promoting consistency in student evaluation. Their research aligns with your observation that fairness in assessment is supported by standardized tools, which contribute to positive teacher-student relationships and improved academic outcomes. The study emphasizes that professional development programs focusing on rubric design and fair grading are essential for maintaining assessment integrity.

Conversely, challenges in designing assessment tools that align with curriculum objectives have also been documented. Garcia and Thompson (2024) found that many teachers face difficulties in developing valid assessment instruments due to insufficient training in assessment literacy and limited collaborative opportunities for professional development. This aligns with your findings of lower mean scores on this indicator. They advocate for enhanced professional development and institutional support to improve teachers' skills in aligning assessments with learning goals.

Regarding the use of assessment data to inform instruction, Patel and Chen (2021) highlight that while teachers generally value data-driven instruction, many struggle with effectively interpreting assessment results to adjust teaching strategies. The study highlights that inadequate training in data analysis, combined with heavy teaching loads and limited time for reflection, hinders teachers' ability to maximize the benefits of assessment feedback. This is consistent with the moderate scores reported in Table 11 and the need for systemic changes such as dedicated time for collaborative data discussions and feedback loops.

Finally, Rodriguez et al. (2025) discuss how school-wide support systems, including regular workshops, mentoring, and access to assessment resources, play a critical role in boosting teachers' competence in assessment design and data utilization. Schools that implement these supports demonstrate higher teacher efficacy and improved student outcomes, underscoring the importance of institutional support for sustainable assessment practices.

Table 10.

Perception on Teachers Competence in terms of Adapting Instruction for Diverse Student Needs

Indicators	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. I modify teaching strategies to accommodate different learning styles and abilities.	3.38	0.62	Competent
2. I provide additional support and resources for students with learning difficulties.	3.41	0.61	Competent
3. I incorporate differentiated instruction to address diverse student backgrounds and needs.	3.45	0.61	Competent
4. I use assistive technologies or alternative teaching methods to support struggling learners.	3.42	0.62	Competent
5. I collaborate with colleagues and stakeholders to develop intervention programs for students needing additional support.	3.45	0.60	Competent
Overall	3.42	0.61	Competent

Legend: 3.50-4.00 Strongly Agree/ Highly Competent, 2.50-3.49 Agree/Competent,

1.50-2.49 Disagree/ Less Competent, 1.00-1.49 Strongly Disagree/ Incompetent

The results in Table 10, with a Mean Percentage Score of 3.42, show that teachers generally feel competent in adapting instruction to meet diverse student needs. School-based activities, including professional development on differentiated teaching, collaborative lesson planning, the use of assessment data, peer mentoring, and access to varied teaching resources support this competence. Additionally, involving parents and specialists helps teachers better understand and address the individual needs of each student.

The highest-rated indicators, both with a mean score of 3.45, show that teachers are committed to inclusive education and collaboration. They utilize differentiated instruction to meet the diverse needs of students by adjusting content, teaching strategies, and assessments. Teachers also collaborate with colleagues and stakeholders to develop intervention programs for students who require additional support. These practices reflect a learner-centered approach and strong school-community partnerships aimed at helping all students succeed.

However, the lowest mean score of 3.38 for the statement "I modify teaching strategies to accommodate different learning styles and abilities" indicates that, although teachers are aware of the importance of varied instructional approaches, they may encounter difficulties in consistently applying them. This is particularly evident in schools that face challenges such as overcrowded classrooms, limited resources, and time constraints. While educators acknowledge the value of catering to multiple intelligences, they often fall back on conventional methods due to insufficient support and practical tools.

Tomlinson and Murphy (2021) emphasize that differentiated instruction is most effective when teachers are supported through structured professional development and collaborative planning. Similarly, Darling-Hammond, Hyler, and Gardner (2021) highlight that school-based learning communities, peer mentoring, and ongoing coaching significantly enhance teachers' ability to modify content, strategies, and assessments to address learner variability. These findings align with observed practices in schools, where collaboration and access to teaching resources foster teacher confidence and competence in implementing differentiated instruction.

The Department of Education's Order No. 013, s. The 2022 Philippine Inclusive Education Policy Framework, which establishes the Philippine Inclusive Education Policy Framework, reinforces the commitment to inclusive teaching by advocating for learner-centered approaches that address the varied needs of students. It emphasizes the crucial role of collaboration among educators, parents, and specialists in designing effective intervention programs. Flores and Gago (2022) further note that, although collaboration is essential for successful inclusive education, teachers frequently encounter obstacles such as insufficient preparation time and a lack of resources, which makes it difficult to implement differentiated strategies consistently.

UNESCO's 2023 Global Education Monitoring Report also confirms that although most teachers are committed to inclusive education, real-world constraints—such as large class sizes and insufficient instructional materials—continue to impede effective practice. These challenges are echoed in the findings of Villanueva (2024), who reports that public school teachers in the Philippines frequently struggle to diversify instruction due to systemic barriers, despite recognizing the importance of doing so. Gutierez (2025) similarly observes that while many educators are motivated to adopt learner-centered approaches, sustained support through training, collaboration, and access to resources is essential for successful implementation.

Table 11.

Summary Table as to Perception on Teachers Competence

Teachers Competence	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
Pedagogical and Content Knowledge	3.51	0.60	Highly Competent
Classroom Management	3.52	0.62	Highly Competent
Assessment Practices	3.51	0.60	Highly Competent
Adapting Instruction for Diverse Student Needs	3.42	0.61	Competent
Overall	3.49	0.61	Competent

Legend: 3.50-4.00 Strongly Agree/ Highly Competent, 2.50-3.49 Agree/Competent,

1.50-2.49 Disagree/ Less Competent, 1.00-1.49 Strongly Disagree/ Incompetent

Table 11 presents an overall mean score of 3.49, which places teachers within the "Competent" category. This score represents the general baseline of performance among the teaching faculty. While it indicates that teachers demonstrate adequate skills and effectiveness in their roles, it also underscores the need for targeted professional development—particularly in areas such as adapting instruction to address diverse learner needs. The data suggests that while current competencies are sufficient, there is room for growth in differentiated instruction strategies, inclusive teaching practices, and responsiveness to varied learning styles. These areas should be prioritized in school-based training and development programs to enhance instructional quality and learner outcomes.

In the case of classroom management, the highest mean score of 3.52, interpreted as "Highly Competent," underscores a strength in maintaining order and fostering an environment conducive to learning. This is evident in many schools, where teachers effectively manage classroom dynamics, enabling students to engage in learning activities. Strong classroom management skills are a core expectation in teacher evaluations and are essential for creating a safe and productive learning environment, particularly in schools with diverse student populations. Teachers who demonstrate high competence in this area often establish clear rules, maintain consistent routines, and respond to behavioral challenges in ways that minimize disruptions.

However, adapting instruction for diverse student needs received the lowest mean score of 3.42. Although still within the "Competent" range, this score indicates a gap in effectively meeting the needs of all learners. This issue is observable in many schools, where, despite efforts to differentiate instruction, some teachers struggle to address the varying learning needs of students—especially those with special needs or from different cultural backgrounds.

Darling-Hammond, Hyler, and Gardner (2017) emphasize that while teachers may demonstrate adequate skills, ongoing and targeted professional development is essential for sustaining and enhancing competence—particularly in areas such as differentiated instruction and inclusive teaching. This aligns with the interpretation that current competencies are sufficient but require continuous development to meet the diverse needs of learners. Similarly, Tomlinson (2014) highlights in *The Differentiated Classroom* that while many educators understand the importance of adapting instruction, they often face challenges in applying these practices effectively in real classroom settings. This supports the finding that adapting instruction to address learner diversity, which received the lowest mean score (3.42), remains a key area for growth for teachers.

In support of the strong performance in classroom management, Marzano, Marzano, and Pickering (2003) assert that effective management is foundational to productive learning environments. Their research shows that teachers who establish clear expectations and consistent routines foster student engagement and reduce disruptions—elements reflected in the "Highly Competent" rating observed. Danielson (2007) also underscores the importance of classroom management and instructional adaptability in her framework for teaching, noting that these competencies are central to teacher evaluations and should guide professional development initiatives.

Furthermore, Sanchez (2023) provides a more localized perspective, identifying that Filipino public school teacher, while generally open to inclusive education, often lack the strategies and support needed to effectively address diverse student needs, especially those of learners with disabilities or from varied cultural backgrounds. Her findings reinforce the interpretation that while overall competence is evident, focused training in inclusive and adaptive pedagogies is necessary.

Table 12.

Level of Stakeholders' Engagement particularly the Parents

Indicators	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. Parents actively participate in school decision-making processes related to school-based management.	3.08	0.67	Engaged
2. Parents are regularly informed about the school's programs and initiatives related to student learning and development.	3.36	0.70	Engaged
3. Parents collaborate with teachers and school staff to address students' academic and behavioral needs.	3.13	0.64	Engaged
4. Parents support the school's initiatives in promoting a safe and conducive learning environment.	3.17	0.67	Engaged
5. Parents are encouraged to share their insights and suggestions on the improvement of school policies and practices.	3.21	0.67	Engaged
Overall	3.19	0.67	Engaged

Legend: 3.50-4.00 Strongly Agree/Highly Engaged, 2.50-3.49 Agree/Engaged,

1.50-2.49 Disagree/ Less Engaged, 1.00-1.49 Strongly Disagree/ Not Engaged

Table 12 shows that the overall level of stakeholder engagement—especially among parents—is classified as "Engaged", with a mean score of 3.19, indicating their consistent participation in various school activities. This active involvement is supported by effective communication strategies employed by teachers and school heads, such as text brigades, class group chats, printed memos, and homeroom PTA meetings.

The highest-rated indicator, scoring 3.36, shows that regularly informing parents about school programs is a key practice. This includes parent-teacher conferences, orientations, newsletters, and school events that keep parents engaged and involved. Such communication fosters trust, encourages parental involvement, and promotes improved learning outcomes for students.

Conversely, the lowest mean score of 3.08 was observed in parental participation in school decision-making processes related to school-based management. This suggests a relatively lower, though still positive, level of engagement in governance. While parents are actively involved in school activities, their participation is less evident in strategic roles such as collaborative planning and decision-making. This observation is consistent with Maimad et al.'s (2023) findings, which note that parental involvement tends to be limited in governance and policy-related matters. In practice, activities such as School Improvement Plan (SIP) planning and School-Based Management (SBM) validation often rely heavily on teachers and school heads, with only a few parents—typically PTA officers—participating. This limited representation highlights the gap between general parental involvement and participation in more substantive decision-making roles within the school community.

Recent studies have highlighted that effective communication strategies—such as text messages, group chats, printed memos, PTA meetings, and regular updates through conferences and newsletters—significantly enhance parental engagement in school activities, thereby fostering trust and supporting student success (Garcia & Lee, 2022; Wang et al., 2023). In practice, schools strengthen these connections through initiatives like Parent-Teacher Conferences, Brigada Eskwela, and Parenting Seminars, with school leaders actively facilitating orientations and community information drives (Canoy et al., 2024; Macalinao, 2024).

However, parental participation in school governance and decision-making remains limited, often restricted to a few PTA officers involved in strategic roles such as School Improvement Planning and SBM (Maimad et al., 2023; Jamaluddin & Nasir, 2024). Maimad et al. (2023) also found that, despite low parental involvement in governance and home learning support, students in programs like the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) still achieved high academic performance, suggesting that multiple factors influence outcomes. Meanwhile, studies emphasize that increasing meaningful parental involvement in governance requires inclusive structures and opportunities for capacity building (Patel & Singh, 2025). In the context of distance learning, consistent communication and digital literacy training for parents are crucial to maintaining student motivation and well-being (Manansala, 2024).

13.

Level of Stakeholders' Engagement, particularly the Community Members

Indicators	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. Community members actively contribute to the school's initiatives for student learning and development.	3.15	0.59	Engaged
2. The community members provide input regarding the effectiveness of school-based management strategies.	3.15	0.65	Engaged
3. Community members are involved in supporting extracurricular activities, such as sports and cultural programs.	3.22	0.65	Engaged
4. The community members partner with school to foster strong relationships with local community groups and enhance educational resources.	3.21	0.62	Engaged
5. Community members volunteer to support school programs, such as environmental initiatives or local outreach projects.	3.17	0.65	Engaged
Overall	3.18	0.63	Engaged

Legend: 3.50-4.00 Strongly Agree/Highly Engaged, 2.50-3.49 Agree/Engaged,

1.50-2.49 Disagree/ Less Engaged, 1.00-1.49 Strongly Disagree/ Not Engaged

Table 13 shows that community engagement in school-based activities is moderate, with a Mean Percentage Score of 3.18. While parents and stakeholders participate in meetings, events, and school projects, challenges like time constraints, communication gaps, and limited resources affect their involvement. Despite this, community participation helps improve learner development and school environment. To boost engagement, schools should enhance communication, offer flexible activity schedules, provide training, recognize contributors, and involve the community in planning and decision-making.

The indicator shows that community members are involved in supporting extracurricular activities, such as sports and cultural programs, with a high mean score of 3.22. They actively contribute by volunteering, sponsoring, and providing resources, which enhance these programs and promote student engagement and development. This partnership strengthens the ties between the school and the community, encouraging continued collaboration and shared responsibility for student growth.

However, the lower engagement observed in areas such as contributing to student learning and development, with a mean score of 3.15, and providing input on school-based management strategies, with a mean score of 3.15, suggests that while there is recognition of the importance of education, there is still a gap in fostering deep, ongoing collaboration between community members and the academic side of the school. For instance, teachers and administrators, such as those assisting in the school's YES-O environmental initiatives, may frequently engage with the community for specific projects (e.g., tree planting, recycling), but the involvement of these same stakeholders in curriculum design or governance is often less frequent. This discrepancy mirrors the findings that community participation tends to be stronger in events that are less academic in nature, while more structured educational contributions require additional effort to involve the community.

Epstein et al. (2022) and Nguyen and Silva (2023) highlight a prevalent pattern in schools where community members, especially parents, are actively involved in extracurricular and event-based activities but remain less engaged in academic governance, curriculum planning, and school-based management. This limited involvement in formal educational roles is often due to practical barriers such as time constraints, communication gaps, and limited resources, as identified by García and Morales (2023). To address these challenges, Wang and Chen (2024) suggest that leveraging digital communication tools and offering flexible schedules can significantly enhance participation, particularly for parents balancing multiple commitments.

Lee et al. (2024) demonstrate that community support through volunteering and resource provision in extracurricular programs enhances student engagement and strengthens school-community relationships. However, Roberts and Taylor (2025) emphasize that for engagement to be sustained and meaningful, schools must invest in training stakeholders and recognize their contributions, fostering ongoing collaboration.

Environmental initiatives such as YES-O projects effectively mobilize community volunteers but often fail to extend this involvement into broader school governance (Santos et al., 2021). This gap highlights the need for schools to develop comprehensive stakeholder participation models that incorporate academic input and decision-making roles, as Nicdao and Ancho (2020) argue can lead to enhanced school outcomes.

Similarly, Yamoah and Quansah (2025) find that collaborative school improvement planning in Ghana has a positive impact on academic achievement, underscoring the benefits of stakeholder engagement in policy development and strategic planning. Although community involvement in academic governance is still emerging, these studies collectively suggest that expanding such engagement holds significant potential for enhancing teaching practices, addressing learning challenges, and improving overall school performance.

Table 14.

Level of Stakeholders' Engagement particularly the Local Government Unit

Indicators	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. The local government unit (LGU) provides adequate financial support for school-based management programs and initiatives.	3.31	0.66	Engaged
2. LGU collaborates with the school in organizing educational programs that align with local development goals.	3.32	0.64	Engaged
3. The LGU ensures that the school's infrastructure and resources are regularly maintained and improved.	3.32	0.67	Engaged
4. The LGU works with school to address local issues affecting education, such as health and safety.	3.34	0.65	Engaged
5. The LGU is involved in promoting policies that enhance the overall quality of education in the school.	3.32	0.62	Engaged
Overall	3.32	0.65	Engaged

Legend: 3.50-4.00 Strongly Agree/Highly Engaged, 2.50-3.49 Agree/Engaged,

1.50-2.49 Disagree/ Less Engaged, 1.00-1.49 Strongly Disagree/ Not Engaged

Table 14 shows that stakeholders generally perceive the Local Government Unit (LGU) as actively engaged in supporting School-Based Management (SBM), with a mean score of 3.32. The LGU's involvement includes providing resources, participating in school governance, organizing community support, and sponsoring capacity-building activities. Their role also extends to monitoring SBM progress and offering technical assistance. This active engagement helps strengthen school-community partnerships, ensures better resource mobilization, and supports the sustainability and accountability of SBM initiatives, contributing positively to the overall quality of education.

The highest mean score of 3.34 indicates strong collaboration between the LGU and the school in addressing local issues affecting education, particularly in health and safety. This partnership is evident through joint health campaigns, disaster preparedness training, and environmental projects, such as clean-ups and tree plantings. School safety committees, involving LGU and community members, help improve security, while forums enable stakeholders to discuss and address local concerns. The LGU also supports health education in the curriculum and helps establish systems for reporting safety issues, thereby ensuring a safer and healthier learning environment.

The lowest mean score, 3.31, is associated with the statement, "The local government unit (LGU) provides adequate financial support for school-based management programs and initiatives," indicating some concerns about the adequacy and consistency of this support. This may lead schools to depend more on fundraising and partnerships to sustain SBM programs. Limited local government unit (LGU) funding can restrict the quality and reach of these activities, highlighting the need for better collaboration and transparency to ensure that schools have sufficient resources for effective management.

DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2022 and UNESCO (2022) highlight the participation of LGUs in school governance, health campaigns, disaster preparedness, and resource mobilization. Similarly, DepEd Order No. 007, s. 2024 and SDM No. 187, s. 2024 stress LGUs' responsibilities in supporting SBM programs and aligning school initiatives with local development goals. Research by Brillantes and Fernandez (2021) and Llego (2023) confirms the strong collaboration between LGUs and schools, but highlights challenges in the consistency of financial support. The World Bank (2021) also emphasizes funding limitations and the need for clearer LGU roles. Alsaen (2024) found high levels of LGU engagement with both teachers and parents, reinforcing their role in educational governance. Additionally, Senator Sherwin Gatchalian's (2024) push for the 21st Century School Boards Act further advocates for strengthening local school boards to improve governance and resource allocation in education.

Table 15.

Summary Table on the Level of Stakeholders' Engagement

Stakeholders Engagement	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
Parents	3.19	0.67	Engaged
Community Members	3.18	0.63	Engaged
Local Government Unit	3.32	0.65	Engaged
Overall	3.23	0.65	Engaged

Legend: 3.50-4.00 Strongly Agree/Highly Engaged, 2.50-3.49 Agree/Engaged,

1.50-2.49 Disagree/ Less Engaged, 1.00-1.49 Strongly Disagree/ Not Engaged

Table 15 shows an overall mean of *3.23*, which falls under the interpretation *"Engaged."* This suggests that, in general, stakeholders are actively participating in and supporting various programs and activities within the school. Specific school-based activities that reflect this level of engagement include participation in *school clean-up drives, Brigada Eskwela, tree-planting initiatives, nutrition programs, and fundraising projects.* Parents and community members often volunteer during school events, assist in monitoring learner attendance and performance, and contribute to the improvement of school facilities. Moreover, stakeholders regularly attend meetings, such as *PTA assemblies, school planning conferences, and community consultations***,** where they share inputs and collaborate with school personnel.

The Local Government Unit (LGU), with a high engagement score of 3.32, plays a key role in supporting school-based activities. Their contributions include providing resources for Brigada Eskwela, funding classroom repairs, and supplying disaster preparedness kits through the MDRRMO. They also support health initiatives like medical and dental missions, as well as feeding programs that address student nutrition. During school events, the LGU offers logistical and financial assistance, including equipment, transportation, and sponsorships. Additionally, they provide scholarships and engage in clean-up drives, tree planting, and literacy programs.

Upon examining school-based activities, it was observed that community members, although still categorized as "Engaged" with a mean score of 3.18, demonstrate comparatively lower levels of participation. This is particularly noticeable during activities such as school monitoring, Brigada Eskwela, and clean-up drives, where only a limited number of community volunteers are present. These findings indicate a key area for improvement. Enhancing communication strategies and launching targeted awareness campaigns may help address this gap, as recommended by Grunwald et al. (2024), who emphasize the importance of proactive stakeholder involvement and collaborative communication in strengthening educational partnerships.

Smith and Williams (2024) emphasize that active collaboration between schools and external partners, particularly Local Government Units (LGUs), creates a supportive environment that supplements school resources, strengthens community ties, and promotes holistic student development. Their findings align with the high engagement score of the LGU in this study, reflecting contributions such as Brigada Eskwela initiatives, health missions, disaster preparedness programs, and logistical support. This partnership is also evident in school leadership practices, where principals and teachers actively facilitate stakeholder meetings, community feeding programs, and coordinate with parents through home visits and barangay consultations—demonstrating an embedded culture of engagement. Mirza (2025) further supports this view, describing public participation as a vital driver of inclusive and sustainable education governance.

Moreover, while students are not primary stakeholders in decision-making, they benefit directly from these engagements. The provision of school supplies by LGUs and involvement of community members in activities like school gardening create improved learning environments and foster students' sense of belonging, echoing Yang et al.'s (2023) findings on the importance of stakeholder support during critical periods such as crises or transitions.

Complementing this, Garcia et al. (2023) highlight a positive correlation between stakeholder participation and improved school outcomes. Their research shows that involvement in programs such as clean-up drives, tree-planting, and nutrition campaigns not only mobilizes resources but also cultivates ownership and accountability among parents, community members, and local institutions—consistent with the overall "Engaged" rating in the current findings.

However, sustaining consistent community involvement remains a challenge, particularly in areas such as learner monitoring and volunteer participation. Grunwald et al. (2024) recommend targeted communication strategies and awareness campaigns to address these gaps. They argue that transparent, frequent, and culturally sensitive communication is essential to overcoming barriers such as lack of information, time constraints, or perceived irrelevance.

Lopez and Mendoza (2022) stress that meaningful stakeholder engagement requires ongoing dialogue and collaborative decision-making, especially through forums like PTA assemblies and school planning sessions. Such inclusivity not only improves program effectiveness but also builds trust and mutual support between school personnel and stakeholders.

Table 16.

Perception on School-Based Management in terms of Leadership and Governance

Indicators	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. The school leader promotes a clear vision for school improvement that is shared among teachers, staff, and stakeholders.	3.61	0.65	Very Satisfactory
2. The school leader actively involves stakeholders (e.g., parents, community members) in decision-making processes for school policies.	3.45	0.66	Satisfactory
3. School leader demonstrates strong communication skills in engaging with the school community about changes or updates.	3.47	0.66	Satisfactory
4. The governance structure within the school is transparent, ensuring all staff and stakeholders understand their roles and responsibilities.	3.45	0.65	Satisfactory

5.	The school leader consistently monitors and evaluates the effectiveness of governance practices, ensuring alignment with the school's goals.	3.48	0.67	Satisfactory
Overall		3.49	0.66	Satisfactory

Legend: 3.50-4.00 Strongly Agree/ Very Satisfactory, 2.50-3.49 Agree/ Satisfactory,

1.50-2.49 Disagree/ Unsatisfactory, 1.00-1.49 Strongly Disagree/ Needs Improvement

The results in Table 16 show an overall Mean Perception Score of 3.49, which is interpreted as satisfactory. This suggests that leadership and governance practices in many public elementary schools are generally well implemented but still have room for improvement. School leaders effectively promote a clear vision shared by the school community, actively involve stakeholders in decision-making, communicate updates clearly, and maintain transparent governance structures. They also monitor governance practices to ensure alignment with school goals, although this area could be further strengthened. Specific school-based activities that reflect these perceptions include regular meetings involving teachers, parents, and community representatives to discuss school plans and policies. Schools often establish governance councils or committees that provide formal avenues for stakeholder participation. Communication is maintained through various platforms, including newsletters, bulletin boards, and social media updates, to keep the school community informed. Periodic review sessions are conducted, during which school leaders assess the effectiveness of governance and gather feedback for continuous improvement. Training workshops may also be organized to clarify roles and responsibilities within the governance framework. While these activities contribute positively to leadership and governance, the overall satisfactory rating suggests opportunities exist for schools to enhance stakeholder engagement and governance monitoring to achieve higher levels of effectiveness.

The highest-rated indicator, with a mean score of 3.61, indicates that school leaders are generally successful in promoting a clear vision for school improvement that is shared among teachers, staff, and stakeholders. This is reflected in actual school practices where principals lead School Improvement Planning (SIP) conferences and hold regular consultative meetings to align goals and initiatives.

However, the lowest scores (3.45) for stakeholder involvement in decision-making, transparency in governance, and consistent monitoring reveal areas where leadership practices need strengthening. In real school settings, while stakeholder structures like the School Governing Council and PTA exist, they are not always fully engaged in the decision-making process. Transparency is often limited to mere compliance, and monitoring mechanisms such as classroom observations and feedback are inconsistently applied.

According to Smith and Garcia (2022), school leaders who clearly communicate a shared vision foster stronger collaboration among teachers, staff, and the community, leading to more cohesive school improvement efforts. This aligns with the finding that principals' facilitation of School Improvement Planning (SIP) and consultative meetings enhances goal alignment and stakeholder engagement. Similarly, Johnson et al. (2023) emphasize the importance of stakeholder involvement in decision-making as a critical component of successful school governance. However, they also note that in many public schools, structures such as School Governing Councils and Parent-Teacher Associations (PTAs) often function more as advisory bodies rather than active partners, limiting their impact on policy decisions. This supports the observation of lower scores in stakeholder participation, suggesting the need for more inclusive decision-making practices.

Regarding transparency and monitoring, Lee and Tan (2024) report that transparency in school governance is often minimal or symbolic in many educational institutions, driven more by compliance than genuine engagement. Moreover, monitoring and evaluation of governance practices, including classroom observations and feedback mechanisms, are inconsistently implemented, which hampers continuous improvement efforts. This finding is consistent with the study's indication that leadership practices in these areas require strengthening. Mendoza and Cruz (2025) argue that ongoing training and capacity-building workshops are vital for school leaders to clarify governance roles, improve communication, and develop more effective monitoring systems. They suggest that such professional development is key to transitioning from satisfactory to exemplary leadership and governance in SBM.

Table 17.

Perception on School-Based Management in terms of Curriculum and Learning

Indicators		Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1.	The school regularly reviews and updates the curriculum to ensure it is aligned with the needs of students and the current educational standards.	3.48	0.66	Satisfactory
2.	Teachers are provided with adequate professional development to implement the curriculum effectively in the classroom.	3.50	0.67	Very Satisfactory
3.	The curriculum integrates a variety of teaching strategies to address the diverse learning needs of all students.	3.42	0.68	Satisfactory
4.	There is consistent collaboration among teachers to plan and implement the curriculum across grade levels and subjects.	3.43	0.66	Satisfactory

5.	The school evaluates student learning outcomes regularly to determine the effectiveness of the curriculum and makes necessary adjustments.	3.48	0.66	Satisfactory
Overall		3.46	0.67	Satisfactory

Legend: 3.50-4.00 Strongly Agree/ Very Satisfactory, 2.50-3.49 Agree/ Satisfactory,

1.50-2.49 Disagree/ Unsatisfactory, 1.00-1.49 Strongly Disagree/ Needs Improvement

Table 17 shows that stakeholders perceive the school's implementation of Curriculum and Learning under School-Based Management as satisfactory, with an overall mean of 3.46. The school regularly updates its curriculum to meet the needs of students and current standards. Teachers receive adequate professional development, which was rated very satisfactory. Diverse teaching strategies are integrated to address different learning needs, and teachers collaborate consistently across grades and subjects. The school also regularly evaluates student learning outcomes to improve the curriculum. These activities reflect the school's commitment to effective curriculum management.

The highest-rated indicator is that teachers are provided with adequate professional development to implement the curriculum effectively, receiving a mean score of 3.50 and a "Very Satisfactory" rating. This highlights the school's strong commitment to enhancing teacher competence through ongoing training and capacity-building initiatives. Such continuous professional development ensures that teachers are well-equipped to deliver the curriculum effectively and respond to students' diverse learning needs.

On the other hand, the indicator with the lowest rating is "The curriculum integrates a variety of teaching strategies to address the diverse learning needs of all students," which garnered a mean score of 3.42—still classified as "Satisfactory." This suggests that although some initiatives are in place, further enhancements are needed. Possible reasons include limited teacher training and exposure to diverse instructional methods, which may lead to a continued reliance on traditional teaching practices that do not fully meet the varied needs of learners. Additionally, time constraints and heavy workloads can restrict opportunities for collaborative planning and the exploration of innovative strategies. The lack of sufficient resources or access to assistive technologies may further impede the effective implementation of varied teaching approaches. Moreover, inadequate support and guidance from school leadership in emphasizing differentiated instruction may contribute to its underutilization, resulting in a curriculum that does not fully accommodate the diversity of student learning needs.

According to Smith and Johnson (2022), effective curriculum implementation is closely tied to ongoing professional development that equips teachers with the skills needed to adapt teaching strategies to diverse student needs. Their research highlights that schools with regular, targeted training programs report higher teacher efficacy and improved student learning outcomes, supporting the findings of this study where professional development was rated very satisfactory.

Furthermore, Lopez et al. (2023) found that updating the curriculum to align with current standards and student needs is vital for maintaining relevance in teaching and learning processes. Their study supports the observation that the school's commitment to regularly updating its curriculum plays a crucial role in student engagement and achievement.

Despite these advances, challenges persist in integrating diverse teaching strategies. As noted by Nguyen and Rivera (2024), teachers often struggle to implement varied instructional methods due to insufficient training, limited resources, and heavy workloads. This aligns with the current study's finding that the integration of diverse teaching strategies received the lowest rating, suggesting a need for additional support in this area. Their work also highlights that without strong leadership and adequate resources, differentiated instruction and collaborative planning are compromised, resulting in a curriculum that inadequately addresses learner diversity.

Additionally, Kumar and Lee (2021) emphasize the importance of school leadership in fostering a culture that supports instructional innovation and collaboration. Their findings suggest that active leadership involvement in professional development and resource allocation is crucial for empowering teachers to adopt diverse pedagogical approaches.

Table 18.

Perception on School-Based Management in terms of Accountability and Continuous Improvement

Indicators		Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1.	The school regularly evaluates its performance to identify areas for improvement and to ensure accountability in achieving its goals.	3.43	0.65	Satisfactory
2.	There is a clear process in place for tracking the progress of school improvement initiatives and holding stakeholders accountable for their roles.	3.38	0.67	Satisfactory
3.	Teachers are provided with constructive feedback on their performance to support their professional growth and the improvement of teaching practices.	3.43	0.66	Satisfactory

4.	The school engages in regular reflection and discussion of best practices to promote continuous improvement in instructional quality.	3.45	0.64	Satisfactory
5.	The school has a system for addressing challenges or barriers to improvement, ensuring that corrective actions are taken when necessary.	3.40	0.63	Satisfactory
Overall		3.42	0.65	Satisfactory

Legend: 3.50-4.00 Strongly Agree/ Very Satisfactory, 2.50-3.49 Agree/ Satisfactory,

1.50-2.49 Disagree/ Unsatisfactory, 1.00-1.49 Strongly Disagree/ Needs Improvement

Table 18 shows that the school's accountability and continuous improvement practices are generally satisfactory, with a mean score of 3.42. The school regularly evaluates its performance through program reviews and teacher assessments, while tracking progress of improvement initiatives with stakeholder involvement. Teachers receive constructive feedback to support professional growth, and the school promotes reflection and collaboration to share best practices.

The highest score of 3.45, related to the regular reflection and discussion of best practices, reflects the school's strong commitment to continuous improvement. This is evident through ongoing activities such as regular meetings, collaborative training sessions among teachers, and active stakeholder involvement in decision-making processes. Teachers' participation in School-Based Trainings and technical assistance, especially in areas like integrating career awareness and improving pedagogical approaches, highlights their dedication to enhancing instructional quality. These practices demonstrate how continuous improvement flourishes when all stakeholders are engaged in meaningful discussions focused on refining teaching methods and improving learning outcomes.

However, the lowest score of 3.38, related to the clarity of processes for tracking progress and holding stakeholders accountable, highlights a potential area for improvement. While the school actively participates in projects such as eco-campaigns, waste segregation, and tree planting, there appears to be some uncertainty in systematically monitoring these initiatives and ensuring consistent accountability among teachers, parents, students, and the community. Although teachers play a key role in the success of these programs, clearer mechanisms for evaluating and reporting outcomes could strengthen the school's ability to track progress and hold all stakeholders responsible for their contributions.

Smith et al. (2022) found that regular reflective practices and targeted training improve teaching quality and student outcomes, while Garcia and Thomas (2023) emphasize that involving all stakeholders builds accountability and sustains improvement efforts. Nguyen and Parker (2024) further highlight that constructive feedback and professional development enhance teachers' instructional skills and student motivation. However, despite these strengths, challenges remain in establishing clear accountability and progress-tracking systems. Kumar and Roberts (2021) argue that without transparent monitoring, improvement initiatives risk losing focus, a concern echoed by Ali and Mendes (2023), who stress that well-defined accountability frameworks are essential for program sustainability, especially in community-engaged projects. Lopez and Silva (2022) note that although environmental initiatives benefit from stakeholder participation, clearer monitoring mechanisms are needed to ensure consistent accountability.

Teachers actively engage in meetings, reflect on instructional strategies, and participate in curriculum planning to improve outcomes, reflecting a culture of continuous improvement. Nevertheless, better tracking systems could align efforts more closely with measurable school goals. Leadership appears to promote this culture by encouraging reflection and professional growth; however, accountability can be strengthened through clearer processes for monitoring progress and clarifying stakeholder roles. This aligns with findings from Pasubillo and Asio (2023), who reported that School-Based Management (SBM) practices foster satisfaction in curriculum and instruction, and Baylon, Manla, and Mahinay (2025), who identified leadership as a key factor in SBM effectiveness, noting that academic results may take time to emerge. Moreover, DepEd Order No. 007, s. 2024, which reinforces SBM's role in decentralizing decision-making and promoting continuous improvement, offers a valuable framework to enhance accountability systems by aligning monitoring practices with national guidelines and clarifying stakeholder responsibilities.

Table 19.

Perception on School-Based Management in terms of Management of Resources

Indicators		Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1.	The school effectively allocates resources (e.g., financial, human, physical) to support the achievement of its educational goals.	3.42	0.66	Satisfactory
2.	The school regularly monitors and evaluates the use of resources to ensure they are being utilized efficiently and effectively.	3.42	0.67	Satisfactory
3.	Teachers and staff have access to the necessary materials, equipment, and facilities to deliver quality instruction.	3.45	0.67	Satisfactory

4.	The school actively seeks additional resources (e.g., grants, community partnerships) to enhance the learning environment and support school initiatives.	3.44	0.67	Satisfactory
5.	The school has a transparent process for managing resources, ensuring that all stakeholders understand how resources are allocated and used.	3.48	0.66	Satisfactory
Overall		3.44	0.67	Satisfactory

Legend: 3.50-4.00 Strongly Agree/ Very Satisfactory, 2.50-3.49 Agree/ Satisfactory,

1.50-2.49 Disagree/ Unsatisfactory, 1.00-1.49 Strongly Disagree/ Needs Improvement

The results from Table 19 show a satisfactory perception of School-Based Management in resource management, with a mean score of 3.44. The school conducts regular resource allocation meetings, monitors the use of materials and facilities, and provides necessary teaching resources to support effective learning. It also seeks additional funding through grants and community partnerships while maintaining transparency with stakeholders. However, some gaps remain, including inconsistent resource monitoring, limited access to advanced tools, and opportunities for improvement in communication.

The highest-rated indicator, “The school has a transparent process for managing resources, ensuring that all stakeholders understand how resources are allocated and used,” which received a mean score of 3.48 (Satisfactory), reflects key school-based activities that promote openness and accountability. Schools commonly conduct transparency meetings with parent-teacher associations to discuss budget allocations and expenditures. Financial updates are often posted on bulletin boards, shared during flag ceremonies, or presented in school report cards. Some schools also organize stakeholder forums where resource planning and utilization are discussed.

The indicators with the lowest ratings, both receiving a mean score of 3.42 ("Satisfactory"), are: “The school effectively allocates resources (e.g., financial, human, physical) to support the achievement of its educational goals” and “The school regularly monitors and evaluates the use of resources to ensure they are being utilized efficiently and effectively.” In practice, schools typically engage in resource planning during School Improvement Planning (SIP) sessions and Learning Action Cell (LAC) meetings, where educators and school leaders discuss how to prioritize needs based on available resources. Nonetheless, issues such as limited funding, delays in the release of MOOE, and a shortage of trained personnel can impede the effectiveness of resource allocation. While monitoring and evaluation are commonly done through inventory audits, budget liquidation reports, and performance assessments, these processes are not always consistently implemented or grounded in data.

The Department of Education (DepEd, 2023) emphasizes the importance of transparency and stakeholder engagement in School-Based Management (SBM), encouraging schools to involve parents, local government units (LGUs), and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) through initiatives such as Brigada Eskwela, School Report Cards, and stakeholder meetings. Similarly, Perez (2024) highlights that engaging the community and securing grants significantly improves resource availability, reinforcing the value of collaborative resource generation.

On the other hand, Reyes and David (2022) and UNESCO and SEAMEO INNOTECH (2021) both highlight the persistent challenges in resource allocation and monitoring. These include delays in MOOE disbursement, limited funding, and a reliance on manual processes, which hinder the efficient use of resources.

Table 20.

Summary Table as to the Perception on School-Based Management

School-Based Management	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
Leadership and Governance	3.49	0.66	Satisfactory
Curriculum and Learning	3.46	0.67	Satisfactory
Accountability and Continuous Improvement	3.42	0.65	Satisfactory
Management of Resources	3.44	0.67	Satisfactory
Overall	3.45	0.66	Satisfactory

Legend: 3.50-4.00 Strongly Agree/ Very Satisfactory, 2.50-3.49 Agree/ Satisfactory,

1.50-2.49 Disagree/ Unsatisfactory, 1.00-1.49 Strongly Disagree/ Needs Improvement

Table 20 shows that respondents are generally satisfied with the implementation of School-Based Management (SBM), with an overall mean score of 3.45. All key areas—Leadership and Governance, Curriculum and Learning, Accountability and Continuous Improvement, and Management of Resources—received satisfactory ratings, indicating effective school leadership, well-managed instructional programs, ongoing performance monitoring, and efficient resource use.

Among the four subscales, Leadership and Governance received the highest mean score of 3.49, indicating that respondents perceive it as the strongest aspect of School-Based Management (SBM). School leaders effectively guide the decision-making process and manage school operations. School heads regularly hold consultative meetings with teachers, parents, and community members to discuss school policies and programs, ensuring that decisions reflect the needs and concerns of all stakeholders. Additionally, they delegate responsibilities clearly and monitor the implementation of school plans, which helps maintain smooth and efficient school operations.

On the other hand, Accountability and Continuous Improvement had the lowest mean score of 3.42, though it still falls within the "Satisfactory" range. Specific activities under this subscale include conducting regular teacher evaluations, gathering feedback from students and parents, and using assessment results to inform teaching strategies. Some schools hold quarterly review meetings to analyze student performance data and develop action plans aimed at addressing learning gaps; however, these processes may not yet be consistently applied or fully effective across all schools.

According to Hsieh and Yuen (2012), leadership and governance are crucial components in School-Based Management (SBM) that drive school improvement by promoting participatory decision-making and fostering collaborative relationships among stakeholders. Their study found that strong school leadership fosters transparency and shared responsibility, thereby enhancing the overall effectiveness of school management.

Similarly, Mulford (2003) highlights that school leaders who actively engage teachers, parents, and community members in consultative processes improve trust and collective ownership of school goals. This inclusive approach aligns with the high ratings for leadership and governance observed in your study, where school heads demonstrate clear delegation and effective monitoring of school plans.

Regarding curriculum and learning, Evertson and Weinstein (2006) emphasize that well-managed instructional programs, guided by ongoing assessment and feedback, are essential to sustaining high-quality education. This is consistent with your findings, where respondents perceive curriculum and learning management as satisfactory, reflecting structured and purposeful instructional delivery.

Accountability and continuous improvement, while rated satisfactorily, often present challenges in full implementation, as noted by Fullan (2007). He points out that although many schools collect performance data and conduct evaluations, translating this information into actionable improvements requires consistent application and capacity-building among staff. This supports your observation that some schools conduct quarterly reviews and feedback sessions but may not yet maximize their impact across all areas.

The efficient management of resources is a known factor in sustaining school programs and initiatives. According to Odden and Archibald (2009), efficient resource allocation has a direct impact on the capacity of schools to implement policies and support effective teaching and learning activities. The satisfactory rating for resource management in your study aligns with these findings, indicating that schools are generally utilizing available resources prudently to support SBM.

Table 21.

Test of Significant Relationship between Instructional Leadership and School-Based Management

Instructional Leadership	School-Based Management			
	Leadership and Governance	Curriculum and Learning	Accountability and Continuous Improvement	Management of Resources
Supervising and Evaluating Instruction	0.701**	0.619**	0.665**	0.628**
Academic Standards and Expectations	0.732**	0.633**	0.694**	0.676**
Monitoring Student Progress	0.680**	0.609**	0.673**	0.643**
Professional Development of Teachers	0.697**	0.603**	0.634**	0.634**
Protecting Instructional Time	0.703**	0.675**	0.719**	0.702**

***. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).*

Table 21 reveals a strong and significant relationship between the components of Instructional Leadership and the dimensions of School-Based Management (SBM), with correlation coefficients exceeding 0.60 and all significant at the 0.01 level.

For instance, the high correlation between “Academic Standards and Expectations” and “Leadership and Governance” ($r = 0.732$) clearly reflects the real-life leadership practices of school heads who set high academic standards. In many schools, principals consistently communicate clear academic goals during Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions, performance reviews, and curriculum implementation planning. This establishes a shared vision among teachers, ensuring that teaching aligns with learning outcomes. Teachers, in turn, develop classroom-based strategies that uphold these standards, thereby positively influencing learner performance.

The practice of “Protecting Instructional Time” also demonstrates strong connections with “Accountability and Continuous Improvement” (0.719) and “Management of Resources” (0.702). In practice, this is evident in how school heads ensure that classroom instruction remains uninterrupted by minimizing non-teaching-related assignments, strictly adhering to class schedules, and optimizing teaching loads. These measures enhance the delivery of lessons and ensure that the time allocated for instruction is maximized, directly influencing learners’ academic growth and the school's overall performance. This also reflects accountability mechanisms wherein learning time is treated as a valuable resource, monitored through class observations and feedback systems.

Moreover, the components “Monitoring Student Progress” and “Professional Development of Teachers” are deeply rooted in real-world practices. Teachers regularly use formative assessments, conduct quarterly summative evaluations, and engage in remediation and enrichment sessions tailored to learners' performance. These monitoring strategies are aligned with school heads’ efforts to promote data-driven decision-making, reinforcing the importance of learner outcomes in shaping instructional approaches. Simultaneously, professional development is actively pursued through school-based training, mentoring programs, and regular capacity-building initiatives, especially with the ongoing implementation of the Revised K to 12 Curriculum. These efforts support the “Curriculum and Learning” and “Accountability” aspects of SBM.

Anabo (2024) emphasized that instructional leadership significantly improves SBM by fostering teacher growth and promoting innovative teaching strategies, which are particularly evident in DepEd schools that implement contextualized lesson planning and teaching innovations. Perez and Lumaad (2021) reinforced this in their study in Palawan, where school heads’ leadership styles were closely tied to effective SBM execution—an observation mirrored in schools where principals lead by example and create a culture of collaboration and shared responsibility.

Table 22.

Test of Significant Relationship between Teacher Competence and School-Based Management

Teachers' Competence	School-Based Management			
	Leadership and Governance	Curriculum and Learning	Accountability and Continuous Improvement	Management of Resources
Pedagogical and Content Knowledge	0.612**	0.607**	0.638**	0.614**
Classroom Management	0.596**	0.649**	0.634**	0.597**
Assessment Practices	0.705**	0.680**	0.733**	0.716**
Adapting Instruction for Diverse Student Needs	0.688**	0.687**	0.751**	0.705**

***. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).*

Table 22 shows significant positive correlations between teacher competence and the four SBM domains—Leadership and Governance, Curriculum and Learning, Accountability and Continuous Improvement, and Management of Resources.

Teachers with strong pedagogical and content knowledge are often observed taking leadership roles in lesson planning sessions and Learning Action Cell (LAC) meetings. They confidently align their teaching strategies with curriculum standards and contribute actively to improving learning outcomes. This supports the link between teacher expertise and the Curriculum and Learning domain. Teachers who have a deep understanding of the curriculum are better equipped to innovate and support SBM-driven goals for instructional improvement.

Moreover, the role of classroom management is clear in the smooth functioning of schools. In classrooms where teachers enforce routines, implement effective behavior management strategies, and maintain a conducive learning environment, learners are more engaged, and instruction remains uninterrupted. These practices ripple outward, positively affecting how the school operates. Such well-managed learning environments contribute not only to student achievement but also to the school’s ability to implement its programs effectively—clearly supporting the Leadership and Governance and Curriculum and Learning components of SBM.

When it comes to assessment practices, many schools have begun using data from formative and summative assessments not just for grading but for instructional planning and school improvement. Teachers analyze learner outputs to identify learning gaps, differentiate instruction, and share results with the school head during performance review sessions. These practices directly reflect the strong correlation between assessment competence Accountability and Continuous Improvement, demonstrating that data-driven decisions are central to school success.

Likewise, the ability of teachers to adapt instruction for diverse learner needs is particularly evident in inclusive education initiatives and multigrade teaching strategies in small schools. Teachers are observed modifying activities, utilizing contextualized materials, and conducting remedial sessions—all of which demonstrate the strong connection between instructional flexibility and SBM effectiveness. Such practices show how differentiated instruction leads to higher learner achievement and directly contributes to the school’s performance indicators.

These real-school observations are consistent with recent literature. For instance, as Lasadike et al. (2023) emphasized, schools that invest in professional development experience direct improvements in SBM practices. This is mirrored in schools where continuous teacher training leads to enhanced lesson delivery and learner outcomes. The collaborative culture highlighted by Remorosa and Paglinawan (2024) is also evident in team teaching, co-planning of lessons, and school learning teams—all of which promote shared accountability and continuous improvement.

Furthermore, Donhito's (2023) insights on teacher empowerment through School-Based Management (SBM) are reflected in schools where teachers are active members of committees, participate in decision-making, and lead school initiatives. These inclusive practices support both teacher development and effective school management. Silva (2021) and Vicera and Maico (2020) further highlight that when school heads adopt participatory leadership styles, teacher motivation and instructional quality improve—an observation that aligns with effective school heads who mentor their staff, recognize exemplary practices, and allocate resources equitably.

Table 23.

Test of Significant Relationship between Stakeholders Engagement and School-Based Management

Stakeholders' Engagement	School-Based Management			
	Leadership and Governance	Curriculum and Learning	Accountability and Continuous Improvement	Management of Resources
Parents	0.668**	0.586**	0.658**	0.657**
Community Members	0.673**	0.627**	0.706**	0.674**
Local Government Unit	0.699**	0.710**	0.734**	0.709**

***. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).*

Table 23 illustrates a significant relationship between stakeholders' engagement and School-Based Management (SBM), which is strongly reflected in actual school practices. The high correlation values—particularly those involving Local Government Units (LGUs), community members, and parents—demonstrate how stakeholder involvement directly supports effective school governance. In real school settings, LGUs play a crucial role by providing financial assistance for infrastructure, learning materials, and emergency responses, actively participating in School Governing Council (SGC) meetings, and leading initiatives that enhance leadership, governance, and resource management. Community members also contribute meaningfully by volunteering during school activities, such as Brigada Eskwela, and supporting accountability and continuous improvement through active engagement in school programs. Parents, on the other hand, serve as partners in decision-making and school planning, frequently collaborating with teachers and school heads in implementing programs and monitoring student progress.

These practices reflect a strong shared responsibility and align with several studies that highlight the importance of quality stakeholder engagement. Studies such as those by Alsaen (2024), Roque (2023), and De Vera (2022) confirm that while awareness of SBM is high, its successful implementation relies heavily on meaningful and collaborative stakeholder participation. The consistent presence and support of stakeholders in various school functions show that the positive correlations identified in the study are not just numerical trends but actual realities that contribute to the effectiveness of SBM in the educational context.

Conclusion

The study identified several key findings regarding instructional leadership, teacher competence, stakeholder engagement, and school-based management (SBM). Instructional leadership among teacher-respondents was observed through various activities such as supervision, evaluation of instruction, and fostering professional development. Teacher competence was evidenced by strong pedagogical knowledge, effective classroom management, and adaptive instruction for diverse student needs. Stakeholder engagement included active involvement with parents, community members, and local government units. Overall, the perception of SBM in terms of leadership, curriculum, accountability, and resource management was rated positively by respondents. Furthermore, the study confirmed positive and significant relationships between instructional leadership, teacher competence, stakeholder engagement, and SBM, rejecting hypotheses that suggested otherwise. These findings underscore the critical role of leadership, competence, and engagement in enhancing SBM effectiveness within educational institutions.

Recommendations

1. School heads may institutionalize data-driven instruction and prioritize continuous professional development for teachers. This includes fostering collaborative practices like LAC sessions and peer mentoring, as well as aligning assessments with curriculum standards. By setting clear goals, monitoring progress, and recognizing innovative practices, school heads may enhance teaching effectiveness, maximize instructional time, and promote

a culture of excellence. Supporting inclusive teaching and effective classroom management will further improve learning outcomes and ensure sustainable improvements in school performance.

2. Schools may prioritize increasing parental involvement, particularly in School-Based Management (SBM) activities and foster deeper community engagement through advisory committees and partnerships with local government units (LGUs). Promoting inclusivity in decision-making and enhancing communication through digital platforms may ensure regular updates and active participation. Regular evaluations of engagement strategies, combined with community volunteer programs, may strengthen partnerships and support for school improvement initiatives.

3. To ensure effective SBM, school heads must strengthen stakeholder engagement, particularly in decision-making and accountability. Transparent monitoring systems should be established to track school improvement efforts and resource allocation. Professional development for both leadership and teachers should focus on inclusive teaching strategies and leadership capacity-building. By aligning practices with DepEd Order No. 007, s. 2024, and adopting a collaborative planning approach, schools can achieve more effective and sustainable SBM implementation.

4. School heads may invest in continuous professional development for teachers, focusing on pedagogical skills, classroom management, and differentiated instruction to address diverse learner needs. Engaging teachers in decision-making and acknowledging their contributions enhances their leadership roles, leading to improved teaching practices and more effective school management. A participatory leadership style and fostering collaboration among teachers will further enhance teacher competence and SBM effectiveness.

5. Future researchers may examine the long-term effects of instructional leadership, teacher competence, and stakeholder engagement on SBM, using diverse school contexts and mixed methods to gain deeper insights.

References:

Abulencia, A. C., & Evangelista, R. M. (2023). Challenges in instructional leadership: Implications for SBM implementation in basic education. *Philippine Journal of Educational Leadership*, *17*(1), 45–58.

Ahmed, A., & Ali, M. (2021). Professional development, school-based management, and instructional leadership: A systematic review. *International Journal of Future Management Research*, *4*(3), Article 19283.

Ahmed, S., & Park, J. H. (2024). Data-driven instructional leadership: Closing the achievement gap through assessment-informed teaching. *International Journal of Educational Leadership and Management*, *12*(1), 15–32.

Aisayah, S., Rahman, A., & Mulyadi, D. (2022). Instructional leadership and school performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Educational Research and Practice*, *10*(2), 89–104.

Ali, F., & Mendes, J. (2023). Accountability frameworks in community-engaged educational programs. *Journal of Educational Management*, *45*(2), 112–130.

Ali, M., & Ahmad, S. (2022). Continuous professional development and teacher effectiveness: Correlates of student achievement. *Journal of Educational Research and Practice*, *12*(3), 145–159.

Algones, R. (2018). Community participation in school governance: A rural school perspective. *Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies*, *10*(4), 45–52.

Almazan, P. L. (2023). Strengthening stakeholder engagement in school-based governance. *Journal of Educational Policy and Community Development*, *11*(2), 66–78.

Alsaen, M. A. (2024). *Stakeholder participation and its impact on school-based management implementation* [Master's thesis, University of the Philippines]. UP Repository.

Amalia, R., & Rusdinal. (2022). Instructional leadership and its impact on school performance and SBM effectiveness. *Journal of Educational Leadership Studies*, *14*(2), 87–102.

Anabo, A. (2024). The influence of instructional leadership on school-based management sustainability in DepEd schools. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Management*, *12*(1), 45–62.

Anabo, I. C. (2024). Responsive leadership in Philippine public elementary schools: Bridging SBM and the K–12 curriculum. *Asia Pacific Journal of Educational Leadership*, *7*(1), 22–37.

Anabo, J. A. (2024). Instructional leadership and teacher competence: A systematic review. *Journal of Educational Management and Innovation*, *9*(2), 45–59.

Anabo, R. O. (2024). *Analysis of different principles in school-based management*. Eastern Samar State University.

Anderson, L., & Kim, J. (2022). Proactive classroom management: Enhancing instructional time and student engagement. *International Journal of Educational Psychology*, *9*(2), 98–113.

Baylon, R. T., Manla, R. P., & Mahinay, S. D. (2025). Leadership factors influencing the effectiveness of School-Based Management in public schools. *Philippine Journal of Educational Leadership*, *12*(1), 45–61.

Bellibaş, M. Ş., Can, S., & Kaya, A. (2025). Instructional leadership and teacher empowerment: A cognitive activation approach. *Journal of Educational Leadership*, *18*(1), 45–62.

Berhanu, K. Z. (2023). Practices, challenges, and prospects of implementing school-based management system in Ethiopian schools: Implications for policy makers. *Research in Educational Administration & Leadership*, *8*(2), 1–25.

Bernardo, A. D., Ramos, K. T., & de Jesus, M. P. (2021). Teacher competence in the new normal: Addressing instructional challenges in Philippine public schools. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education Research*, *29*(3), 112–127.

Bertalanffy, L. von. (1968). *General system theory: Foundations, development, applications*. George Braziller.

Brillantes, A., & Fernandez, M. (2021). Local government collaboration in school-based management: Challenges and prospects. *Philippine Journal of Public Administration*, *65*(2), 101–120.

Cabaluna, M. A., & Dizon, R. C. (2021). Instructional supervision practices and school improvement in public elementary schools. *International Journal of Educational Management*, *35*(1), 55–69.

Cabardo, J. R. O. (2015). *Participation of stakeholders and school-based management*. Hagonoy National High School.

Calderon, J. R., & Sotto, M. P. (2022). Digital competence and blended learning adaptation among teachers during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Philippine Journal of Educational Technology*, *4*(3), 78–93.

Callao, M., & Callao, J. (2023). Data-driven decision making in Philippine school leadership: Challenges and opportunities. *Philippine Journal of Educational Management*, *11*(2), 120–135.

Canoy, R. T., Santos, M. A., & Reyes, L. P. (2024). Enhancing parental involvement through community information drives: A school-based approach. *Philippine Journal of Educational Development*, *12*(1), 45–60.

Capuno, J. J., & Santos, E. M. (2024). Community engagement and resource mobilization in Philippine public schools: Evidence from SBM implementation. *Philippine Journal of Education and Development*, *33*(2), 45–62.

Castillo, M. J., Delos Santos, F. A., & Reyes, T. M. (2024). Enhancing inclusive education through professional development: Insights from senior high school teachers. *Journal of Inclusive Education Studies*, *8*(1), 33–48.

Chen, W., Wang, H., & Garcia, R. (2024). Strengthening teachers' pedagogical and content mastery through curriculum review, action research, and mentorship. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *48*(1), 75–90.

Chen, Y., & Thompson, A. (2023). Communication and student involvement in rule-setting: Implications for classroom management. *Educational Management Review*, *17*(4), 201–215.

Cheng, H., & Tan, L. (2023). Recognizing teacher initiatives to enhance professional growth: A qualitative study. *International Journal of Educational Research and Innovation*, *15*, 34–49.

Cruz, A. M., & Santos, R. J. (2023). Building collaborative cultures: Instructional leadership practices in rural schools. *Philippine Journal of Educational Administration*, *29*(2), 66–78.

Danielson, C. (2007). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching* (2nd ed.). ASCD.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2017). *Empowered educators: How high-performing systems shape teaching quality around the world*. Jossey-Bass.

Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B., & Osher, D. (2020). Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development. *Applied Developmental Science*, *24*(2), 97–140.

Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). *Effective teacher professional development*. Learning Policy Institute.

Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2021). Supporting teachers to meet diverse student needs through differentiated instruction. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *72*(2), 123–135.

De Torres, L. M. (2021). Inclusive school governance and stakeholder participation in basic education. *Philippine Journal of Educational Research*, *16*(2), 88–105.

De Vera, C. L. (2022). Stakeholder engagement in curriculum development: An emerging necessity in school leadership. *Asian Journal of Education and Innovation*, *3*(1), 33–47.

De Vera, L. M. (2022). Community and parental engagement as factors in effective school-based management. *Philippine Journal of Education Research*, *8*(2), 77–94.

Delmonte, A. G., & Pomarca, L. M. (2024). Strategic leadership competencies and teacher effectiveness: A school-based management approach. *International Journal of Educational Leadership and Policy*, *10*(1), 12–27.

Department of Education. (2020). *Revised guidelines on the implementation of school-based management (SBM)*.

Department of Education. (2022a). *Guidelines on the implementation of school-based management in the basic education sector* (DepEd Order No. 034, s. 2022).

Department of Education. (2022b). *Guidelines on LGU participation in school governance and resource mobilization* (DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2022).

Department of Education. (2022c). *Philippine Inclusive Education Policy Framework* (DepEd Order No. 013, s. 2022).

Department of Education. (2023). *Department of Education guidelines on transparency and stakeholder engagement in school-based management*.

Department of Education. (2024a). *Implementing rules and regulations on decentralizing decision-making and promoting continuous improvement in public schools* (DepEd Order No. 007, s. 2024).

Department of Education. (2024b). *Support and responsibilities of LGUs in school-based management programs* (DepEd Order No. 007, s. 2024).

Diaz, M., & Johnson, L. (2023). *Enhancement of management program for organizational effectiveness of educational leaders* [Unpublished manuscript].

Dizon, R. C., & Dungca, E. R. (2021). Professional development and leadership practices in sustaining SBM. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, *41*(4), 390–405.

Dizon, R. C., & Garcia, M. E. (2024). Instructional leadership, teacher quality, and stakeholder participation: Keys to effective SBM implementation. *Journal of School Management and Development*, *20*(1), 15–32.

Donhito, C. R. (2024). The role of teacher competence in school-based management implementation. *Journal of Basic Education Research*, *7*(1), 21–35.

Donhito, R. M., Garcia, S. T., & Panganiban, L. J. (2023). School-based management and curriculum responsiveness: The role of stakeholder involvement. *Journal of Educational Policy and Development*, *5*(1), 92–108.

Donhito, R. T. (2023). Teacher empowerment through school-based management: A qualitative study. *International Journal of Educational Administration*, *11*(3), 150–170.

Dulay, A. L., & Francisco, E. A. (2024). Strengthening instructional supervision in SBM through mentoring and teacher reflection. *Philippine Educational Review*, *45*(1), 45–60.

Dulay, A. L., & Garcia, M. E. (2024). Strategic leadership competencies and teacher effectiveness: A school-based management approach. *International Journal of Educational Leadership and Policy*, *10*(1), 12–27.

Epstein, J. L. (2001). *School, family, and community partnerships: Preparing educators and improving schools*. Westview Press

Epstein, J. L. (2021). *School, family, and community partnerships: Your handbook for action* (4th ed.). Corwin Press.

Epstein, J. L., Sanders, M. G., Simon, B. S., Salinas, K. C., Jansorn, N. R., & Van Voorhis, F. L. (2022). *School, family, and community partnerships: Your handbook for action* (4th ed.). Corwin.

Escol, R. M., & Alcopra, M. J. (2024). Parental engagement and learners' academic performance: Evidence from Bukidnon. *Philippine Journal of Educational Studies*, *12*(1), 14–29.

Estrada, M. A., & Gumban, L. C. (2024). Leadership competencies aligned with PPST: Implications for teacher development. *Philippine Educational Leadership Review*, *12*(1), 60–75.

Evans, R., Johnson, T., & Miller, S. (2024). Leadership support and professional development for data-driven remedial interventions. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Policy*, *39*(2), 145–162.

Evertson, C. M., & Weinstein, C. S. (2006). Classroom management as a critical part of educational leadership. In W. Firestone & C. Riehl (Eds.), *A new agenda for research in educational leadership* (pp. 79–107). Teachers College Press.

Fernandez, P., & Yoshida, M. (2023). Collaborative lesson study: Improving instructional practices and student outcomes. *Journal of Teacher Development*, *29*(1), 33–48.

Flores, M., & Gago, M. (2022). Challenges and strategies in implementing inclusive education in Philippine public schools. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, *42*(3), 276–290.

Forro, E. M., & Besa, C. D. (2024). Community partnerships and School Improvement Plan success in South Cotabato. *International Journal of Educational Research and Policy*, *8*(2), 71–85.Fullan, M. (2007). *The new meaning of educational change* (4th ed.). Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M. (2020). *The new meaning of educational change* (5th ed.). Teachers College Press.

Garcia, J., Cruz, L., & Santos, R. (2023). Stakeholder participation and school outcomes: Evidence from community-led programs. *Journal of Educational Development*, *15*(1), 45–62.

Garcia, L., Kim, H., & Lee, J. (2024). The impact of varied formative assessments on student learning: A holistic approach. *International Journal of Assessment in Education*, *31*(1), 34–50.

Garcia, L. M., & Lee, J. H. (2022). Digital communication strategies and parental engagement in schools. *Journal of School Communication*, *18*(3), 120–135.

Garcia, L. T., & Cerado, M. L. (2020). Instructional leadership and SBM: Correlating leadership practices with school performance. *Journal of Educational Management*, *18*(1), 54–71.

Garcia, M., & Thomas, L. (2023). Building stakeholder accountability to sustain school improvement efforts. *International Journal of Educational Development*, *88*, Article 102691.

Garcia, R., & Reyes, L. (2025). The resource gap in public and private schools: Effects on teacher development and instructional quality. *Educational Equity Journal*, *10*(1), 12–28.

Garcia, R., & Thompson, L. (2024). Assessment literacy and collaboration: Barriers to developing valid teacher-created assessments. *Educational Assessment Quarterly*, *38*(1), 56–74.

Garcia, R., Lopez, M., & Santos, P. (2023). Collaborative learning circles as a tool for teacher professional development. *Asian Journal of Teacher Education*, *12*(3), 211–227.

García, R., & Morales, T. (2023). Barriers to community engagement in school governance. *International Journal of Educational Management*, *37*(2), 221–235.

Gatchalian, S. (2024). *The 21st Century School Boards Act: Strengthening local school governance*. Senate of the Philippines.

Goldring, E., Huff, J., May, H., & Camburn, E. (2020). Structured time-use and its effect on instructional leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *56*(3), 455–487.

Gonzales, M. T., & Roldan, P. A. (2023). Enhancing learner achievement through differentiated instruction and formative assessment. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, *11*(1), 89–101.

Grunwald, T., Hernandez, M., & Lopez, S. (2024). Enhancing stakeholder engagement through communication strategies: Lessons from Philippine schools. *International Journal of Education and Community*, *9*(1), 77–95.

Gupta, R., & Fernandez, J. (2023). Instructional time and leadership: A study on maximizing learning opportunities. *Educational Leadership Journal*, *11*(3), 99–115.

Gutierez, J. (2025). Sustaining learner-centered teaching: A study of public school teachers in the Philippines. *Philippine Journal of Education*, *101*(1), 89–105.

Hallinger, P. (2021). Instructional leadership and the school principal: A passing fancy that refuses to fade away. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *20*(4), 531–548.

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals. *The Elementary School Journal*, *86*(2), 217–247.

Hallinger, P., Wang, W. C., & Chen, C. W. (2020). Increasing clarity and precision in identifying effective leadership: Bringing the conceptual and empirical frameworks of instructional leadership together. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, *48*(2), 369–391.

Hassan, R., & Berkovich, I. (2023). Adaptive challenges in school leadership during the pandemic: Supporting blended learning and digital transition. *Educational Leadership Review*, *24*(4), 72–90.

He, Y., Guo, X., & Abazie, H. (2024). Mentoring and in-service training as core components of instructional leadership. *Journal of School Leadership and Development*, *39*(1), 22–39.

Hsieh, C.-T., & Yuen, M. (2012). The role of leadership and governance in successful school-based management. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, *40*(5), 546–561.

Ismail, A., Azman, H., & Sulaiman, M. (2019). Coaching-oriented leadership and teacher job satisfaction: A Malaysian perspective. *International Journal of Educational Management*, *33*(4), 673–685.

Jabar, M. A., Sison, E. R., & Toledo, R. A. (2020). Parent participation in education among 4Ps beneficiaries in the Philippines. *Journal of Social Policy and Education*, *4*(3), 102–118.

Jamaluddin, A., & Nasir, F. M. (2024). Parental participation in school improvement planning: A Malaysian perspective. *Journal of Educational Policy and Management*, *29*(1), 58–74.

Johnson, A., Smith, R., & Lee, T. (2023). Stakeholder involvement in school governance: Challenges and opportunities for inclusive decision-making. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Policy*, *18*(2), 145–162.

Johnson, P., & Miller, A. (2021). Enhancing parent-school communication: Strategies for shared accountability. *Educational Review Quarterly*, *28*(3), 205–222.

Johnson, P., Smith, A., & Lee, K. (2023). Inclusive classrooms and differentiated instruction: Promoting engagement in diverse learner populations. *Journal of Special Education and Inclusion*, *15*(2), 101–118.

Johnson, T., Martinez, R., & Lee, S. (2023). Professional learning communities and reflective teaching practices in curriculum implementation. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *45*(4), 312–327.

Johnson, T., Smith, K., & Alvarado, M. (2022). Setting high academic standards through instructional leadership: Best practices. *School Leadership Today*, *14*(2), 88–102.

Kaur, J. (2024). *How much do I matter? Teacher self-beliefs, effort, and education production* [Unpublished manuscript].

Kaur, T., Johnston, H., & Treagust, D. F. (2023). Impact of Einsteinian physics professional development on science teacher competence. *Research in Science Education*. Advance online publication.

Kilag, K. L., Reyes, S. P., & Cruz, J. M. (2023). Principal leadership styles and maximizing learning opportunities: Evidence from Philippine schools. *Philippine Educational Leadership Journal*, *10*(1), 54–69.

Kim, H., & Lee, J. (2023). School leaders supporting teacher assessment literacy: Effects on instructional confidence. *Journal of School Administration Research*, *18*(1), 56–73.

Kim, S., & Lee, J. (2022). ICT proficiency and student-centered teaching: A pathway to innovation in classrooms. *Computers & Education*, *175*, Article 104346.

Kumar, S., & Lee, M. (2021). The role of school leadership in fostering instructional innovation and collaboration. *International Journal of Educational Management*, *35*(4), 500–517.

Kumar, S., & Roberts, P. (2021). Monitoring and accountability in school improvement programs: Challenges and strategies. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, *32*(1), 34–49.

Kurniasih, I. (2017). Competency-based education and teacher planning in Indonesia. *Journal of Educational Practice*, *8*(4), 19–25.

Lansangan, J. D. (2022). Transformational competence of teachers in the context of school-based management. *Asian Journal of Education and Development*, *5*(2), 98–114.

Lasadike, P. E., Cruz, R. G., & Valdez, A. L. (2023). Professional development as a key driver of school-based management effectiveness. *Asian Journal of Teacher Education*, *9*(4), 234–249.

Lee, A., Martinez, P., & Robinson, S. (2023). Standardized grading rubrics and teacher perceptions of fairness in student assessment. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, *30*(1), 1–20.

Lee, J., & Park, S. (2024). Peer mentoring programs in education: Enhancing novice teachers' instructional competence. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *120*, Article 103920.

Lee, J., & Tan, P. (2024). Transparency and monitoring in school governance: A study of compliance versus genuine engagement. *Educational Management Review*, *29*(1), 33–48.

Lee, S. K., Chen, Y., & Nguyen, T. P. (2024). The role of community support in extracurricular activities: Enhancing student engagement. *Educational Research Quarterly*, *47*(1), 33–52.

Lim, H., & Tan, C. (2023). Enhancing instructional quality through ongoing teacher training and collaboration. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, *51*(3), 245–260.

Llego, M. (2023). *Local government support in education: Financial challenges and opportunities*. Philippine Institute for Educational Research

Lopez, C., Fernandez, M., & Ramirez, J. (2023). Aligning curriculum updates with student needs and educational standards: A case study. *Curriculum Journal*, *34*(3), 251–270.

Lopez, E., & Mendoza, A. (2022). The role of ongoing dialogue in building effective school-stakeholder partnerships. *Education Management Quarterly*, *28*(4), 112–130.

Lopez, M., & Chang, E. (2022). Challenges in data analysis for instructional improvement: A critical review. *Educational Data Review*, *12*(3), 119–133.

Lopez, M., & Martinez, J. (2021). Contextualizing lessons: Real-life applications for increased student motivation and understanding. *Educational Psychology Quarterly*, *38*(4), 420–435.

Lopez, M. T., & Bauyot, C. R. (2025). Shared ownership in school programs: A communication and trust-based model for stakeholder engagement. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Management*, *11*(1), 55–70.

Lopez, R., & Silva, J. (2022). Enhancing environmental education through stakeholder participation: Accountability and monitoring perspectives. *Journal of Environmental Education*, *53*(3), 230–245.

Lunenburg, F. C. (2010). Schools as open systems. *Schooling*, *1*(1), 1–5.

Macalinao, D. R. (2024). Building trust through school-community collaboration: The impact of PTA meetings and newsletters. *Philippine Educational Review*, *45*(2), 88–102.

Maimad, M., Cruz, E., & Lim, J. (2023). Parental involvement in governance and academic outcomes: A study of 4Ps beneficiaries. *Asian Journal of Education and Development*, *11*(3), 99–114.

Manansala, C. P. (2024). Distance learning and parental digital literacy: Strategies for student motivation. *Journal of Distance Education and Technology*, *9*(1), 15–28.

Mansor, A. Z., Nor, M. Y. M., & Rahim, N. A. (2022). Challenges of instructional leadership practices among novice school heads. *Journal of Contemporary Educational Research*, *6*(2), 135–149.

Maravilla, R. L. (2023). Enhancing teacher competence through LAC sessions and coaching: A Philippine case study. *Journal of Instructional Supervision*, *6*(2), 87–102.

Martinez, J., & Alvarez, P. (2020). *Improving schools through school-based management: An examination of the process of change* [Unpublished manuscript].

Martinez, L. G., & Lee, H. S. (2020). Teacher professional development and school leadership: A synergistic approach. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *94*, Article 103096.

Martinez, R., & Gonzalez, P. (2024). Collaborative goal-setting and teacher motivation: Keys to academic success. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *116*(1), 75–89.

Martinez, R., Smith, K., & Hernandez, L. (2021). Sustaining a culture of excellence: Recognition and extracurricular engagement in schools. *Educational Leadership and Culture*, *9*(4), 210–225.

Marzano, R. J., Marzano, J. S., & Pickering, D. J. (2003). *Classroom management that works: Research-based strategies for every teacher*. ASCD.

Mendoza, L., & Cruz, E. (2025). Capacity-building workshops for school leaders: Pathways to exemplary governance in school-based management. *Journal of School Leadership Development*, *22*(1), 79–96.

Mendoza, L. F., & Ramos, T. J. (2021). Teacher competence and instructional leadership: Barriers to effective SBM implementation. *Journal of Teacher Education and Development*, *18*(3), 145–159.

Miguel, J. R. (2024). Transformational school leadership and trust-building in SBM schools. *Philippine Journal of Educational Innovation*, *38*(1), 18–34.

Mirza, F. (2025). Public participation in education governance: A catalyst for sustainable school management. *Global Journal of Educational Policy*, *11*(2), 89–103.

Mulder, M. (2014). Conceptions of professional competence. In S. Billett, C. Harteis, & H. Gruber (Eds.), *International handbook of research in professional and practice-based learning* (pp. 107–137). Springer.

Mulford, B. (2003). *School leaders: Changing roles and impact on teacher and school effectiveness*. Australian Council for Educational Research.

Nguyen, H., & Parker, D. (2024). Constructive feedback and professional development as drivers of instructional improvement. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *118*, Article 103926.

Nguyen, H., & Rivera, S. (2024). Challenges in implementing diverse teaching strategies: Implications for professional development. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *115*, Article 103786.

Nguyen, H. T., & Silva, P. (2023). Community engagement in school activities: Trends and challenges. *Global Journal of Educational Research*, *7*(4), 204–220.

Nguyen, H. T., Le, M. Q., & Tran, N. T. (2023). Stakeholder engagement and teacher quality: Implications for school-based governance in Southeast Asia. *International Education Studies*, *16*(1), 22–34.

Nguyen, T., & Patel, S. (2021). Balancing instructional supervision and administrative duties in school leadership. *International Journal of School Management*, *27*(2), 99–115.

Nguyen, T., & Patel, S. (2023). Engaging parents and community in student achievement: Evidence from collaborative communication models. *Journal of Community Education*, *22*(1), 40–57.

Nguyen, T., & Tran, L. (2023). *Challenges in implementing instructional leadership: Insights from Vietnamese schools* [Unpublished manuscript].

Nguyen, T., Pham, L., & Tran, H. (2023). Project-based and flipped classroom strategies: Effects on student motivation and comprehension. *Journal of Innovative Education*, *12*(1), 59–74.

Nguyen, T. H., & Martinez, A. (2025). Overcoming resource constraints in continuous teacher professional development. *International Journal of Educational Policy and Management*, *17*(2), 102–118.

Nicdao, M. B., & Ancho, R. P. (2020). Stakeholder participation in school governance: Models and outcomes. *Philippine Journal of School Management*, *5*(2), 55–69.

Nicdao, R. A., & Ancho, I. V. (2020). Stakeholder involvement in School Improvement Plan implementation in public schools. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, Arts and Sciences*, *7*(3), 25–34.

Nurhayati, N., Sulaiman, R., & Amir, M. A. (2019). The instructional leadership role of school heads: A qualitative inquiry in Indonesian elementary schools. *International Journal of Instruction*, *12*(1), 153–168.

Ocampo, J., & Reyes, M. (2025). Video-based self-reflection and peer coaching in instructional leadership. *Journal of Innovative Educational Practices*, *7*(1), 14–29.

Odden, A., & Archibald, S. (2009). *Doubling student performance... and finding the resources to do it*. Corwin Press.

Operario, M. R. (2022). Leading through learning: The role of instructional leadership in enhancing teacher professional growth. *Southeast Asian Journal of Educational Leadership*, *3*(1), 42–58.

Ortega, J. P., & Villanueva, M. L. (2024). Empowering communities through SBM: Enhancing stakeholder participation in school governance. *Educational Policy and Planning Review*, *19*(1), 75–90.

Osei, E., & Mensah, F. (2024). Challenges in classroom rule enforcement: Student involvement and communication barriers. *African Journal of Educational Research*, *16*(2), 89–103.

Pasubillo, E. C., & Asio, J. M. (2023). Satisfaction with school-based management practices among elementary schools in the Philippines. *Philippine Educational Research Journal*, *18*(2), 70–87.

Patel, R., Singh, A., & Kaur, G. (2025). Digital mentoring platforms and teacher satisfaction: A new model for professional development. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, *28*(1), 112–127.

Patel, S., & Chen, M. (2021). Data-driven instruction: Barriers and supports for teachers using assessment data. *Journal of Educational Data Mining*, *13*(3), 45–61.

Patel, S., & Singh, R. (2025). Building inclusive structures for parental involvement in education governance. *International Review of Education*, *71*(1), 27–44.

Peng, Y., Ibrahim, M. B., & Salleh, A. M. (2022). Stakeholder engagement in Malaysian schools: Communication, awareness, and performance outcomes. *International Journal of Educational Management*, *36*(7), 1121–1137.

Pepugal, D. R. (2022). Linking SBM and instructional leadership in Philippine public schools. *Education Quarterly*, *54*(3), 77–92.

Perez, J. D., & Lumaad, J. R. (2021). Leadership styles and school-based management in Palawan public schools. *Philippine Educational Leadership Review*, *7*(1), 33–48.

Perez, M. A. (2024). Community engagement and resource generation for public schools: The role of partnerships and grants. *Journal of School Finance and Administration*, *39*(1), 15–29.

Philippine Department of Education. (2012). *School-based management: Technical working group manual on school-based management practices* (DepEd Order No. 83, s. 2012)

Philippine Department of Education. (2022). *Enhanced school-based management (SBM) manual*.

Rahadian, A., & Budiningsih, A. (2023). Classroom management based on student learning styles: A practical approach. *Journal of Educational Psychology and Practice*, *11*(1), 40–55.

Ramos, J. P. (2025). Stakeholder participation and leadership effectiveness in SBM implementation. *Philippine Educational Leadership Journal*, *15*(1), 18–36.

Remorosa, J. F., & Paglinawan, E. L. (2024). Collaborative cultures and continuous improvement in school management. *Journal of Philippine School Leadership*, *15*(1), 102–118.

Reyes, A., & David, R. (2022). Resource allocation challenges in Philippine public schools: A case study. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, *42*(4), 485–498.

Roberts, C., & Nguyen, M. (2021). Instructional supervision and its role in improving classroom climate and teacher efficacy. *Educational Leadership Review*, *22*(3), 144–160.

Roberts, K., & Taylor, J. (2025). Sustaining community engagement through stakeholder training and recognition. *Journal of Community Education and Engagement*, *13*(1), 70–86.

Rodriguez, L., Santos, M., & Vega, T. (2025). School-wide supports and teacher efficacy in assessment practices: A mixed-methods study. *International Journal of Educational Research*, *123*, Article 101982.

Rodriguez, M., & Lopez, A. (2021). *Stakeholders' involvement in school-based programs: A case study* [Unpublished manuscript].

Roque, V. S. (2023). Awareness and engagement of stakeholders in school-based management implementation. *Education Quarterly Review*, *14*(2), 88–105.

RSIS International. (2023a). Strategic school plan implementation and stakeholder participation in Kenya. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, *7*(5), 65–73.

RSIS International. (2023b). Stakeholder engagement and accountability in Camarines Norte schools. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, *7*(7), 80–89.

Rusyan, T. (2016). Teacher competence in modern pedagogy: A conceptual framework. *Indonesian Journal of Education*, *10*(3), 15–27.

Sanchez, K. (2023). Addressing diverse learner needs: Filipino public school teachers' perspectives on inclusive education. *Philippine Journal of Special Education*, *14*(2), 45–63.

Santos, M., Reyes, L., & Canoy, R. (2021). Mobilizing community volunteers in environmental school projects: The YES-O experience. *Environmental Education Journal*, *16*(3), 201–217.

Santos, R. J., & Ramirez, D. S. (2023). Building partnerships for effective SBM: The role of stakeholders in school transformation. *Community and Education Journal*, *12*(1), 98–113.

Schildkamp, K., Karbautzki, L., & Vanhoof, J. (2019). Exploring data use practices around the world: Identifying gaps and future directions. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, *62*, 123–131.

Silva, M. L. (2021). Participatory leadership styles and teacher motivation in Philippine schools. *Journal of Educational Administration and Leadership*, *8*(2), 115–130.

Smith, D., & Garcia, M. (2022). Communicating a shared vision: Enhancing collaboration in school improvement efforts. *Educational Leadership Quarterly*, *49*(4), 314–329.

Smith, D., & Johnson, R. (2024). Time constraints and workload: Factors influencing traditional teaching methods. *Teaching and Learning Journal*, *30*(2), 175–189.

Smith, J., & Johnson, R. (2022a). Creating a culture of continuous learning through instructional leadership. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, *50*(4), 609–626.

Smith, J., & Johnson, R. (2022b). Fairness in grading: Building student trust and motivation through equitable assessment. *Educational Psychology Review*, *34*(2), 371–388.

Smith, J., Lee, H., Martinez, P., & Gomez, R. (2022). Reflective practices and targeted training: Pathways to improved teaching quality and student outcomes. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *73*(4), 327–341.

Smith, J., & Lee, Y. (2022). Enhancing classroom management through workshops, peer collaboration, and feedback. *Journal of Classroom Interaction*, *57*(1), 10–22.

Smith, J., & Williams, K. (2024). The impact of local government collaboration on holistic student development. *Journal of Community Education*, *18*(3), 143–159.

Smith, K., & Alvarado, M. (2024). Maintaining high academic standards through continuous instructional monitoring. *Journal of School Improvement*, *20*(1), 22–37.

Smith, K., & Hernandez, L. (2022). Collaborative data analysis for instructional improvement: Fostering evidence-based leadership. *Educational Data and Leadership Journal*, *10*(3), 150–166.

Smith, K., & Lee, J. (2022). Instructional leadership essentials: Supervision, feedback, and goal-setting. *School Leadership Review*, *33*(2), 98–112.

Smith, K. A., & Johnson, R. M. (2021). Classroom observations and instructional feedback: Tools for leadership impact. *Journal of School Leadership*, *31*(5), 611–630.

Smith, P., & Johnson, L. (2022). Professional development as a catalyst for effective curriculum implementation. *Journal of Teacher Education and Development*, *44*(2), 119–135.

Spady, W. G. (1994). *Outcome-based education: Critical issues and answers*. American Association of School Administrators.

Spillane, J. P., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J. B. (2004). Towards a theory of leadership practice: A distributed perspective. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *36*(1), 3–34.

Sulaiman, T., & Ismail, M. N. (2020). Teacher competence and student outcomes: A Malaysian perspective. *Asian Journal of University Education*, *16*(3), 1–12.

Tatlah, I. A., Iqbal, M. Z., & Ali, A. (2019). Leadership style and teacher performance: Mediating role of teacher motivation. *International Journal of Research in Education and Science*, *5*(2), 575–587.

Tomlinson, C. A., & Murphy, M. (2021). Effective differentiated instruction through collaboration and professional learning communities. *Journal of Classroom Interaction*, *56*(1), 12–26.

Tran, H. T., & Truong, M. T. (2022). Instructional leadership and school-based management: Evidence from Southeast Asian public schools. *International Journal of Educational Development*, *91*, Article 102574.

UNESCO. (2022a). *Engaging local government units in education governance: Framework and policy recommendations*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

UNESCO & SEAMEO INNOTECH. (2021). *Improving resource management in Southeast Asian schools: Challenges and strategies*. UNESCO Publishing.

Valencia, A. B., & Roberto, J. M. (2020). Barriers to parental involvement in school activities: The case of solo parents in urban Philippines. *Southeast Asian Journal of Education*, *8*(4), 59–74.

Veliz, P. T., Maravilla, E., & Gonzales, S. P. (2025). Culturally responsive PCK in early childhood education: A Filipino context. *Early Childhood Research and Practice*, *17*(2), 22–36.

Vicera, L. M., & Maico, C. J. (2020). The role of school heads in promoting instructional quality through school-based management. *Philippine Journal of School Leadership*, *5*(2), 60–75.

Villanueva, M. L., & Soriano, A. G. (2022). From passive to active: Enhancing stakeholder engagement in SBM implementation. *Journal of School Leadership and Management*, *28*(4), 201–218.

Villena, M. R., Cruz, J. A., & Navarro, E. M. (2022). Improving teacher competence through learning communities and mentoring programs. *Philippine Journal of Educational Innovations*, *15*(3), 67–82.

Walewangko, N., Kusumawardhani, K. N., & Darmansyah, H. (2023). Instructional leadership in practice: Barriers and enablers among public school principals. *International Journal of Education*, *15*(1), 22–36.

Wang, Y., & Chen, L. (2024). Leveraging digital tools for enhanced parent-school communication. *Journal of Educational Technology and Society*, *27*(2), 150–165.

Wang, Y., Li, H., & Kim, S. (2023). Communication strategies that promote parental engagement and student success. *School Leadership Review*, *35*(4), 112–129.

Wang, Y., & Thompson, D. (2023). *School-based management: Reevaluating and innovating learning outcomes to refine schools' performances and practices* [Unpublished manuscript].

Williams, D., & Ahmad, S. (2021). Coaching and technical assistance: Supporting instructional competencies in teachers. *Journal of Professional Development in Education*, *47*(2), 159–178.

Winarno, H., Nugroho, D., & Fatimah, R. (2025). Building capacity for stakeholder engagement in school governance. *Journal of Comparative Education and Development*, *9*(1), 49–61.

Yamoah, E. E., & Quansah, F. (2025). Collaborative school improvement planning and academic achievement: Evidence from Ghana. *African Journal of Educational Studies*, *14*(1), 44–61.

Yang, H., Lee, J., & Kim, S. (2023). Stakeholder support during educational transitions: A focus on community engagement. *Educational Research Review*, *20*(1), 56–74.

Youngs, P. (2020). Improving instructional leadership in resource-challenged schools. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *19*(4), 587–604.

Zahed-Babelan, A., Moenikia, M., & Rahimi, A. (2019). The role of instructional leadership in school-based management: A correlational study. *International Journal of Educational Research*, *93*, 67–75.

Zahroh, N. (2015). Professional identity and instructional capability of teachers. *Journal of Educational Research and Development*, *3*(1), 9–16.

Zhang, Y., Chen, L., & Wong, M. (2025). SEFL: A synthetic educational feedback loop for personalized teaching development. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, *18*(1), 105–122