

The Interplay of School Governance, Resource Management and Participatory Decision-Making for School Performance Optimization

Elinina Kara San Jose Roxas^a

juliorosemendoza002@gmail.com

Laguna State Polytechnic University Sta. Cruz Laguna 4009 PHILIPPINES

Abstract

This dissertation examines how school leadership practices in the Philippines contribute to optimizing school performance. It focuses on three key areas: school governance, resource management, and participatory decision-making employed by school heads. The research investigates how effectively these practices are implemented and how they influence various aspects of school performance.

A quantitative correlational design was employed to examine the relationships between leadership practices and school performance. The researchers selected a sample of 261 public secondary school teachers in the 5 Sub-Offices of Cluster 2 Laguna using stratified random sampling. A questionnaire was developed to measure two key aspects: leadership practices and school performance optimization.

The findings revealed based on the presented, analyzed, and interpreted data, that the extent of school heads' school governance in terms of communication, conflict resolution, multitasking, organization, accountability, and integrity were all very high. The level of school heads' resource management in terms of planning, organizing, utilization, monitoring, and evaluating were all fully implemented. The level of school heads' participatory decision-making in terms of involvement, decentralization, and belongingness were all fully implemented. The level of school performance of school heads in terms of leading strategically, managing school operations and resources, focusing on teaching and learning, developing self and others, and building connections were fully implemented. There is a significant relationship between school heads' governance and school performance optimization. There is a significant relationship between school heads' resource management and school performance optimization. There is a significant relationship between school heads' participatory decision-making and school performance optimization.

Based on the analysis, effective school governance, resource management, and participatory decision-making were all found to be significant contributors to optimizing school performance.

Based on these conclusions, the study recommends policymakers and school districts can emphasize these findings to ensure aspiring school heads are equipped with the necessary skills and knowledge in areas of governance, resource management, and participatory decision-making. Ensuring long-term improvement in school performance, prioritizing the development of strong leadership skills in governance, resource management, and participatory decision-making for aspiring school heads is the most effective strategy, given the significant relationship identified between these practices and successful educational outcomes.

Keywords: Leadership, Performance, Relationship

1. Introduction

Achieving educational excellence requires a holistic approach to school management, encompassing effective governance, efficient resource utilization, and informed decision-making (Bustamante, J.D.R 2022). School-Based Management (SBM), implemented under DepEd Order No. 45, series 2015, has emerged as a transformative framework for optimizing school performance in the Philippines. This decentralized approach empowers schools to make informed decisions tailored to their unique contexts,

fostering a culture of collaboration and accountability.

Effective school governance serves as the foundation for a school's success. Strong governance structures provide a framework for decision-making, ensuring that school resources align with strategic goals and that the school community actively participates in shaping the educational process. Resource management, the process of acquiring, allocating, and utilizing resources, is crucial for ensuring that schools have the necessary tools to implement their educational programs effectively. Informed decision-making, guided by evidence and data, enables schools to make strategic choices that enhance student learning and achievement.

Participatory decision-making power has revolutionized school management in the Philippines, shifting decision-making power from centralized authorities to the school level. This shift has empowered school stakeholders, including parents, teachers, and community members, to play an active role in shaping their schools' educational agendas. It has also fostered a culture of accountability, as schools are held responsible for their own performance.

Leading strategically, managing school operations, focusing on teaching and learning, developing self and others, and building connections – are elements that should work together like a symphony to optimize school performance. Studies show that effective leadership combined with a focus on teaching and learning, strong school operations, and a commitment to professional development all contribute to improved student outcomes (Leithwood et al., 2022; Grubb et al., 2021).

Finding the right balance is key. Strong governance provides a framework, but stifling participation leads to missed opportunities. Effective resource management requires clear direction, while inflexible allocation can hinder innovation from participatory processes.

By fostering a healthy interplay between these elements, schools can create an environment that is not only well-resourced and strategically directed but also one where everyone feels invested in its success. This collective effort ultimately leads to a school that is optimized for student achievement.

1.1 Statement of the problem

The problem specifically seeks to address the following research questions.

1. What is the extent of school heads' school governance in terms of:
 - 1.1 communication;
 - 1.2 conflict resolution;
 - 1.3 multitasking;
 - 1.4 organization;
 - 1.5 accountability; and
 - 1.6 Integrity?
2. What is the level of school heads' resource management in terms of:
 - 2.1 planning;
 - 2.2 organizing;
 - 2.3 utilizing;
 - 2.4 monitoring; and
 - 2.5 evaluating?
3. What is the level of school heads' participatory decision-making in terms of:
 - 3.1 involvement;
 - 3.2 decentralization; and
 - 3.3 belongingness?
4. What is the level of school performance optimization of the school heads in terms of:
 - 4.1 Leading Strategically;
 - 4.2 Managing School Operations and Resources;
 - 4.3 Focusing on Teaching and Learning;
 - 4.4 Developing Self and Others; and
 - 4.5 Building Connections?
5. Is there a significant relationship between school heads' governance strategies and school performance optimization?
6. Is there a significant relationship between school heads' resource management and school performance optimization?
7. Is there a significant relationship between school heads' participatory decision-making strategies and school performance optimization?

2. Methodology

In this study, the researcher utilizes the quantitative research design. In the attempt to establish the impact of promoting

relationships between school heads and teachers, correlational analysis shall be the approach. The quantitative research design relies on measuring variables using a numerical system, analyzing these measurements using any of a variety of statistical models, and reporting relationships and associations among the studied variables (McKinsey & Company, 2020).

3. Results and Discussion

This research examines the influence of six key attributes on effective school governance: communication, conflict resolution, multitasking, organization, accountability, and integrity. Through data analysis and interpretation, this study explores how these attributes interact to create a foundation for a well-functioning and ethical school environment. By investigating the interplay between these factors and school governance practices, the study aims to illuminate their combined effect on school performance optimization.

Table 1. Level of School Governance in terms of Communication

Table 1 illustrates the Level of School Governance in terms of Communication. Teachers observed the high extent of school

<i>My School Head</i>	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
<i>communicates clearly and concisely, using language that is easy to understand for all stakeholders.</i>	3.72	0.51	High Extent
<i>communicates frequently and promptly, ensuring that stakeholders are kept up to date on important matters.</i>	3.68	0.54	High Extent
<i>utilizes a variety of communication channels to reach all stakeholders, including traditional method, digital platforms, and face-to-face interactions effectively.</i>	3.68	0.54	High Extent
<i>demonstrates openness and transparency in their communication, providing all relevant information and actively seeking feedback from stakeholders.</i>	3.70	0.53	High Extent
<i>communicates with respect and consideration, valuing the diverse perspectives of stakeholders and avoiding personal attacks or hurtful language.</i>	3.75	0.46	High Extent
<i>delivers messages that resonate with stakeholders and drive positive outcome consistently.</i>	3.70	0.52	High Extent
<i>demonstrates adaptability and flexibility in their communication approach, tailoring strategies to different audiences and situations.</i>	3.72	0.51	High Extent
<i>fosters a culture of open dialogue and collaborates within the school community.</i>	3.69	0.52	High Extent
Weighted Mean		3.71	
SD		0.46	
Verbal Interpretation		Very High	

governance in terms of communication in their school. The school heads are seen as communicating respectfully and considerately valuing the diverse perspectives of stakeholders and avoiding personal attacks or hurtful language, ($M=3.75$, $SD=0.46$). Additionally, they are perceived to communicate frequently and promptly, keeping stakeholders informed through various channels to reach all stakeholders, such as traditional method, digital platforms, and face-to-face interactions effectively, ($M=3.68$, $SD=0.54$).

The Level of School Governance in terms of Communication attained a weighted mean score of 3.71 and a standard deviation of 0.46 and was Very High by school heads. This means that school heads have effectively executed aspects of communication within the governance framework such as prioritizing effective communication practices, and demonstrating respect, clarity, adaptability, and transparency in their interactions with stakeholders.

Level of School Governance in terms of Conflict Resolution

Table 2. Level of School Governance in terms of Conflict Resolution

My School Heads	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
<i>identifies and addresses potential conflicts within the school community proactively.</i>	3.61	0.60	High Extent
<i>implements effective communication strategies to prevent misunderstandings and escalate conflicts.</i>	3.62	0.60	High Extent
<i>demonstrates empathy and impartiality when mediating conflicts</i>	3.60	0.62	High Extent

<i>between individuals or groups.</i>	3.60	0.57	High Extent
<i>facilitates collaborative solutions to conflicts, focusing on common interests and mutual respect.</i>	3.63	0.57	High Extent
<i>promotes a culture of open communication and conflict resolution within the school community.</i>	3.62	0.57	High Extent
<i>demonstrates a commitment to fairness and justice in addressing conflicts.</i>	3.61	0.59	High Extent
<i>learns from conflicts and uses them to improve relationships and school climate effectively.</i>	3.65	0.55	High Extent

Weighted Mean	3.62
SD	0.52
Verbal Interpretation	Very High

Table 2 exemplifies the Level of School Governance in terms of Conflict Resolution. Teachers observed the high extent of school governance in terms of conflict in their school. The school heads are seen as contributing to a harmonious and productive school environment, (M=3.65, SD=0.55). Additionally, they are perceived to demonstrate empathy and impartiality when mediating conflicts between individuals or groups, (M=3.60, SD=0.62).

The Level of School Governance in terms of Conflict Resolution reached a weighted mean score of 3.62 and a standard deviation of 0.52, falling under the category of "High Extent" among the school heads. This means that school heads believe their practices create a positive school environment, with room for improvement in demonstrating empathy and impartiality during conflict resolution. Despite this minor difference, both aspects achieved "Very High" status, highlighting a generally favorable view of conflict resolution practices within the schools.

Table 3 *Level of School Governance in terms of Multitasking*

My School Head	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
<i>manages multiple tasks and priorities simultaneously, ensuring that all responsibilities are fulfilled efficiently effectively.</i>	3.65	0.59	High Extent
<i>demonstrates the ability to switch between tasks without losing focus or compromising the quality of their work.</i>	3.67	0.56	High Extent
<i>meets deadlines under pressure, maintaining a calm and composed demeanor even when facing time constraints consistently.</i>	3.62	0.59	High Extent
<i>prioritizes tasks and manages their time wisely, ensuring that the most important responsibilities receive the necessary attention effectively.</i>	3.67	0.58	High Extent
<i>maintains an organized workspace and system for tracking important information, enabling them to stay on top of their tasks.</i>	3.65	0.59	High Extent
<i>delegates tasks to others, ensuring that responsibilities are shared and distributed appropriately and effectively.</i>	3.66	0.58	High Extent
<i>follows through on their commitments, ensuring that promises and deadlines are met consistently.</i>	3.68	0.54	High Extent
<i>demonstrates exceptional multitasking skills, effectively balancing multiple responsibilities while maintaining a positive and productive work environment.</i>	3.67	0.57	High Extent
Weighted Mean	3.66		
SD	0.52		
Verbal Interpretation	Very High		

Table 3 shows the Level of School Governance in terms of Multitasking. Teachers observed the high extent of school governance in terms of multitasking in their school. The school heads are seen as following through on their commitments, ensuring that promises and deadlines are met consistently, (M=3.68, SD=0.54). Additionally, they are perceived to meet the deadlines under pressure, maintaining a calm and composed demeanor even when facing time constraints consistently, (M=3.62, SD=0.59).

The Level of School Governance in terms of Multitasking reached a weighted mean score of 3.66 and a standard deviation of 0.52, falling under the category of "High Extent" among the school heads. This means that school heads prioritize fulfilling commitments and meeting deadlines. While managing pressure with a calm demeanor is also considered important, it received a slightly lower score. Despite this minor difference, both aspects achieved "Very High" status, highlighting a generally positive perception of multitasking abilities within the school leadership.

Level of School Governance in terms of Organization

Table 4. Level of School Governance in terms of Organization

My School Head	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
demonstrates a clear understanding of the school's goals, priorities, and strategic direction.	3.67	0.54	High Extent
develops and implements organizational plans and structures to achieve the school's goals effectively.	3.63	0.59	High Extent
communicates organizational plans and expectations to all stakeholders, ensuring alignment and understanding clearly.	3.66	0.58	High Extent
establishes and maintains effective systems and processes to support efficient and organized operations.	3.61	0.61	High Extent
delegates tasks and responsibilities effectively, ensuring that work is distributed appropriately and completed efficiently.	3.64	0.58	High Extent
monitors and evaluates organizational performance, identifying areas for improvement and implementing necessary changes.	3.65	0.59	High Extent
fosters a culture of organization and efficiency within the school community, encouraging all stakeholders to adopt organized practices.	3.62	0.57	High Extent
contributes to the smooth functioning, productivity, and overall success of the school.	3.67	0.56	High Extent
Weighted Mean		3.64	
SD		0.53	
Verbal Interpretation		Very High	

Table 4 shows the Level of School Governance in terms of Organization. Teachers observed high extent of school governance in terms of organization in their school. The school heads are seen as demonstrating a clear understanding of the school's goals, priorities, and strategic direction, (M=3.67, SD=0.54). Additionally, they are perceived to establish and maintain effective systems and processes to support efficient and organized operations, (M=3.61, SD=0.61).

The Level of School Governance in terms of Organization reached a weighted mean score of 3.64 and a standard deviation of 0.53, falling under the category of "High Extent" among the school heads. This means that school heads prioritize having a clear understanding of the school's goals and direction. However, there's potential for further development in establishing effective systems to streamline operations. Despite this minor difference, both aspects achieved "Very High" status, highlighting a generally positive perception of organizational practices within the school leadership.

Table 5. Level of School Governance in terms of Accountability

My School Head	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
takes clear and consistent ownership of their decisions and actions.	3.65	0.57	High Extent
is transparent about their decision-making process and openly shares rationale for their actions.	3.67	0.57	High Extent
holds themselves and others accountable for meeting agreed-upon goals and expectations.	3.65	0.60	High Extent
establishes clear and measurable performance indicators to track progress and assess accountability.	3.65	0.57	High Extent
monitors and evaluates progress towards goals, identifying areas for improvement and implementing necessary changes regularly.	3.69	0.55	High Extent
addresses any instances of non-performance or ethical concerns promptly and effectively.	3.62	0.57	High Extent
creates a culture of accountability within the school community, fostering a sense of responsibility and ownership among all stakeholders.	3.64	0.58	High Extent
Weighted Mean		3.65	
SD		0.51	
Verbal Interpretation		Very High	

Table 5 demonstrates the Level of School Governance in terms of Accountability in their school. Teachers observed the

high extent of school governance in terms of accountability. The school heads are seen monitoring and evaluating progress towards goals, identifying areas for improvement, and implementing necessary changes regularly, ($M=3.69$, $SD=0.55$). Additionally, they are perceived to address any instances of non-performance or ethical concerns promptly and effectively, ($M=3.62$, $SD=0.57$).

The Level of School Governance in terms of Accountability reached a weighted mean score of 3.65 and a standard deviation of 0.51, falling under the category of "High Extent" among the school heads. This means that school heads prioritize monitoring progress and making adjustments to achieve goals. However, there's potential for further development in addressing performance and ethical concerns more promptly and effectively. Despite this minor difference, both aspects achieved "Very High" status, highlighting a generally positive perception of accountability practices within the school leadership.

Table 6. Level of School Governance in terms of Integrity

My School Head	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
<i>demonstrates honesty, upholding the truth and avoiding deception in their words and actions consistently.</i>	3.70	0.56	High Extent
<i>maintains fairness and impartiality in their decisions and actions, treating all stakeholders with equity and respect.</i>	3.63	0.61	High Extent
<i>avoids conflicts of interest and discloses any potential conflicts to ensure ethical decision-making.</i>	3.66	0.58	High Extent
<i>demonstrates courage and conviction in standing up for what is right, even when faced with difficult or unpopular decisions.</i>	3.65	0.60	High Extent
<i>acts in the best interests of the school community, prioritizing student well-being and academic success consistently.</i>	3.68	0.54	High Extent
<i>maintains a strong moral compass and adheres to ethical principles in their personal and professional conduct.</i>	3.69	0.59	High Extent
<i>serves as a role model for integrity, inspiring and encouraging ethical behavior among students, staff, and parents.</i>	3.65	0.61	High Extent
<i>commits to integrity and contributes to a positive and ethical school culture, fostering trust, respect, and responsible behavior within the school community.</i>	3.69	0.58	High Extent
Weighted Mean		3.67	
SD		0.54	
Verbal Interpretation		Very High	

Table 6 explains the Level of School Governance in terms of Integrity. Teachers observed the high extent of school governance in terms of integrity in their school. The school heads are seen as demonstrating honesty, upholding the truth, and avoiding deception in their words and actions consistently, ($M=3.70$, $SD=0.56$). Additionally, they are perceived to maintain fairness and impartiality in their decisions and actions, treating all stakeholders with equity and respect, ($M=3.63$, $SD=0.61$).

The Level of School Governance in terms of Integrity reached a weighted mean score of 3.67 and a standard deviation of 0.54, falling under the category of "High Extent" among the school heads. This means that school heads prioritize demonstrating honesty and avoiding deception. However, there's potential for further development in fostering a perception of unwavering fairness and impartiality in their leadership practices. Despite this minor difference, both aspects achieved "Very High" status, highlighting a generally positive perception of integrity practices within the school leadership.

Level of Resource Management in terms of Planning

Table 7. Level of Resource Management in terms of Planning

My School Head	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
<i>develops and implements a clearly defined and comprehensive resource management plan that aligns with the school's goals and priorities.</i>	3.66	0.56	Fully Implemented
<i>involves stakeholders in the resource planning process, gathering input, and ensuring transparency in decision-making actively.</i>	3.67	0.53	Fully Implemented
<i>analyzes and evaluates the school's current resource allocation and identifies areas for improvement and optimization effectively.</i>	3.67	0.52	Fully Implemented
<i>prioritizes resource allocation based on the school's most pressing</i>	3.67	0.50	Fully Implemented

needs and strategic objectives.

establishes clear and measurable goals for resource utilization, ensuring that resources are used effectively and efficiently.	3.67	0.50	Fully Implemented
--	------	------	-------------------

monitors and evaluates resource utilization, identifying any deviations from the plan and making necessary adjustments regularly.	3.67	0.53	Fully Implemented
---	------	------	-------------------

demonstrates flexibility and adaptability in resource management, adjusting plans as needed to address unforeseen circumstances or changing priorities.	3.63	0.56	Fully Implemented
---	------	------	-------------------

plans resources to contribute to the school's overall success, and supports student's achievement, and financial sustainability.	3.65	0.53	Fully Implemented
--	------	------	-------------------

Weighted Mean		3.66	
----------------------	--	------	--

SD		0.45	
-----------	--	------	--

Verbal Interpretation		Very High	
------------------------------	--	-----------	--

Table 7 illustrates the Level of Resource Management in terms of Planning. The findings mean that teachers observed a full implementation of resource management practices. Specifically, teachers reported that school heads establish clear and measurable goals for resource utilization ($M = 3.67$, $SD = 0.50$). This indicates a commitment to ensuring that resources are used effectively and efficiently to achieve desired outcomes. Additionally, teachers perceived that school heads prioritize resource allocation based on the school's most pressing needs and strategic objectives ($M = 3.67$, $SD = 0.50$). This finding highlights a data-driven approach to resource allocation, where resources are strategically directed to areas with the greatest potential impact. Furthermore, teachers indicated that school heads demonstrate flexibility and adaptability in resource management ($M = 3.63$, $SD = 0.56$).

The Level of Resource Management in terms of Planning attained a weighted mean score of 3.66 and a standard deviation of 0.45 and was "Fully Implemented" among the respondents. This means that school heads prioritize establishing clear and measurable goals for resource utilization. While demonstrating flexibility and adaptability in resource management is also considered important, it received a slightly lower score. Despite the difference, both aspects were categorized as "Very High," indicating that school heads are able to adjust plans as needed to address unforeseen circumstances or changing priorities. Overall, the findings depict a school environment where resources are managed strategically and effectively to support student learning and school improvement.

Table 8. Level of Resource Management in terms of Organizing

My School Head	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
establishes and maintains effective organizational structures and systems to support efficient resource management.	3.66	0.55	Fully Implemented
defines roles and responsibilities for resource management, ensuring accountability and ownership clearly.	3.65	0.59	Fully Implemented
implements clear and consistent procedures for resource acquisition, allocation, and utilization.	3.67	0.54	Fully Implemented
manages and maintains accurate records of resource inventory, usage, and expenditures effectively.	3.67	0.54	Fully Implemented
utilizes technology and automation to streamline resource management processes, enhancing efficiency and reducing errors.	3.64	0.55	Fully Implemented
promotes a culture of resource stewardship within the school community, encouraging responsible and sustainable resource utilization.	3.68	0.55	Fully Implemented
evaluates and refines organizational structures and systems for resource management, adapting to changing needs and improving effectiveness regularly.	3.63	0.56	Fully Implemented
contributes to the school's overall success, ensuring optimal resource utilization and maximizing their impact on student learning.	3.67	0.56	Fully Implemented
Weighted Mean		3.66	
SD		0.50	
Verbal Interpretation		Very High	

Table 8 exemplifies the Level of Resource Management in terms of Organizing. Teachers observed full implementation of resource management in terms of organizing in their school. The school heads are seen as promoting a culture of resource stewardship within the school community, encouraging responsible and sustainable resource utilization, ($M=3.68$, $SD=0.55$). Additionally, they are perceived to evaluate and refine organizational structures and systems for resource management, adapting to changing needs and

improving effectiveness regularly, ($M=3.63$, $SD=0.56$).

The Level of Resource Management in terms of Organizing reached a weighted mean score of 3.66 and a standard deviation of 0.50 and was "Fully Implemented" among the respondents. This means that school heads prioritize promoting a culture of resource stewardship within the school community. While evaluating and refining organizational structures and systems for resource management is also considered important, it received a slightly lower score. Despite the difference, both aspects were categorized as "Very High," indicating a generally positive perception of organizing practices among school heads.

Table 9. Level of Resource Management in terms of Utilizing

My School Head	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
<i>allocates resources to support the school's educational goals and priorities effectively.</i>	3.69	0.52	Fully Implemented
<i>demonstrates efficient and prudent use of resources, avoiding unnecessary expenditures and maximizing the value of each money spent.</i>	3.62	0.57	Fully Implemented
<i>implements strategies to minimize waste and conserve resources, contributing to environmental sustainability and cost savings.</i>	3.65	0.56	Fully Implemented
<i>promotes the use of technology and digital resources to enhance teaching and learning, while also considering cost-effectiveness and sustainability.</i>	3.65	0.55	Fully Implemented
<i>encourages collaboration and resource sharing among departments and grade levels to maximize resource utilization and reduce duplication.</i>	3.68	0.54	Fully Implemented
<i>evaluates the effectiveness of resource utilization and makes adjustments as needed to optimize resource allocation regularly.</i>	3.66	0.54	Fully Implemented
<i>seeks feedback from stakeholders on resource utilization and considers their input when making decisions about resource allocation.</i>	3.64	0.55	Fully Implemented
<i>practices of resource utilization contribute to a positive and sustainable school environment, where resources are used effectively to support student learning and school improvement.</i>	3.65	0.55	Fully Implemented
Weighted Mean		3.66	
SD		0.49	
Verbal Interpretation		Very High	

Table 9 demonstrates the Level of Resource Management in terms of Utilizing. Teachers observed full implementation of resource management in terms of utilizing in their school. The school heads are seen as allocating resources to support the school's educational goals and priorities effectively, ($M=3.69$, $SD=0.52$). Additionally, they are perceived to demonstrate efficient and prudent use of resources, avoiding unnecessary expenditures, and maximizing the value of each money spent, ($M=3.62$, $SD=0.57$).

The Level of Resource Management in terms of Utilizing achieved a weighted mean score of 3.66 and a standard deviation of 0.49 and was "Fully Implemented" among the respondents. This means that school heads prioritize aligning resource allocation with educational goals. While efficient resource use is also considered important, it received a slightly lower score. Despite the difference, both aspects were categorized as "Very High," indicating a generally positive perception of resource utilization practices among school heads. Interestingly, even though efficient use was rated slightly lower, the overall weighted mean score for Utilizing (3.66) is the highest compared to other areas assessed. This means a strong emphasis on aligning resources with goals, even if there's room for improvement in terms of maximizing the value of each resource spent.

Level of Resource Management in terms of Monitoring

Table 10. Level of Resource Management in terms of Monitoring

My School Head	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
<i>establishes clear and measurable performance indicators to track resource utilization and effectiveness.</i>	3.70	0.54	Fully Implemented
<i>collects and analyzes data on resource usage to identify trends, patterns, and potential areas for improvement regularly.</i>	3.72	0.49	Fully Implemented
<i>implements effective systems and procedures for monitoring resource expenditures and ensuring compliance with budgetary guidelines.</i>	3.68	0.53	Fully Implemented

conducts periodic reviews and audits of resource management practices to assess efficiency and identify areas for risk mitigation.	3.70	0.52	Fully Implemented
involves stakeholders in the monitoring and evaluation of resource management practices, seeking their input and feedback actively.	3.67	0.53	Fully Implemented
addresses any identified issues or concerns related to resource utilization, implementing corrective actions as needed promptly.	3.73	0.51	Fully Implemented
uses monitoring data to inform resource allocation decisions and ensure that resources are directed towards areas of greatest need and impact.	3.70	0.51	Fully Implemented
monitors practices contribute to the school's overall accountability and transparency in resource management.	3.70	0.52	Fully Implemented
Weighted Mean		3.70	
SD		0.46	
Verbal Interpretation		Very High	

Table 10 shows the Level of Resource Management in terms of Monitoring. Teachers observed full implementation of resource management in terms of monitoring in their respective school. The school heads are seen as to addressing any identified issues or concerns related to resource utilization, implementing corrective actions as needed promptly, ($M=3.73$, $SD=0.51$). Additionally, they are perceived to involve stakeholders in the monitoring and evaluation of resource management practices, seeking their input and feedback actively, ($M=3.67$, $SD=0.53$).

The Level of Resource Management in terms of Monitoring accomplished a weighted mean score of 3.70 and a standard deviation of 0.46 and was "Fully Implemented" among the respondents. This means that school heads prioritize addressing resource utilization issues promptly. While involving stakeholders in monitoring and evaluation is also considered important, it received a slightly lower score. Despite the difference, both aspects were categorized as "Very High," indicating a generally positive perception of monitoring practices among school heads. Interestingly, the overall weighted mean score for Monitoring (3.70) is the highest compared to other areas assessed. This means a strong emphasis on addressing resource issues promptly, even if there's room for improvement in terms of actively seeking stakeholder input.

Level of Resource Management in terms of Evaluating

Table 11. Level of Resource Management in terms of Evaluating

My School Head	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
evaluates the effectiveness of resource management practices, assessing alignment with goals, efficiency, and impact on student learning regularly.	3.73	0.51	Fully Implemented
uses a variety of evaluation methods, including data analysis, stakeholder feedback, and site visits, to gain a comprehensive understanding of resource management effectiveness.	3.68	0.56	Fully Implemented
involves stakeholders in the evaluation process, seeking their insights and perspectives on resource utilization and effectiveness.	3.68	0.58	Fully Implemented
uses evaluation findings to identify areas for improvement and implement necessary changes to optimize resource management practices.	3.67	0.57	Fully Implemented
communicates evaluation findings and recommendations to stakeholders in a clear and transparent manner.	3.72	0.56	Fully Implemented
evaluates practices that contribute to continuous improvement in resource management, ensuring that resources are used effectively to support student achievement and school improvement.	3.72	0.54	Fully Implemented
demonstrates a commitment to data-driven decision-making, using evaluation findings to inform resource allocation and program planning.	3.70	0.55	Fully Implemented
practices evaluation that promotes accountability and transparency in resource management, building trust and confidence among stakeholders.	3.67	0.60	Fully Implemented

Weighted Mean	3.70
SD	0.52
Verbal Interpretation	Very High

Table 11 proves the Level of Resource Management in terms of Evaluating. Teachers observed full implementation of resource management in terms of evaluating in their school. The school heads are seen as evaluating the effectiveness of resource management practices, assessing alignment with goals, efficiency, and impact on student learning regularly, ($M=3.73$, $SD=0.51$).

Additionally, they are perceived to practices evaluation that promote accountability and transparency in resource management, building trust and confidence among stakeholders, ($M=3.67$, $SD=0.60$).

The Level of Resource Management in terms of Evaluating conquered a weighted mean score of 3.70 and a standard deviation of 0.52 and was "Fully Implemented" among the respondents. This means that school heads prioritize evaluating the effectiveness and impact of resource management practices on student learning. While promoting accountability and transparency through evaluation is also considered important, it received a slightly lower score. Despite the difference, both aspects were categorized as "Very High," indicating a generally positive perception of evaluation practices among school heads. Interestingly, the overall weighted mean score for Evaluating (3.70) is tied with Monitoring for the highest score. This means a strong emphasis on both addressing resource issues promptly and ensuring effective resource use aligns with goals and student learning. There's room for improvement, however, in using evaluation to actively build trust with stakeholders.

Table 12. Level of School Heads' Participatory Decision Making in terms of Involvement

My School Head	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
<i>seeks out and incorporates the input of stakeholders in the decision-making process actively.</i>	3.74	0.51	Fully Implemented
<i>creates opportunities for stakeholders to express their opinions and concerns on relevant school matters.</i>	3.70	0.57	Fully Implemented
<i>communicates the purpose and rationale behind decisions to stakeholders, ensuring understanding and transparency effectively.</i>	3.70	0.51	Fully Implemented
<i>considers and addresses the diverse perspectives and needs of stakeholders when making decisions.</i>	3.70	0.51	Fully Implemented
<i>encourages stakeholders to participate in the implementation and evaluation of decisions, fostering ownership and accountability.</i>	3.75	0.48	Fully Implemented
<i>demonstrates a commitment to participatory decision-making, empowering stakeholders to contribute to the school's success.</i>	3.73	0.48	Fully Implemented
<i>involves in participatory decision-making contributes to a positive and collaborative school culture, where stakeholders feel valued and respected.</i>	3.73	0.48	Fully Implemented
<i>participates in decision-making that leads to informed, well considered, and widely supported decisions.</i>	3.70	0.49	Fully Implemented
Weighted Mean		3.72	
SD		0.45	
Verbal Interpretation		Very High	

Table 12 explains the Level of School Heads' Participatory Decision Making in terms of Involvement. Teachers observed full implementation of school heads' participatory decision-making in terms of involvement in their school. The school heads are seen as encouraging stakeholders to participate in the implementation and evaluation of decisions, fostering ownership and accountability, ($M=3.75$, $SD=0.48$). Additionally, they are perceived to create opportunities for stakeholders to express their opinions and concerns on relevant school matters, ($M=3.70$, $SD=0.57$).

The Level of School Heads' Participatory Decision Making in terms of Involvement got a weighted mean score of 3.72 and a standard deviation of 0.45 and was Fully Implemented among the respondents. This means that school heads prioritize encouraging active participation in implementing and evaluating decisions. While creating opportunities for expressing opinions is also considered important, it received a slightly lower score. Despite the difference, both aspects were categorized as "Very High," indicating a generally positive perception of involvement practices among school heads. Interestingly, the overall weighted mean score for Involvement (3.72) is the highest compared to other areas assessed thus far. This suggests a strong emphasis on fostering ownership and accountability through participation, which goes beyond simply providing opportunities to express opinions.

Table 13. *Level of School Heads' Participatory Decision Making in terms of Decentralization*

My School Head	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
<i>delegates decision-making authority to appropriate levels within the school organization, empowering teachers, staff, and parents to participate in decision-making processes effectively.</i>	3.69	0.55	Fully Implemented
<i>establishes clear and transparent guidelines for decentralized decision-making, ensuring accountability and alignment with overall school goals.</i>	3.66	0.54	Fully Implemented
<i>provides adequate training and support to stakeholders to develop their skills and knowledge in participatory decision-making.</i>	3.69	0.53	Fully Implemented
<i>fosters a culture of collaboration and mutual respect among stakeholders, encouraging open communication and shared ownership of decisions.</i>	3.68	0.52	Fully Implemented
<i>implements effective mechanisms for communication and feedback between different levels of the school organization, ensuring that decentralized decisions are informed and considered.</i>	3.69	0.52	Fully Implemented
<i>evaluates the effectiveness of decentralized decision-making practices, identifying areas for improvement and making necessary adjustments regularly.</i>	3.67	0.56	Fully Implemented
<i>demonstrates a commitment to empowering stakeholders and fostering a sense of ownership in the school community through decentralized decision-making.</i>	3.68	0.55	Fully Implemented
<i>approach to decentralization for participatory decision-making contributes to a more responsive, inclusive, and effective school governance system.</i>	3.66	0.56	Fully Implemented
Weighted Mean		3.68	
SD		0.49	
Verbal Interpretation		Very High	

Table 13 illustrates the Level of School Heads' Participatory Decision Making in terms of Decentralization. Teachers observed full implementation of school heads' participatory decision making in terms of decentralization in their school. The school heads are seen as delegating decision-making authority to appropriate levels within the school organization, empowering teachers, staff, and parents to participate in decision-making processes effectively, ($M=3.69$, $SD=0.55$). Additionally, they are perceived to establish clear and transparent guidelines for decentralized decision-making, ensuring accountability and alignment with overall school goals, ($M=3.66$, $SD=0.54$).

The Level of School Heads' Participatory Decision Making in terms of Decentralization attained a weighted mean score of 3.68 and a standard deviation of 0.49 and was "Fully Implemented" among the respondents. This means that school heads prioritize empowering stakeholders through delegating decision-making authority. While establishing clear guidelines for such decentralization is also considered important, it received a slightly lower score. Despite the difference, both aspects were categorized as "Very High," indicating a generally positive perception of decentralization practices. However, the slightly lower score for clear guidelines suggests there might be room for improvement in ensuring everyone understands their roles and how decisions align with school goals within a decentralized structure.

Level of School Heads' Participatory Decision Making in terms of Belongingness

Table 14. *Level of School Heads' Participatory Decision Making in terms of Belongingness*

My School Head	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
<i>seeks out and values the diverse perspectives and contributions of all stakeholders, creating a sense of belonging and inclusion in the decision-making process actively.</i>	3.72	0.51	Fully Implemented
<i>communicates information and opportunities for involvement to all stakeholders, ensuring that everyone feels informed and included proactively.</i>	3.68	0.55	Fully Implemented
<i>creates a welcoming and inclusive environment where stakeholders feel comfortable expressing their opinions and ideas without fear of judgment or reprisal.</i>	3.69	0.49	Fully Implemented
<i>listens to and acknowledges the concerns and suggestions of all</i>	3.69	0.49	Fully Implemented

<i>stakeholders, demonstrating respect and valuing their input actively.</i>	3.71	0.50	Fully Implemented
<i>recognizes and celebrates the contributions of all stakeholders, fostering a sense of appreciation and belonging within the school community.</i>	3.69	0.52	Fully Implemented
<i>fosters a sense of belongingness contribute to a more engaged and participatory school community, where stakeholders feel valued and empowered to contribute.</i>	3.71	0.50	Fully Implemented
<i>approaches to inclusive participatory decision-making fosters informed, well- considered, and widely supported decisions.</i>			
Weighted Mean		3.70	
SD		0.45	
Verbal Interpretation		Very High	

Table 14 exemplifies the Level of School Heads' Participatory Decision Making in terms of Belongingness. Teachers observed full implementation of school heads' participatory decision making in terms of belongingness in their school. The school heads are seen as seeking out and value the diverse perspectives and contributions of all stakeholders, creating a sense of belonging and inclusion in the decision-making process actively, (M=3.72, SD=0.51). Additionally, they are perceived to communicate information and opportunities for involvement to all stakeholders, ensuring that everyone feels informed and included proactively, (M=3.68, SD=0.55).

The Level of School Heads' Participatory Decision Making in terms of Belongingness reached a weighted mean score of 3.70 and a standard deviation of 0.45 and was Fully Implemented among the respondents. This means that school heads prioritize actively seeking out and valuing diverse perspectives. While clear communication and ensuring everyone feels informed is also considered important, it received a slightly lower score. Despite the difference, both aspects were categorized as "Very High," indicating a generally positive perception of practices that foster belongingness. The higher score for valuing diverse perspectives suggests a focus on creating an inclusive environment where everyone feels their voice matters. However, the slightly lower score for communication highlights a potential area for improvement in ensuring everyone is aware of information and opportunities to be involved.

Level of School Performance Optimization in terms of Leading Strategically

Table 15. *Level of School Performance Optimization in terms of Leading Strategically*

My School Head	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
<i>articulates a clear and compelling vision for the school's future, inspiring and motivating stakeholders towards a shared goal.</i>	3.70	0.57	Fully Optimized
<i>develops and implements a comprehensive strategic plan that aligns with the school's vision and addresses its most pressing challenges and opportunities.</i>	3.68	0.55	Fully Optimized
<i>communicates the strategic plan to all stakeholders, ensuring understanding, buy-in, and alignment across the school community effectively.</i>	3.70	0.53	Fully Optimized
<i>establishes clear and measurable performance indicators to track progress towards strategic goals, enabling data-driven decision-making.</i>	3.68	0.55	Fully Optimized
<i>monitors and evaluates the effectiveness of the strategic plan, making adjustments as needed to ensure continuous improvement and adaptation to changing circumstances regularly.</i>	3.69	0.53	Fully Optimized
<i>fosters a culture of strategic thinking and innovation within the school community, encouraging creative problem-solving and exploring new approaches to school improvement.</i>	3.67	0.54	Fully Optimized
<i>demonstrates adaptability and resilience in the face of challenges, adjusting strategies and tactics as needed to navigate obstacles and achieve strategic goals.</i>	3.67	0.55	Fully Optimized
<i>leads strategic planning that drives overall school performance optimization, resulting in improved student outcomes, enhanced stakeholder satisfaction, and a thriving school community.</i>	3.70	0.53	Fully Optimized
Weighted Mean		3.69	
SD		0.50	

Verbal Interpretation*Very High*

Table 15 demonstrates the Level of School Performance Optimization in terms of Leading Strategically. Teachers observed full optimization of school performance in terms of leading strategically in their school. The school heads are seen as communicating the strategic plan to all stakeholders, ensuring understanding, buy-in, and alignment across the school community effectively, ($M=3.70$, $SD=0.53$). Additionally, they are perceived to foster a culture of strategic thinking and innovation within the school community, encouraging creative problem-solving and exploring new approaches to school improvement, ($M=3.67$, $SD=0.54$).

The Level of School Performance Optimization in terms of Leading Strategically achieved a weighted mean score of 3.69 and a standard deviation of 0.50 and was “Fully Optimized” among the respondents. This means that school heads prioritize clear communication of the strategic plan and leading effective planning processes. While fostering a culture of strategic thinking and innovation is also considered important, it received a slightly lower score. Despite the difference, all aspects were categorized as “Very High,” indicating a generally positive perception of strategic leadership practices. The high scores for communication and planning show a focus on aligning the school community towards a shared vision. However, the slightly lower score for fostering strategic thinking suggests there might be room for improvement in encouraging creative problem-solving and exploring new approaches to school improvement.

Level of School Performance Optimization in terms of Managing School Operations and Resources**Table 16.** *Level of School Performance Optimization in terms of Managing School Operations and Resources*

My School Head	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
<i>establishes and maintains organizational structures, systems, and processes that support efficient and effective school operations effectively.</i>	3.73	0.47	Fully Optimized
<i>demonstrates strong leadership and decision-making skills in prioritizing resource allocation and ensuring optimal utilization of resources.</i>	3.66	0.52	Fully Optimized
<i>implements effective strategies to manage and maintain school facilities, ensuring a safe, healthy, and conducive learning environment.</i>	3.88	2.48	Fully Optimized
<i>oversees the development and implementation of effective financial management practices, ensuring fiscal responsibility and sustainability.</i>	3.70	0.51	Fully Optimized
<i>identifies and addresses operational challenges and resource constraints, implementing timely and effective solutions proactively.</i>	3.70	0.51	Fully Optimized
<i>fosters a culture of efficiency and accountability within the school community, encouraging responsible resource utilization and cost-consciousness.</i>	3.71	0.49	Fully Optimized
<i>practices operational management that contributes significantly to school performance optimization, boosting student achievement, empowering teachers, and enhancing overall school outcomes.</i>	3.71	0.49	Fully Optimized
<i>commits to operational excellence sets a high standard for the school community, promoting a culture of continuous improvement and innovation.</i>	3.70	0.49	Fully Optimized
Weighted Mean		3.72	
SD		0.54	
Verbal Interpretation		<i>Very High</i>	

Table 16 shows the Level of School Performance Optimization in terms of Managing School Operations and Resources. Teachers observed full optimization of school performance in terms of managing school operations and resources in their school. The school heads are seen as implementing effective strategies to manage and maintain school facilities, ensuring a safe, healthy, and conducive learning environment, ($M=3.88$, $SD=0.48$). Additionally, they are perceived to demonstrate strong leadership and decision-making skills in prioritizing resource allocation and ensuring optimal utilization of resources, ($M=3.66$, $SD=0.52$).

The Level of School Performance Optimization in terms of Managing School Operations and Resources accomplished a weighted mean score of 3.72 and a standard deviation of 0.54 and was “Fully Optimized” among the respondents. This means that school heads prioritize maintaining a safe and healthy learning environment through effective management of facilities. While leadership in resource allocation is also considered important, it received a lower score. Despite the difference, both aspects were

categorized as "Very High," indicating a generally positive perception of management practices. The higher score for facilities management reflects the focus on providing a suitable learning environment.

Level of School Performance Optimization in terms of Focusing on Teaching and Learning

Table 17. Level of School Performance Optimization in terms of Focusing on Teaching and Learning

My School Head	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
<i>demonstrates a deep understanding of the principles of effective teaching and learning, incorporating them into schoolwide policies and practices.</i>	3.73	0.51	Fully Optimized
<i>supports and invests in professional development opportunities for teachers, fostering their growth and enhancing their instructional expertise actively.</i>	3.70	0.54	Fully Optimized
<i>promotes a culture of collaboration and knowledge-sharing among teachers, encouraging peer learning and the exchange of best practices.</i>	3.70	0.54	Fully Optimized
<i>establishes clear and measurable learning goals for students, ensuring that instruction is aligned with expectations and focused on student achievement.</i>	3.71	0.50	Fully Optimized
<i>monitors and evaluates student progress, using data to inform instructional decisions and identify areas for improvement regularly.</i>	3.70	0.52	Fully Optimized
<i>provides teachers with the resources and support they need to implement effective instructional strategies, including technology, curriculum materials, and professional guidance.</i>	3.70	0.51	Fully Optimized
<i>fosters a positive and supportive learning environment that promotes student engagement, motivation, and academic success.</i>	3.73	0.49	Fully Optimized
<i>focus on teaching and learning contributes significantly to school performance optimization, leading to improved student achievement, increased graduation rates, and enhanced overall school outcomes.</i>	3.70	0.48	Fully Optimized
Weighted Mean		3.71	
SD		0.47	
Verbal Interpretation		Very High	

Table 17 illustrates the Level of School Performance Optimization in terms of Focusing on Teaching and Learning. Teachers perceived a strong emphasis on optimizing school performance in terms of focusing on teaching and learning in their school. This environment postured by school heads are believed to be seen as fostering a positive and supportive learning environment that promotes student engagement, motivation, and academic success, (M=3.73, SD=0.49).

Additionally, they are perceived to support and invests in professional development opportunities for teachers, fostering their growth and enhancing their instructional expertise actively, (M=3.70, SD=0.54).

The Level of School Performance Optimization in terms of Focusing on Teaching and Learning accomplished a weighted mean score of 3.71 and a standard deviation of 0.47 and was "Very High" among the respondents. This means that school heads prioritize creating a positive learning environment that motivates students. While investing in teacher development is also considered important, it received a slightly lower score.

Despite the difference, both aspects were categorized as "Very High," indicating a generally positive perception of practices that focus on teaching and learning. The high score for fostering a positive learning environment highlights the importance placed on student engagement and success. However, the slightly lower score for teacher development suggests there might be room for improvement in actively supporting and investing in opportunities for teachers to grow their skills.

Level of School Performance Optimization in terms of Developing Self and Others

Table 18. Level of School Performance Optimization in terms of Developing Self and Others

My School Head	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
<i>demonstrates a commitment to their own professional development, actively seeking opportunities to learn, grow, and enhance their leadership skills.</i>	3.75	0.51	Fully Optimized

<i>encourages and supports the professional development of teachers and staff, providing them with resources, opportunities, and guidance actively.</i>	3.71	0.53	Fully Optimized
<i>fosters a culture of learning and continuous improvement within the school community, encouraging everyone to seek out new knowledge and skills.</i>	3.68	0.52	Fully Optimized
<i>invests in professional development programs that are aligned with the school's strategic goals and the needs of its stakeholders.</i>	3.71	0.55	Fully Optimized
<i>evaluates the effectiveness of professional development programs, using data to inform future planning and ensure that resources are used effectively.</i>	3.73	0.50	Fully Optimized
<i>provides opportunities for teachers and staff to collaborate and share best practices, promoting a culture of knowledge-sharing and collective growth.</i>	3.72	0.51	Fully Optimized
<i>celebrates and recognizes the achievements of teachers and staff, fostering a sense of accomplishment and motivation.</i>	3.71	0.52	Fully Optimized
<i>commits to developing themselves and others contributes significantly to school performance optimization, leading to a more skilled and engaged workforce, enhanced instructional practices, and improved student outcomes.</i>	3.69	0.53	Fully Optimized

Weighted Mean

3.71

SD

0.48

Verbal Interpretation

Very High

Table 18 exemplifies the Level of School Performance Optimization in terms of Developing Self and Others. Teachers observed full optimization of school performance in terms of developing self and others in their school. The school heads are seen as demonstrating a commitment to their own professional development, actively seeking opportunities to learn, grow, and enhance their leadership skills, (M=3.75, SD=0.51). Additionally, they are perceived to foster a culture of learning and continuous improvement within the school community, encouraging everyone to seek out new knowledge and skills, (M=3.68, SD=0.52).

The Level of School Performance Optimization in terms of Developing Self and Others accomplished a weighted mean score of 3.71 and a standard deviation of 0.48 and was "Fully Optimized" among the respondents. This means that school heads prioritize their own professional development to enhance their leadership skills. While fostering a culture of continuous learning within the entire school community is also considered important, it received a slightly lower score.

Despite the difference, both aspects were categorized as "Very High," indicating a generally positive perception of practices that support development. The high score for self-development reflects the focus on leadership growth. However, the slightly lower score for fostering a culture of learning suggests there might be room for improvement in encouraging and supporting continuous learning among staff. This could involve implementing initiatives or programs that promote professional development opportunities for all.

Level of School Performance Optimization in terms of Building Connections

Table 19. The Level of School Performance Optimization in terms of Building

My School Head	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
<i>cultivates relationships with parents, guardians, and families, fostering a sense of partnership and shared responsibility for student success actively.</i>	3.74	0.48	Fully Optimized
<i>communicates with parents and guardians about their child's progress, academic goals, and any areas of concern, ensuring transparency and trust effectively.</i>	3.73	0.49	Fully Optimized
<i>involves parents and guardians in school activities, events, and decision-making processes, valuing their input and contributions.</i>	3.73	0.50	Fully Optimized
<i>creates opportunities for parents and guardians to learn and grow alongside their children, providing workshops, parenting resources, and support programs.</i>	3.70	0.48	Fully Optimized
<i>fosters a welcoming and inclusive environment for parents and guardians, making them feel valued and respected members of the school community.</i>	3.75	0.46	Fully Optimized

builds strong partnerships with community organizations and businesses, leveraging resources and expertise to support student success.	3.73	0.46	Fully Optimized
engages with local government officials, advocating for policies and resources that support the school and its students actively.	3.74	0.46	Fully Optimized
efforts to build connections contribute significantly to school performance, optimization, enhancing parent involvement, community support, and overall school success.	3.72	0.46	Fully Optimized
Weighted Mean		3.73	
SD		0.43	
Verbal Interpretation		Fully Implemented	

Table 19 demonstrates the Level of School Performance Optimization in terms of Building Connections. Teachers observed full optimization of school performance in terms of building connections in their school. The school heads are seen as fostering a welcoming and inclusive environment for parents and guardians, making them feel valued and respected members of the school community, (M=3.75, SD=0.46). Additionally, they are perceived to create opportunities for parents and guardians to learn and grow alongside their children, providing workshops, parenting resources, and support programs, (M=3.70, SD=0.48).

Connections accomplished a weighted mean score of 3.73 and a standard deviation of 0.43 and was "Fully Optimized" among the respondents. This means that school heads prioritize creating a welcoming and inclusive environment for parents and guardians. While providing opportunities for their growth alongside their children is also considered important, it received a slightly lower score.

Despite the difference, both aspects were categorized as "Very High," indicating a generally positive perception of practices that build connections. The high score for fostering a welcoming environment reflects the importance placed on parental involvement and feeling valued. However, the slightly lower score for offering learning opportunities suggests there might be room for improvement in providing resources and programs that support parents' growth alongside their children's education.

Table 20. Significant relationship between School Governance and School Performance Optimization

School Governance		School Performance Optimization				
		Leading Strategically	Managing Schools Operations and Resources	Focusing on Teaching and Learning	Developing Self and Others	Building Connections
Communication	Pearson Correlation	.838**	.655**	.803**	.835**	.762**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	261	261	261	261	261
Conflict Resolution	Pearson Correlation	.808**	.655**	.772**	.814**	.730**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	261	261	261	261	261
Multitasking	Pearson Correlation	.886**	.694**	.811**	.851**	.755**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	261	261	261	261	261
Organization	Pearson Correlation	.818**	.674**	.779**	.810**	.730**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	261	261	261	261	261
Accountability	Pearson Correlation	.890**	.666**	.804**	.845**	.740**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	261	261	261	261	261
Integrity	Pearson Correlation	.857**	.688**	.809**	.847**	.766**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	261	261	261	261	261

Table 20 demonstrates the significant relationship between School Governance and School Performance Optimization.

All school governance strategies (Communication, Conflict Resolution, Multitasking, Organization, Accountability, and

Integrity) have very strong positive correlations (above 0.80) with Leading Strategically and Focusing on Teaching and Learning. Communication, Multitasking, Accountability, and Integrity also have very strong positive correlations with Managing School Operations and Resources and Building Connections. The table shows correlation coefficients between leadership skills and various aspects of school governance. These coefficients are all statistically significant (Sig. (2-tailed) = 0.000), meaning there's a very low probability that the observed relationships occurred by chance.

Thus, the null hypothesis should be rejected which the result incites that there is a significant relationship between them. There exists a notably positive and highly significant relationship between the school governance strategies employed by school heads and the optimization of school performance, with p-values < .005. The strength of this relationship falls within the range of strong to very strong. Given the positive direction of the relationship, it implies that enhancements in the level of school governance strategies adopted by school heads correspond to improvements in school performance optimization.

Table 21. Significant relationship between Resource Management and School Performance Optimization

Resource Management		School Performance Optimization				
		Leading Strategically	Managing Schools Operations and Resources	Focusing on Teaching and Learning	Developing Self and Others	Building Connections
Planning	Pearson Correlation	.870**	.704**	.818**	.832**	.824**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	261	261	261	261	261
Organizing	Pearson Correlation	.832**	.713**	.839**	.850**	.765**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	261	261	261	261	261
Utilizing	Pearson Correlation	.765**	.679**	.782**	.766**	.728**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	261	261	261	261	261
Monitoring	Pearson Correlation	.849**	.750**	.878**	.868**	.825**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	261	261	261	261	261
Evaluating	Pearson Correlation	.878**	.742**	.899**	.904**	.791**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	261	261	261	261	261

Table 21 demonstrates the significant relationship between Resource Management and School Performance Optimization. The table shows correlations between different aspects of resource management (planning, organizing, utilizing, monitoring, and evaluating) and "Managing Schools Operations and Resources," which directly relates to performance optimization. The correlations range from strong (0.60 - 0.79) to very strong (0.80 - 1.00), particularly for evaluating (0.899) and monitoring (0.878). This indicates a substantial relationship between effective resource management and successful school operations and resource management, which is a key component of performance optimization.

Table 22. Significant relationship between Participatory Decision Making and School Performance Optimization

Participatory Decision Making		School Performance Optimization				
		Leading Strategically	Managing Schools Operations and Resources	Focusing on Teaching and Learning	Developing Self and Others	Building Connections
Involvement	Pearson Correlation	.861**	.740**	.874**	.872**	.802**

	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	261	261	261	261	261
Decentralization	Pearson Correlation	.892**	.701**	.865**	.897**	.780**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	261	261	261	261	261
Belongingness	Pearson Correlation	.870**	.766**	.868**	.884**	.828**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	261	261	261	261	261

Table 22 demonstrates the significant relationship between Participatory Decision Making and School Performance Optimization. The table shows correlations between different aspects of participatory decision-making (involvement, decentralization, and belongingness) and various aspects of school performance optimization listed across the columns. The correlations range from strong (0.60 - 0.79) to very strong (0.80 - 1.00), with most exceeding 0.8. This indicates a substantial relationship between involving stakeholders in decision-making and positive outcomes in various areas of school performance optimization. Thus, the null hypothesis should be rejected which the result incites that there is a significant relationship between them. Participatory decision-making can lead to a more inclusive environment, fostering a sense of ownership and responsibility among stakeholders. This can contribute to better planning, resource allocation, improved teaching and learning practices, and stronger connections with the community. All these factors can contribute to overall school performance optimization.

Based on the results of the analyses of all the relationships, it can be concluded that there are significant relationships between various factors such as governance strategies, participatory decision-making, resource management, and school performance optimization. These findings emphasize the importance of adopting effective governance practices, fostering participatory decision-making strategies, and implementing comprehensive resource management policies to have better school performance outcomes. Additionally, the strength of these relationships suggests that improvements in governance, decision-making, and resource management are associated with enhancements in school performance optimization.

4. Conclusion and Recommendation

Based on the findings, the following conclusions were drawn.

There is a significant relationship between school heads' governance and school performance optimization, the null hypothesis is rejected. There exists a notably positive and highly significant relationship between the school governance strategies employed by school heads and the optimization of school performance, with p-values < .005. The strength of this relationship falls within the range of strong to very strong. Given the positive direction of the relationship, it implies that enhancements in the level of school governance strategies adopted by school heads correspond to improvements in school performance optimization. Also, There is a significant relationship between school heads' resource management and school performance optimization, the null hypothesis is rejected. The correlations range from strong (0.60 - 0.79) to very strong (0.80 - 1.00), particularly for evaluating (0.899) and monitoring (0.878). This indicates a substantial relationship between effective resource management and successful school operations and resource management, which is a key component of performance optimization. Lastly, There is a significant relationship between school heads' participatory decision-making and school performance optimization, the null hypothesis is rejected. The correlations range from strong (0.60 - 0.79) to very strong (0.80 - 1.00), with most exceeding 0.8. This indicates a substantial relationship between involving stakeholders in decision-making and positive outcomes in various areas of school performance optimization.

Through the conclusions drawn from the findings, the following recommendations are made since all variables are fully implemented and significant, the focus can shift from implementation to sustainability and potential refinement. Here are some of the recommendations based on that:

1. School heads may opt to develop strategies for succession planning. This will consider how to ensure the continuity and sustainability of effective practices. Explore strategies for leadership development and knowledge transfer to ensure successful school governance practices even with personnel changes.

2. School leaders can leverage data analysis to further optimize resource allocation and ensure resources are directed towards areas with the greatest impact on student learning.

3. School heads are encouraged to explore ways to sustain and enhance stakeholders' participation. This could involve creating a formalized council or committee structure where stakeholders have a strong voice in decision-making or implementing anonymous feedback channels to ensure continuous input.

References

- Leithwood, K., Begley, P., & Coleman, H. (2022). Leading for equity and excellence in schools: A relational approach. Corwin.
- Department of Education (2015). School-Based Management Grant. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2015/10/28/school-based-management-grant>