

Influence of Strategic Partnership Practices on the Performance of Elementary School Leaders

Marlona R. Reginio

0322-3015@lspu.edu.ph, elsa.callo@lspu.edu.ph

Teacher II, Casile Elementary School, Casile, Cabuyao, Laguna, 4025, Philippines

Abstract

This study investigates the influence of strategic partnership practices on the performance of elementary school leaders in the City Schools Division of Cabuyao. Strategic partnerships—whether with parents, local communities, government agencies, non-governmental organizations, or private institutions—provide critical support in addressing resource constraints, enhancing instructional quality, and fostering innovation. A descriptive correlational research design was employed in the study, involving 447 elementary teachers from various schools during the 2025-2026 school year. A researcher developed a questionnaire and from DepEd SBM Indicator to collect the data. Findings reveal that leaders who actively cultivate and sustain strategic partnerships demonstrate stronger competencies in instructional supervision, stakeholder engagement, and organizational management. Partnerships were shown to enhance decision-making processes, build trust among stakeholders, and increase leaders' adaptability in responding to challenges such as curriculum reforms, resource shortages, and community expectations. Moreover, the study highlights that those partnerships contribute to sustainable school development by aligning external support with internal priorities, thereby reinforcing the resilience and responsiveness of school leadership.

Keywords: Influence of Strategic Partnership Practices on the Performance of Elementary School Leaders

1. Introduction

School personnel and other school heads are concerned about the student's welfare and academic success. They are responsible for being interested in and sensitive to the student's struggles and progress in school. The DepEd Partnership Strategic Framework by Rolly Soriano, under the Adopt-a-School Program, is composed of three conceptual frameworks: cooperation, performance, and governance. The collaboration framework is the foundation for the institutional attitude toward partnering, partnering policies, delivery capabilities, and agreed-upon goals (Soriano, n.d.). On the other hand, the performance framework affects the demand for partnerships, an incentive to partner, and what worked and did not work well in the relationship. Finally, the governance framework is the foundation, encompassing partnership institutions, partnership strategies, partnership values, procedures, benefits, coordination, decision-making and monitoring (Llego, 2020)

In line with this, a strategic framework helps a school identify its goals and objectives to achieve student and organizational success.

With good planning and communication, parents, teachers, administrators, principals, school heads and the community will all be working toward the same goals. Ong (2016) stated that successful strategic plan implementation requires developing high-output teams and continually monitoring all progress. This is because not all employees understand how their jobs benefit the organization; employee unhappiness is common in corporations, non-profits and even schools. When employees see a strategic plan, it helps them commit to their work because it shows that their work matters and it is part of a larger strategy to help their school succeed. Now the heads of the schools will have a roadmap to follow, assess and change to make better governance decisions and give direction for the future of the school. Most importantly, despite the best intentions of all parties to improve the quality of life in our communities through lifelong learning, several obstacles may impede effective collaboration among academic departments/faculties. School personnel and other school heads are concerned about the student's welfare and academic success. They are responsible for being interested in and sensitive to the student's struggles and progress in school.

The DepEd Partnership Strategic Framework by Rolly Soriano, under the Adopt-a-School Program, is composed of three conceptual frameworks: cooperation, performance, and governance. The collaboration framework is the foundation for the institutional attitude toward partnering, partnering policies, delivery capabilities, and agreed-upon goals (Soriano, n.d.). On the other hand, the performance framework affects the demand for partnerships, an incentive to partner, and what worked and did not work well in the relationship. Finally, the governance framework is the foundation, encompassing partnership institutions, partnership strategies, partnership values, procedures, benefits, coordination, decision-making and monitoring (Llego, 2020).

2. Literature Review

2.1 Strategic Partnership Practices

The data processing of the study or the legal foundation will be DepEd Partnership Strategic Framework that has the conceptual frameworks of collaboration, performance, and governance. The cooperation framework is the base of the delivery capabilities, partnering policies, institutional partnering mindset, and mutually agreed-upon goals. While the performance framework influences the desire for partnerships, the motivation to partner, and the relationship's successes and failures. The final piece of the foundation is the governance framework, which includes partnership institutions, partnership strategies, partnership principles, procedures, and benefits. It helps with coordination, decision-making, and monitoring (Department of Education, 2022).

The school partnerships were founded as a mechanism for schools to work for mutual benefit, according to the description. This is in contrast to other types of school-to-school partnerships, such as those in which a "successful" school leader and their school assist less successful schools in improving (Ngobeni, 2024), a relationship that has been criticized for legitimizing "new forms of dependency, perpetuating existing imbalanced power relations." Understanding how schools can work with one another and with other organizations are of broad interest, since it pertains to a variety of international contexts and forms of cooperation. While schools have been given more authority in managing their budgets, the external support services on which they previously relied have been drastically reduced. This creates a climate in which schools, although being rivals, are increasingly required to help one another. This is a move away from the direct control of schools by local governments, towards governance through networks and alliances of schools (Nehez & Blossing, 2020). There is a significant gap in accessible research due to the increased importance of school-to-school cooperation.

As the world becomes increasingly diverse, so too have expectations of schools from the community. This is being intensified by a greater understanding that society as a whole, not just schools, is responsible for educating its citizens. Schools are now focusing more on building alliances with the wider community including parents, organizations, businesses and other educational institutions (Ewulley et al., 2023). Assessments can be used to systematically assess how well a program, practice, intervention or initiative is achieving the school's goals. It will help identify what is working well and areas where a partnership program or venture in general could benefit from improvement. In order to help students, achieve their goals and create a sense of community pride and dedication that can impact the overall success of the school, school leaders allocate additional resources to the institution (Zamiri & Esmaeili, 2024).

2.2 Stakeholder Engagement

Moreover, Transformational leadership is a style of leadership that goes beyond managing tasks; it inspires people to do more than they thought they could. Transformational leaders create a clear vision, motivate others with passion, and build strong relationships based on trust and empathy. They don't just focus on their own interests but work with others to bring about real change (Davis & Thilagarah, 2022). In the school setting, this type of leadership helps school heads form stronger partnerships with parents, LGUs, NGOs, and the community. By inspiring and motivating others, school leaders can unite different stakeholders to work toward shared goals. This not only strengthens partnerships but also leads to better school performance and improved student outcomes.

Eden et al. (2024) stated that collaboration among educators, parents, and the community is essential for improving school performance. They emphasize that collaborative leadership fosters a sense of shared purpose, encouraging stakeholders to work together toward common goals. This approach enhances teacher efficacy and student achievement, as teachers benefit from shared expertise and resources. Furthermore, Cojorn and Sonsupap (2024) found that collaborative professional development initiatives lead to improved instructional practices, which are crucial for enhancing student learning outcomes.

Transparent, responsive, and flexible collaborations work best (Cagatan & Quirap, 2024). Academic development in the information age is fueled by a collaborative attitude fortified by a competitive spirit. All in the interest can boost student success by demonstrating partnerships that blend a collaborative approach with a competitive spirit.

According to the People in Need Philippines (2024), the collaboration framework of the Local Government Unit (LGU), non-governmental organization (NGO)/Private Sector, and Department of Education (DepEd) includes the institutional mindset of partnership as part of their functions under the general welfare clause of their roles. Institutional partnership mindset is also a philanthropic priority and advocacy. The general practice is to seek aid to support DepEd initiatives, as well as numerous unwritten policies and practices regulating partnerships.

A partnership mindset is made up of internal ideas held by practitioners that are widely acknowledged as necessary for establishing good collaborations. A partnership mindset, according to Minnaert et al. (2020), is a set viewpoint that leads to the ability and desire to create high-quality collaborations in which both parties achieve more than they could alone. Organizations that create the ideal work environment for forging partnerships can help employees develop the right mindset. A shared sense of accountability reinforced by a strategy of continuous improvement that incorporates the entire school community is an important component of collaborative collaboration. This is a cyclical process that can start with an asset and needs evaluation that includes student, family, and educator involvement. The evaluation can contribute to the discovery of mutually agreed-upon objectives, programs, outcomes, and indicators, as well as the tracking of pertinent student, school, and community data (Maier & Niebuhr, 2021).

Local education groups should participate in all phases of the education planning process, according to the World Bank (2022), bringing together bilateral collaborators, intergovernmental institutions, teacher

organizations, civil society, and private sector organizations and institutions involved in the education sector to maximize synchronization and alignment. The local education group is responsible for the country's students, and its members are collectively responsible to one another.

Both at the global level, through participation in the constituency-based organization, and at the national level, as the principal policymakers and administrators of education systems, partner country governments take a crucial role. The necessity of government administration and comprehensive, collaborative policy dialogue is emphasized. All school heads must work together to effectively transform education and deliver a quality education to all students (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, n.d.).

Laws and policies direct the implementation of programs and activities in schools. The transfer from policy to implementation can be complicated, with implications throughout the educational system. "Inclusive involvement of stakeholders and school heads" is one of the areas that can either delay or help the transition from policy to action (Stephens, 2020).

When separately operating entities join together to collaborate, the aspect of management addresses the difficulties of moving from governance to executing activities toward accomplishing goals. Traditional hierarchical administrative approaches are being replaced by considerations of communication methods, roles, and duties. Shifting roles in university-school partnerships has emerged as an endeavor to give teachers more control over the curriculum by allowing them to develop their own ideas (Matriano, 2024). Performance management is a critical aspect of school leadership that directly impacts school performance. According to Comighud and Writes (2021), effective school heads implement performance management systems that include setting clear goals, monitoring progress, and providing feedback. This systematic approach not only holds educators accountable but also creates a culture of continuous improvement. The alignment of instructional practices with performance goals is essential for achieving desired outcomes, as highlighted by Schildkamp et al. (2020), who note that data-driven decision-making enables principals to tailor interventions to meet the specific needs of their students.

According to Lapuz and Pecajas (2022), school heads have three characteristics. The first is power, or how much a school head has or may obtain access to authoritarian, utilitarian, or ethical ways of imposing his or her will on the partnership. The second feature is legitimacy, which refers to how suitable, legitimate, and desirable a school head relationship is in the societal environment. When the task to be accomplished is time-sensitive and the work is significant or essential to the school heads, the third attribute is urgency.

Through "adopt a school initiative," heads such as businesses and government officials can have a deeper knowledge of schools and forge a more formal connection. As a result of these initiatives, school heads gain exposure to schools and become aware of needs. At the same time, when professionals work directly with students in programs, students gain from it. This may boost their motivation as well as the significance of their learning (Cornico, 2025).

Moreover, demands can only be achieved if partners are open about their objectives and express their roles and duties, as well as the limits of their aptitudes and capabilities. Parents and teachers must recognize the crucial relevance of each other's contributions in a student's life in order to collaborate effectively. This development in learning, understanding, and compassion stems not only from a recognition of the student as the collaboration's fundamental purpose, but also from a sense of the necessity to maintain complete, flexible, and differentiated roles and interactions with students (Cornico, 2025).

According to Erickson's Psychosocial Development hypothesis (quoted by McLeod, 2025), if children are praised and rewarded for their initiative, they will become more productive and confident in their capacity to attain their goals. If this initiative is not supported, or if it is limited by parents or teachers, the child will begin to feel inferior, doubting his or her own talents, and thus will not realize his or her full potential. The parents' involvement becomes a critical role in the child's success, which is why more involvement is required throughout this time. On the other hand, a child's psychosocial development alters as they grow older, especially as they approach puberty.

Typical partnership activity between the university and partnership schools revolved around the needs of the trainee teacher; however, the study sought to re-imagine this through the development of a collaborative partnership model focused on developing school-university research-based practice. To facilitate systematic school-based inquiry, teacher professional knowledge was combined with the expertise of university staff. This paper describes a qualitative study that included four university participants and seven primary school participants in the school-based inquiry project. The findings, when viewed through the lens of the concept of a “Community of Practice” (CoP), demonstrate the practice, relationship, and role changes that occurred. The main factors that contributed to the development of this particular CoP are discussed in the discussion, including both their strengths and limitations (Thant Sin, 2021).

2.3 Resource Mobilization

Moreover, the Resource Dependence Theory (RDT) explains that no organization can stand alone; it must rely on resources and support from its environment. In business, this theory shows how companies build partnerships to secure what they need and reduce risks. When applied to schools, the same idea holds true. Schools depend on the support of parents, LGUs, NGOs, and community partners to meet their needs beyond what the government provides. Through strategic partnerships, school leaders are able to access resources, strengthen programs, and create opportunities that directly improve school performance. In short, RDT explains that effective collaboration is not just helpful but essential for schools to thrive in today’s challenging educational environment (Jiang et al., 2022).

School heads' conflicting interests might make it challenging for them to manage their obligations and allocated tasks in a partnership. Organizational performance is linked to organizational goals, which are influenced in part by the organization's approach to competing with school heads' demands (Aquino et al., 2021). They are categorized in the literature by their distinct levels of relevance, or resonance, and are appraised by institutions and partners based on the social constructions of their validity. This classification system includes several aspects of the school head's involvement in partnership performance.

Successful strategic partnerships entail numerous dimensions and motivations. School heads' motivation for partnering varies; nonetheless, the most successful partnerships are predicated on a common value system and objective alignment. Schools were driven to investigate the advantages of using the power of inter-organizational collaborations, such as district–university partnerships, as a result of rising demands and diminishing resources (Yang et al., 2022).

When there is significant engagement and structures in place for collaboration at the network or district level, local community schools are more likely to be successful and maintained. This necessitates a management and financing plan that emphasizes shared accountability for the community schools as well as the communitywide project and its relevant programs. The majority of schools combine and weave federal, state, and local resources. General education, primary learning, emotional, mental and physical health, special education, public security, and health care are all examples of this (Maier & Niebuhr, 2021).

According to Mbanefo (2022), the method of strategic organization allows academic institutions to establish how they will devote resources in the long term to support the school's goal. They expanded on this fundamental finding by proposing that the focus of institutional educational design should be on enriching

learner experiences and improving learner outcomes. It is proposed that the institutional strategic approach be seen more widely as a transition process.

The desire to build a more collaborative approach has been a component of the orientation as school systems in many nations redesign their organizational aspects and programs. Indeed, some authors claim that current reform efforts are based on collaborative approaches. As a result, support of collaboration as a means of attaining progress has followed shared governance projects. Consequently, the need for collaboration has become a common element in reform discourse (Kaufman et al., 2020). In the business world, it appears that precisely stated shared benefits are required for private sector collaboration. If only the public institution gains from a cross-sector partnership, the collaboration may appear to be more like a charity than an alliance. If just the company gains, this might be considered exploitation (Waerder et al., 2021).

The basic premise of cross-sector collaboration is that each organization contributes capabilities that they are uniquely qualified to provide (Ba et al., 2024). Complementarity refers to the interchange of resources and the sharing of goals and benefits based on various interests. Intangible resources, such as time or skill, as well as tangibles, such as student creative projects being merged into business design work, are examples of exchanges of investments and advantages. For organizations, rewards may include media exposure, establishing a company identity with the collaborative issue to engage new employees or improving present staff morale (Mailani et al., 2024).

2.4 Policy Alignment

The DepEd Partnership Strategic Framework (Department of Education, 2022), which serves as the legal foundation for partnership initiatives, demonstrates policy alignment by ensuring that partnerships adhere to established policies and institutional strategies. Within this framework, the governance component covering partnership institutions, principles, procedures, and benefits also promote communication and transparency through decision-making, coordination, and monitoring mechanisms that ensure accountability among stakeholders.

Similarly, Aquino et al. (2021) point out that collaborating just for personal gain is likely to fail given the intricacy of the collaborative process. Furthermore, they also mentioned that an inter-organizational partnership with shared goals is one of these extremes. The concept of shared goals and preparation for strategic education partnerships, and toward enhancing sustainable development, is essential to partnership. In education, it appears that precisely stated shared values are required for collaboration. If only the public institution gains from a cross-sector partnership, the collaboration may appear to be more like a charity than an alliance. If just the company gains, this might be considered exploitation.

Cross-sector collaboration is based on the fundamental tenet that each business delivers capabilities that they are specifically competent to offer. The sharing of objectives and advantages based on multiple interests, as well as the exchange of resources, is referred to as complementarity. Examples of exchanges of investments and advantages include tangibles like student creative efforts being incorporated into business design work, and intangibles like time or skill. For firms, benefits could include media attention, building a brand identity around the cooperative project to attract new personnel, or boosting current staff morale (Resonance Global, n.d.).

The appointment of members from each organization to plan, develop, and manage the partnership activities is an important component of the process of building successful partnerships centered on administrator

education (Hesselgreaves et al., 2021). These people, or school heads, are critical to the successful cooperative educational leadership development initiatives and implementation. Designated school heads are given the chance to develop, define, and shape these alliances, bringing their diverse concepts and values to this collaborative process.

Furthermore, successful school partnerships are built on leadership, trust, consistency, preparation, and long-term outreach (Ngobeni, 2024). Other important characteristics are reciprocity, in which both school heads gain in some way, and capacity alignment and pooling, which avoids redundancy and instead fills in service shortages.

Governance is the concept that members in a collaboration construct frameworks and rules for decision-making and other limitations connected to collective action in a cooperative manner. It is a negotiated process that occurs as a collaboration develops. Most public sector institutions, including higher education institutions, now function within a paradigm focused on partnerships for the effective provision of service and projects. It has been argued that in a broad and varied society with diffused power, effective governance can only be attained through formal inter-sectoral partnerships (Wang & Ran, 2021).

Education reformers stated that, as challenging as forming and maintaining partnerships can be, meaningful reform necessitates community collaboration. Many schools and community organizations are now interested in forming significant collaborative partnerships (Carvalho et al., 2021).

Samuel and Kiu Publication Extension (2024) categorizes the school's collaborations into four groups: business partnerships, mentorship partnerships, corporate sponsors, and community partners. Industry partnerships support the instructional programs of the institution. They guarantee that courses adhere to professional requirements. Additionally, they facilitate communication between the school and the relevant training bodies and present increasingly diverse student awards. Mentoring alliances provide staff and students with mentoring and job opportunities. The creative projects of the school are supported financially or materially by sponsors from the industry. Community partners support and mentor students as they learn how to take charge of their futures. Students take part in volunteer work in the community.

Valk and Kratovits (2021) has also developed a descriptive framework for the partnerships among school heads of professional higher education institutions in the ground of internal security, which includes four key parts: (1) stakeholders/school heads, (2) collaboration essence, (3) collaboration structures, and (4) factors that influence collaboration. A mutual interest-based cooperation partnership and a continuous implementation partnership are the two types of relationships identified by the framework. The first type involves heads of the school with a lot of informal authority, and communication is built on shared interest and trust, whereas the second type is more reliant on the school heads and requires formal cooperation aimed at reaching broad norms or goals.

It has been suggested that effective governance can only be achieved through formal inter-sectoral partnerships in a large and diverse society with diffused power. The majority of public institutions, including those in higher education, currently operate according to a paradigm that emphasizes partnerships for the efficient delivery of services and projects (Aivalli et al., 2025).

A study by Gower et al. (2020) states that the advantages of school-community collaboration are well documented in government reports and academic literature. Several government initiatives have been launched to actively involve parents and the community in school matters. Furthermore, various agencies have developed

resource kits and guidelines to help schools and communities develop and foster partnerships, as well as partnership agreements.

Collaborative governance and policies can enable whole-child educational practices and professional development for teachers and administrators, as well as frameworks and procedures that enable shared decision-making at the school site involving children, families, and key school heads. The principal and school management positions are critical in establishing a participative management culture, which includes collaborating with the community school facilitator, partners, and personnel to actively incorporate students, families, and school heads into the school community, its features, and decision-making practices (Maier & Niebuhr, 2021).

Seven criteria of good planning, including inclusion and openness, support a methodology that is thorough and takes into consideration a wide range of relevant information. This implies that the school development strategy must be designed in such a manner that it taps into all pieces of knowledge and assistance while calling on everyone's contribution in making decisions regarding the school's future orientation. The advancement of student learning is the primary goal of school improvement efforts like site-based governance, school bodies, shared decision planning, and teacher professionalism (Carvalho et al., 2021).

2.5 Communication and Transparency

Collaboration with the school head is typically based on shared interests and personal ties (e.g., intervention, socializing, joint image building, cooperation councils), or on a formal basis or subordination. The factors which influence collaboration the most were those linked to trust and professionalism, with informal collaboration being particularly valued (de Jong et al., 2022).

Thus, partnerships are essential for academic success, with a focus primarily on communication and involvement with a wide range of community leaders and professionals. The methods by which school leaders undertake strategic partnerships and how they validate their strategic partnerships are presumed to be significantly related. The numerous internal and external entities that comprise a school or institution must be known to and understood by school leaders. The overwhelming pressure of reducing personnel, resources, and accountability to raise student test results makes it one of the most challenging opportunities for a principal to create connections between the school heads and the whole school community. This is also one of the opportunities that get disregarded the most. It is a given that a principal needs to build a collaborative partnership with the employees and parents of the school. Still, the external environment of the school spans a far more comprehensive range of various community organizations (Grissom et al., 2021).

The participation of a wide variety of school heads is likely to be beneficial to the school and the students who are enrolled there. If schools and other community organizations are committed to engaging families in meaningful and culturally respectful ways, and if families are actively supporting their children's learning and development, then the quality of education will be improved if it is a shared responsibility between schools and other community organizations. This will also enhance the quality of education for families.

Typically, collaboration is seen as a process in which multiple school leaders look for answers that transcend their individual perspectives, where collaborative operation is seen as a crucial fundamental requirement for achieving short- and long-term goals that might not have been achieved if they were done separately, and where specific stages can be distinguished (McTigue et al., 2023).

Engagement between school heads was a critical component of this move from what can be considered

mass planning to contextual and personalized planning. Chater et al. (2022) assisted the change by stating that humans are products of social interactions and that how they understand reality, as a result, is a function of such interactions. As a result, every strategic plan had to take into consideration the facts that inspired their perspective.

In line with this, everyone benefits when schools and community organizations collaborate to support learning. Partnerships have the potential to strengthen, support, and even transform individual partners, resulting in higher program quality, more efficient resource use, and better alignment of goals and curricula. Learning partnerships can support student outcomes. In addition to supporting student learning directly, partnerships can have additional benefits to students and their families. They can provide continuity of services across the day and year, easing school transitions and promoting improved attendance in after-school programs, facilitate access to a range of learning opportunities and developmental supports, providing opportunities for students and teachers alike to experiment with new approaches to teaching and learning, facilitate information sharing about specific students to best support individual learning, and provide family members with alternative entry points into the school day to support their student's learning (Kayser & Kane, 2021).

3. Methodology

The researcher utilized a descriptive-correlational design in this study. The descriptive study design enables the researcher to pinpoint traits, probabilities, patterns, and classifications. It aids in the analysis and description of the distribution of one or more variables without consideration of any other or causal hypothesis. On the other hand, the correlation design measures two or more variables as they are presented and establishes whether a relationship exists between variables (Bhandari, 2021). This approach collects the necessary quantifiable data to test a specific event within a population. It allows the investigation of frequencies and characterization. Therefore, using a descriptive-correlational design allows the researcher to further evaluate the information acquired and to adequately describe the statement of the problem of this study.

Hence, this research design is fit for the study since it helps to correlate and determine the influence of the strategic practices of the school heads in the school performance. Moreover, it also aids in determining the practices of the school heads in performing strategic partnership as well as the level of performance of the school heads assigned school. Aside from this, it also helps to discover how strategic partnership influences school performance as well as the significant difference between strategic partnership practices of school heads and school performance when grouped according to the respondents' demographic profile. The result of the study permits the researcher to further evaluate the improvements and provide a strategic intervention to address the issues and concerns of the school heads in strengthening partnerships.

4. Results and Discussions

This chapter presents, analyzes and interprets data gathered to address the sub-problem related to the main problem of this study. This section presents the study's findings in response to the research questions.

Table 1

Profile Of Teachers and Master Teachers

Age	f	%
46 years old and above	109	24.4
41-45 years old	90	20.1

36-40 years old	101	22.6
31-35 years old	81	18.1
25-30 years old	66	14.8
Sex	f	%
Male 1	41	9.2
Female 2	406	90.8
Designation/ Position	f	%
Master Teacher III	4	0.9
Master Teacher II	10	2.2
Master Teacher I	24	5.4
Teacher VI	39	8.7
Teacher V	10	2.2
Teacher IV	19	4.3
Teacher III	105	23.5
Teacher II	51	11.4
Teacher I	185	41.4
School Size	f	%
Mega Large	213	47.7
Large	149	33.3
Medium	73	16.3
Small	12	2.7
Teaching Experience	F	%
21 years and above	75	16.8
16-20 years	89	20.0
11-15 years	106	23.8
6-10 years	90	20.2
1-5 years	8687	19.3
Highest Educational Attainment	F	%
Doctorate Degree Holder	5	1.1
With Units in a Doctorate Degree	14	3.1
Master's Degree Holder	139	31.1
With Master's Units	161	36.1
Bachelor's Degree Holder	128	28.6
School SBM Level	F	%
Level III	240	53.7
Level II	202	45.2
Level I	5	1.1

The demographic data reveal fairly mature teachers and master teachers. The largest share falls in the 46-year-old-and-above category (24.4%), followed closely by those aged 36–40 (22.6%) and 41–45 (20.1%). Only 14.8% are in the youngest group (25–30). This indicates that a large percentage of the respondents are

already in the middle and late career stages. This result aligns with the study by Maqhubela (2025), in which respondents reported positive classroom experiences and experiences in practice. Simultaneously, the lower share of younger teachers suggests a shortage of early-career teachers relative to more experienced teachers.

Regarding sex, the data is dominated by females, with 90.8% female and only 9.2% male. This is typical of the teaching workforce, particularly in basic schools, where the teaching fraternity is predominantly female. This unequal representation can affect communication patterns, leadership, and even involvement in professional development. It further implies that this demographic fact should be taken into account by programs or policies when developing interventions or support systems (Núñez-Canal et al., 2025) with regard to designation or position, the majority of respondents are in entry- to mid-level teaching positions. Teacher I has the highest percentage (41.4%), followed by Teacher III (23.5%) and Teacher II (11.4%). Higher ranks like Master Teacher I, II and III are a subset of the group, comprising a significantly smaller proportion. This shows that the largest numbers are still in the lower ranks of the teaching career ladder. It further means that the number of highly experienced mentors or instructional leaders is fewer than the number of classroom teachers, which can influence mentoring, supervision, and teaching support (Alzouebi et al., 2025).

The data on school size indicate that almost half of the participants (47.7%) attend mega-large schools, followed by large schools (33.3%). Very few are attended at medium (16.3) and small schools (2.7). This indicates that a majority of teachers are teaching in highly populated school settings, which tend to have larger class sizes, heavier workloads and more intricate administrative requirements. These circumstances may directly impact the effectiveness of teaching, classroom management, and the provision of individualized instruction.

Experience evidence confirms the previous finding regarding a rather seasoned workforce. The largest group has 11–15 years of experience (23.8%), followed by those with 6–10 years (20.2%) and 16–20 years (20.0%). Even those aged 21 and above make up 16.8%. The percentage with 1–5 years' experience is only 19.3. This distribution indicates that the largest percentage of teachers is not novice teachers. What you are dealing with is a group that may have already developed teaching practices and professional routines, which can provide consistency but may also require more specific implementation approaches when introducing new methods or innovations.

Most teachers have pursued graduate studies. The largest proportions, 36.1 percent and 31.1 percent, are represented by those who possess master's units and complete master's degrees, respectively. Only 28.6% have a bachelor's degree as their highest qualification, and the percentage of those with doctoral qualifications or units is very low. This means that there is a great desire to pursue professional growth and career progression. It further implies that a large percentage of teachers are also in a position to use sophisticated teaching methods, conduct research and exercise leadership.

Lastly, at the School-Based Management (SBM) level, the majority of schools are at higher levels, with 53.7% at Level III and 45.2% at Level II. Only 1.1 are on the Level I. This implies that most schools are already in highly developed phases of implementing SBM practices, including better governance, stakeholder involvement, and resource management. In your study, this implies that the context in which teachers work is more organized and progressive and therefore can promote the implementation of programs and initiatives.

Part II. Extent of the School Leaders in Performing Strategic Partnerships

Table 2 shows that the school leaders exhibit a very high level of stakeholder engagement, as the overall mean of 3.70 falls within the 3.25–4.00 range and is considered in the very extent category (VGE). The

standard deviation of 0.48 indicates that the answers are well concentrated, i.e., the respondents have a linear understanding of strong stakeholder participation in school management and affairs, which aligns with the study by Sarmiento-Márquez et al. (2023).

Table 2*Extent of Practicing Stakeholder Engagement*

Indicator	Mean	SD	VI
1 Ensures active participation of internal and external stakeholders in school governance and operations.	3.74	0.46	VGE
2. Fosters mutual trust and collaboration between the school and external organizations to support school goals.	3.69	0.49	VGE
3. Builds partnerships with local government units, NGOs, and the private sector to address learners' needs.	3.68	0.51	VGE
4. Effectively and efficiently implements its Programs, Projects, and Activities (PPAs), which are aligned to its strategic plan.	3.73	0.47	VGE
5. Maintains open communication channels with stakeholders for feedback and suggestions on school initiatives.	3.69	0.48	VGE
6. Conducts an annual recognition and awarding of stakeholders at the end of the school year.	3.70	0.50	VGE
7. Ensures that partnership initiatives reflect inclusivity and equal representation of all groups.	3.70	0.49	VGE
8. Promotes shared accountability with stakeholders in achieving the school's mission and vision.	3.69	0.48	VGE
Overall	3.70	0.48	VGE

Legend: 1.0-1.74 (Least Extent/LE); 1.75-2.49 (Moderate Extent/ME); 2.50-3.24 (Great Extent/GE); 3.25-4.00 (Very Great Extent/VGE)

This general conclusion is supported by every indicator. The most highly rated item (mean of 3.74) indicates that school leaders actively involve both internal and external stakeholders. This implies that the teachers, parents, community members, and external partners not only have access to information but also actively participate in decision-making and in running the school.

Next to this is the successful execution of Programs, Projects, and Activities (PPAs) aligned with the school's strategic plan, with an average score of 3.73. This implies that the stakeholders' interests are not confined to consultation but also to participation in the implementation of school programs, which is consistent with the study by Endo et al. (2025).

There are other indicators that confirm strong engagement practices. The efforts to maintain motivation and recognize contributions to long-term relationships are evident in the annual recognition and awards for stakeholders (3.70). Equally, ensuring inclusivity and equal representation (3.70) emphasizes that school leaders are keen on providing a voice to all stakeholder groups, which is fundamental to establishing an equal and participatory governance process, consistent with the study by Ermita and Baysa (2025). Opened communication channels (3.69) and a constructive, working relationship with mutual trust and collaboration (3.69) indicate that the school has active, positive relationships with its stakeholders. These principles establish

the culture in which feedback is welcomed, and openness and collaboration are maintained.

The possibility of developing partnerships with local government units, NGOs, and the private sector (3.68) also demonstrates that the engagement is not limited to the school community but extends to other institutions that could help meet learners' needs. This increases the resources and opportunities for students. Finally, encouraging shared accountability (3.69) indicates that the stakeholders not only understand the mission and vision of the school but also learn to be responsible partners in the journey to accomplish them, which makes them committed and responsible.

Altogether, the results reveal that school leaders are highly effective at involving stakeholders at various levels. All these are seen in their active participation, good collaboration, inclusion and sustained communication. The high ratings across all indicators indicate that stakeholder engagement is fully incorporated into leadership practices in schools and plays an important role in facilitating school improvement and achieving strategic goals.

Table 3

Extent of Practicing Resource Mobilization

Indicator	Mean	SD	VI
1. Identifies potential sources of financial, material, and human resources to support school programs.	3.71	0.48	VGE
2. Develops proposals and partnership agreements to generate additional resources for the school.	3.63	0.52	VGE
3. Utilizes school and community resources efficiently to maximize impact.	3.69	0.49	VGE
4. Implements management strategies to mobilize resources.	3.69	0.49	VGE
5. Mobilizes internal and external resources to sustain ongoing school initiatives.	3.80	1.97	VGE
6. Establishes transparent systems for managing and accounting for all acquired resources.	3.66	0.50	VGE
7. Encourages teachers and staff to take part in resource-generating activities.	3.64	0.52	VGE
8. Allocates resources equitably to meet the needs of all learners and staff.	3.64	0.51	VGE
Overall	3.68	0.68	VGE

Legend: 1.0-1.74 (Least Extent/LE); 1.75-2.49 (Moderate Extent/ME); 2.50-3.24 (Great Extent/GE); 3.25-4.00 (Very Great Extent/VGE)

Table 3 shows as regards resource mobilization, the school leaders have very high-performance standards as reflected in the overall mean value of 3.68 with interpretive range (3.25-4.00) or very great extent (VGE). The response deviations range within a single standard deviation (0.68) which suggests consistency in perceptions, while there is evidence of small variations. In real school situation, the management and maximization of available resources is quite possible enabled by the appropriate use of Maintenance and Other Operating Expenses (MOOE), financial support from Local Government Units (LGUs), and assistance from community partners. In many schools, these resources are used for day-to-day school operations, enhancing school facilities, developing learning materials and supporting students' activities, particularly when schools' regular school budgets are set at limited levels.

The mean score of the indicators was highest at the internal and external mobilization of resources to support school programs and projects with a mean score of 3.80. It is a reflection of the fact that school officials

work proactively with the LGU, Barangay leaders, parents, alumni and private sector to mobilize extra resources to the school's needs. For many schools, LGUs and community partners provide the funds for elementary repairs, feeding programs, school materials and technology devices, and MOOE funds are allocated wisely to ensure that schools continue to run. This is not the case however with a high standard deviation (1.97) which shows there is a high variation of responses. This indicates that support and donations will be particularly good in some schools, while others may not receive the same support or partnerships and instead may face shortages in external support resources, as mentioned by Daly et al. (2025).

School leaders showed a high level of performance in identifying possible sources of financial resources (mean score 3.88), material resources (mean score 3.78) and human resources (mean score 3.71). This indicates that school heads are proactive in finding opportunities that can help improve school programs and services. In actual practice, school leadership create connections with LGUs, non-governmental organizations, private donors and parent organizations to secure extra funding in addition to the regular MOOE distribution. They further promote community engagement in school programs and activities for the support of resource generation. The study by Alvarez et al. (2023) underscores the need for strategic planning and effective collaboration with stakeholders to enhance school resource management, and this finding reinforces that argument.

Similarly, the scale items relating to the effective utilization of school and community resources, and the use of management strategies to mobilize resources, both had a mean rating of 3.69. This implies that school leaders are not only about getting the resources but also to making sure they are used appropriately in line with school priorities and learners' needs. In truth, effective use of MOOE is very important to a clean and safe school, in the acquisition of learning materials, the payment of utilities, and the school's success in school improvement initiatives. Care is also taken that donations from the LGUs and other stakeholders are directly used to benefit the learners and teachers. These practices demonstrate good financial management and demonstrate that school leaders are taking action to ensure that the resources they have are maximized to improve teaching and learning conditions.

A mean of 3.66 on the systems to ensure the transparency of the management and accounting of resources. This is indicative of how the director of schools prepares financial reports, documentation of books and other donated resources, and liquidations in schools. Transparency is crucial as stakeholders (E.g., teachers, parents and LGUs) want adequate monitoring and reporting of funds and donation given to the school. Proposals and partnership agreements had a mean of 3.63, indicating that whilst some schools are actively seeking external support and the development of partnership agreements, there remain some schools that could be struggling with the three areas listed above.

The lowest means were found for indicators 3.64 (encouraging teachers and staff to engage in resource-generating activities), and 3.64 (ensuring even distribution of resources) which are still in the very great extent dimension. This indicates that, overall, participation and fairness is upheld, however there is scope for improvement. In most schools, teachers have a lot of teaching and administrative responsibilities that might mean that they may not be able to do more activities to mobilize more resources. In some cases, too, there may be situations in which school resources are not adequate to meet the needs of all learners and staff, particularly in a school where there are not a lot of resources outside the school or a large number of students. Overall, the results show that the school leaders are very effective to mobilize and manage resources in an appropriate way using MOOE, responsible utilizing of LGU resources, and support from stakeholders and community partner. But efforts should be further expanded to build cooperation, better proposal writing and ensure more balanced resources allocation to enhance resource mobilization practices in schools.

Table 4*Extent of Practicing Policy Alignment*

Indicator	Mean	SD	VI
1. Aligns school plans and programs with the Department of Education's policies and priorities.	3.78	0.43	VGE
2. Ensures that partnership activities adhere to existing school policies and legal frameworks.	3.86	2.40	VGE
3. Reviews and updates school policies to remain responsive to emerging educational trends.	3.73	0.47	VGE
4. Implements school policies that promote collaboration and shared responsibility.	3.70	0.47	VGE
5. Coordinates with higher authorities to ensure policy consistency and compliance.	3.66	0.50	VGE
6. Integrates national and local education goals into the school's strategic partnership agenda.	3.65	0.50	VGE
7. Establishes feedback mechanisms to assess the effectiveness of implemented policies.	3.64	0.49	VGE
8. Evaluates the school's compliance with policies governing partnerships and governance.	3.63	0.51	VGE
Overall	3.71	0.72	VGE

Legend: 1.0-1.74 (Least Extent/LE); 1.75-2.49 (Moderate Extent/ME); 2.50-3.24 (Great Extent/GE); 3.25-4.00 (Very Great Extent/VGE)

The table 4 shows the results presented in the table 4 indicated that the overall mean of school leaders' level of practice in policy alignment was 3.71, which lies in the Very Great Extent 3.25-4.00 range. The standard deviation is 0.72, which signifies that the responses are generally consistent although there are some differences in perception among respondents. This translates to the strong implementation of policies made by the Department of Education (DepEd) within the school system, making sure that the school program, activities and partnerships are consistent with national education standards and legal provisions. School heads will observe in a strict manner the guidelines and policies of DepEd, including but not limited to school governance, child protection, Brigada Eskwela, School Improvement Plans (SIP), resource mobilization, and proper utilization of school funds and resources.

The results also indicate that the partnership activities are integrated with the current policies and legal frameworks of the school with a mean score of 3.86. It also aligned with the fact that such school partnership with LGUs and other stakeholders, including private entity and parents, is carefully and comprehensively accounted to adhere with the school guidelines of DepEd prior to implementation. Although activities and/or programs are language-centered in many schools, they are still tightly regulated by official Memoranda, e.g., DepEd Order No. 21 s. While the current policies are directly referenced, the specific references are omitted and adopt the language of the Policy Guidelines on the K to 12 Basic Education Program, DepEd Order No. 24, s. In 2020, the Brigada Eskwela Program and the DepEd Order No. 40, s. 2020 were enacted. The Brigada Eskwela Program and the DepEd Order No. 40, s. 2020 were issued in 2020. 2012. The policies are followed to ensure that school activity, donations and partnerships are well managed and good for the learners. But about the high standard deviation of 2.40 means there are knowledge and interpretation differences between policies

and stakeholders as indicated by Anyanwu et al. (2025).

The second highest Mean – 3.78 relates to enhancement of school plans and programs consistent with DepEd policies and priorities. This means that the school leaders have been known to implement school programs and decisions consistently based on instructions communicated by DepEd and the higher quarters. In practice, schools match School improvement Plans (SIP), Annual Implementation Plans (AIP) including learning recovery programs to children learning issues of the DepEd viz. improvement of literacy, inclusive education and learning continuity. School leaders also receive memoranda on class suspension processes, enrollment procedures, school health and safety processes and guidelines for the implementation of school-based activities to ensure adherence and alignment with national education goals. An average of 3.73, the regular review and update of School policies also demonstrate that leaders are responsive to new directions and changes in educational policies.

The extent of school leaders' facilitation of a participative governance within the school community was evaluated in relation to the adoption of policies on collaboration and shared responsibility and scored a mean of 3.70. In fact, the school involves the teachers, the parents, the School Governing Councils (SGCs), and stakeholder in the planning and execution of the programs based on DepEd Policy in the practice of stakeholder engagement and shared governance. Coordination with higher authorities also received a mean rating of 3.66 meaning that school leaders use higher authorities to communicate commonly on policy implementation, reporting, and how the school is being compliant. This coordination drives the proper implementation of school directives like DepEd memoranda pertaining to disaster preparedness, modalities of learning and school operations.

Mean scores on the school strategic partnership agenda integration of national and local goals equaled 3.65, which means that school leaders recognize the importance of school partnerships with broader education goals. The slightly lower mean may indicate, however, that the integration of external partnerships in long-term education goals would still face challenges in some schools. Meanwhile, the lowest rating was given to setting up feedback mechanisms (3.64) and for measuring compliance of policies (3.63), both of which stayed at Very Great Extent. It implies a need to strengthen policies and their implementation and monitoring and evaluation systems. For some schools, teachers, parents, and other stakeholders may not necessarily know how to respond or document and assess feedback because of time constraints, administrative tasks, or a lack of a formal monitoring process.

Overall, the responses suggest that school leaders are extremely effective in ensuring that the programs and partnership efforts, as well as operations of the school, are congruent with DepEd policies and educational priorities. Leaders of schools are showing very good adherence to national and local guidelines with the strict implementation of DepEd orders and memoranda, proper coordination with higher offices and integration of school activities with legal and policy requirements. Results also indicate that schools are accountable and have structured governance when implementing programs and partnerships. Nevertheless, there was some variation in teacher responses and poorer perceptions of supporting feedback and evaluation systems, indicating there is scope to enhance monitoring systems in schools and the involvement of stakeholders in the evaluation of schools' policies. Reinforcing these should help to ensure that policy implementation is done correctly as well as ongoing evaluation and enhancement of policy to address changing school and learner needs over time.

Table 5 shows that results indicated that school leaders' level of practice in communication and transparency appeared very high with a mean of 3.69, which is at Very Great Extent in the 3.25-4.00 range. Standard deviation results of 0.49 mean that the responses are consistent as the stakeholders have a positive perception of communication practices in the school. This is realized by school leaders running meetings, sending out memoranda, in groups, via social media, and in school reports that help to share and disseminate

important information in the actual school context to ensure that information is shared and understood.

Table 5

Extent of Practicing Communication and Transparency

Indicator	Mean	SD	VI
1. Promotes collaboration and harmonious relationships among its personnel.	3.75	0.46	VGE
2. Encourages feedback and constructive dialogue from stakeholders on school matters.	3.68	0.49	VGE
3. Ensures transparency in decision-making processes and financial transactions.	3.68	0.50	VGE
4. Uses various communication platforms to promote accessibility and inclusivity.	3.67	0.50	VGE
5. Fosters a culture of honesty and accountability among staff and stakeholders.	3.66	0.50	VGE
6. Provides regular updates on school performance, projects, and partnerships.	3.68	0.49	VGE
7. Recognizes the importance of two-way communication in building trust within the school community.	3.67	0.50	VGE
8. Ensures that all information shared with the public reflects the school's integrity and professionalism.	3.69	0.48	VGE
Overall	3.69	0.49	VGE

Legend: 1.0-1.74 (Least Extent/LE); 1.75-2.49 (Moderate Extent/ME); 2.50-3.24 (Great Extent/GE); 3.25-4.00 (Very Great Extent/VGE)

Encouragement of co-operation and good relationships between staff is the highest rated indicator (mean 3.75). This means the school leaders take steps to foster a positive and productive climate for teaching and working together with teachers and staff. Collaborating is fostered in many schools in the form of faculty meeting, team planning, committee work, and school activities that promote unity and teamwork among teachers in line with Pana (2024). These enable better coordination and build relationships within school.

Being held to account and open in school decisions and activities, which had a mean of 3.68, demonstrates school leaders' accountability and openness in school activities. School regularly holds meetings to discuss school programs, MOOE use, donations and project implementation from stakeholders to ensure that teachers and stakeholders are informed. In order to meet the requirements of DepEd, financial reports and procurement records of the meetings and liquidation documents are presented in meetings or posted in the transparency boards, so as to keep stakeholder trust. Through this practice, this helps to ensure that the resources are being managed appropriate and fairly distributed within the school community.

Communication across the school is participatory and ongoing (3.68), as evidenced by the promotion of feedback and discussion between stakeholders, and the regular updates to stakeholders about the school's performance, projects and partnerships. School leaders promote consultation, conferencing and feedback

processes with teachers, parents and stakeholders across the school community to encourage the expression of concerns, suggestions and the involvement of all stakeholders in development efforts. Multiple use of communication platforms with the mean of 3.67 as well, shows that the schools nowadays use now various social media groups, online messaging applications and official memoranda to ensure the wide and rapid dissemination of information particularly in relation to emergency announcements and school activities.

Promotion of integrity and accountability (3.66), alongside the emphasis on using two-way communication to foster trust (3.67), indicate that school leaders prioritize integrity, professionalism and understanding within school community management. Transparency and discipline in disseminating information (3.69) is another example of school leaders' adherence to professionalism and transparency in the school. In practice, schools should communicate relevant information about programs, budgets, schedules and policies in order to keep the stakeholders informed and engaged in school affairs.

Overall, the findings suggest that school leaders employ communication and transparency in the administration of the school fairly to perform their tasks and when dealing with stakeholders. Leaders build trust, cooperation and involvement in the school community through regular communication, clear financial management, open discussions and responsible sharing of information. The practices help ensure improved coordination, better school operations and better partnerships that contribute to the desired outcomes and objectives of the school.

Table 6

Extent of Practicing Capacity Building Initiatives

Indicator	Mean	SD	VI
1. Organizes capacity-building programs to enhance the competencies of teachers and staff.	3.74	0.48	VGE
2. Encourages participation in seminars, training, and professional development programs.	3.70	0.48	VGE
3. Supports mentoring and coaching initiatives within the school.	3.67	0.48	VGE
4. Identifies training needs of teachers and staff to improve school performance.	3.74	1.52	VGE
5. Facilitates learning exchanges and benchmarking activities with other schools.	3.64	0.51	VGE
6. Promotes continuous professional growth as a shared responsibility among all staff.	3.69	0.50	VGE
7. Allocates resources for capacity-building initiatives that align with school goals.	3.70	0.48	VGE
8. Recognizes outstanding professional development efforts among teachers and staff	3.69	0.50	VGE
Overall	3.70	0.62	VGE

Legend: 1.0-1.74 (Least Extent/LE); 1.75-2.49 (Moderate Extent/ME); 2.50-3.24 (Great Extent/GE); 3.25-4.00 (Very Great Extent/VGE)

Table 6 shows that School leaders are very experienced in conducting capacity building activities overall with school-level mean of 3.70 and with a range of 3.25 – 4.00, or Very Great Extent. The value mean=0.62 indicates that there is some general uniformity in responses despite some variances noted between respondents in responses, in this case to the need for training. For the real school environment, this implies that

school leaders engage proactively in teachers' professional development via Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions, In-Service Training (INSET) sessions, seminars and workshops, coaching and Technical Assistance (TA) by school heads, master teachers, and education supervisors.

The most highly scored indicators, both with a mean of 3.74, are the organization of capacity building programs and the identification of teacher/staff training needs. This reflects a clear commitment from school leadership to building the professional learning capacity by arranging activities which are relevant and focused on meeting the needs of staff. In many schools, LAC sessions are held regularly to discuss issues in the classroom, approaches to teaching, assessing students and planning courses as well as concerns in the school curriculum, while INSET sessions give teachers the latest in education and teaching strategies that correlate with DepEd programs and educational reforms. School leaders also identify training needs for staff through observations in the classroom, performance reviews and professional learning meetings with teachers to make sure learning opportunities are relevant and effective. The standard deviation of 1.52 of the training needs indicated, however, that there are differences between the perceptions of the respondents, which mean that those elementary teachers may believe that their needs are met better than others when it comes to training. This is in line with what Alqarni (2021) found that differ in perceptions among respondents with regard to the training needs.

Support for capacity building activities (3.70) – school leaders show their commitment to encouraging participation by providing resources for support activities to reinforce capacity building. To allow teachers and staff to continually develop their capabilities, in practice schools allocate resources, time and materials to INSET, division trainings, webinars and capability building measures. School leaders also coordinate with district and division offices to enable Technical Assistance programs which can support teachers in enhancing classroom delivery, managing school activities and in achieving compliance with DepEd standards. These are all examples of targeted professional development, marking a recognition of the work done as a strategic part of school growth.

The mean scores for obtaining support for mentoring and coaching were 3.67 and for opportunities to share learning with other schools 3.64 respectively. The results of this survey show that school leaders promote teamwork and mutual assistance among faculty and school personnel. In fact, mentoring and coaching frequently occur in the teacher's classroom, between teachers, through Technical Assistance sessions, and by the master teachers and senior teachers. Teachers are also encouraged to bring up best practice, teaching strategies and successful experience in the LAC meetings, district meetings and school benchmarking activities. In this, initiatives contribute to deepening the collaboration and to the learning process of the staff in the schools, aligning with the findings of educational research conducted by Aldenmyr et al. (2025).

The desire to engage in continuous professional learning as professional responsibility (3.69) and the knowledge of exceptional performance in professional learning and development activities (3.69) also indicate the importance school leaders attach to continuous improvement and the willingness of teachers and staff to be actively involved in professional learning programs. Many schools award recognition in the form of certificate, commendations, performance ratings and acknowledgment in meetings, school events. This recognition encourages employees to take part in training, increase their abilities, and apply new knowledge in their professional activities.

Overall, the results show good implementation of internal capacity building initiatives by school leaders to promote teacher and staff professional learning and development. Regular LAC sessions, INSET programs, seminars, mentoring, coaching and Technical Assistance activities enable school leaders to ensure that their school staff has access to the knowledge, skills and competences required to enhance the school operation and the learning process. These efforts also contribute to the enhancement of collaboration,

professional engagement and instructional quality in the school community.

There were differences in responses, however, in some cases suggesting more effort should be made to deeper the level of school assessment and tie the professional development program to ensure the needs are adequately met for all teachers and school staff.

Part III. School Leaders' School Performance in Terms of School-Based Management (SBM)

Table 7

School Leaders' Performance in Leadership and Governance

Indicator	Mean	SD	VI
1. Ensures that mechanisms are in place to develop a shared vision, mission, and goals (VMG) that reflect the aspirations and thrusts of the community.	3.76	0.44	Excellent
2. Periodically revisits and adjusts the school's vision, direction, and aspirations with learning managers, facilitators, and stakeholders to address community conditions and emerging needs.	3.60	0.52	Excellent
3. Encourages stakeholders to actively participate in formulating relevant policies and guidelines through dialogue and consensus-building, including the regular review and updating of community initiatives.	3.71	0.47	Excellent
4. Makes decisions based on credible information sources and processes that align with the community's vision, direction, and aspirations.	3.64	0.50	Excellent
Overall	3.68	0.48	Excellent

Legend: 1.0-1.74 (Poor); 1.75-2.49 (Fair); 2.50-3.24 (Good); 3.25-4.00 (Excellent)

Table 7 indicates that school heads have excellent performance in the Leadership and Governance (L&G) in the School Based Management (SBM). The standard deviation of 0.48 also shows the consistency of respondents' perceptions; the mean is 3.68, which lies between 3.25 and 4.00, this level is in an excellent range that indicates good leadership practices.

The most highly rated indicator is considered to have a mean rating of 3.76: mechanisms to develop a shared vision, mission, and goals (VMG) in line with the aspirations of the community. This means that school leadership values strategic planning and inclusivity as a foundation for school direction which helps to recognize the needs and expectations of students, parents and the community. Achievement of stakeholder responsibility in policy and guideline development (3.71) facilitates such a participation in policy setting and guideline development, and that is to have a consultation, a dialogue, and a consent towards development over the policies and guidelines.

The governance of school heads, backed by credible information, in line with the community vision (3.64), helps demonstrate that school heads are making sound and rational decisions that consider situations they face. The vision and direction of the school, combined with the learning managers, facilitators and stakeholders, 3.60, as well as the educational venture of Mizova et al. (2026), are an expression of the school's adaptation when facing change in the needs of the community by revisiting and updating its vision and direction

of the school.

In all, the evidence suggests that the school leaders and governors are competent leaders; they set shared goals, consult with numerous stakeholders in decision making, and use evidence to make decisions, and respond to changing circumstances. These practices can contribute to the development of a strong SBM framework that engages everyone in leadership, holds everyone accountable, and is consistent with school and community objectives.

Table 8

School Leaders' Performance in Curriculum and Instruction

Indicator	Mean	SD	VI
1. Ensures that the curriculum is consistent with national standards.	3.72	0.47	Excellent
2. Implements a school-based monitoring system of learning and shares the results with stakeholders.	3.70	0.49	Excellent
3. Continuously reviews and improves appropriate assessment tools, and contextualizes assessment results to the learner's needs, local situations, and attainment of relevant life skills.	3.66	0.49	Excellent
4. Equips learners with essential knowledge, skills, and values to develop responsibility and accountability for their own learning.	3.69	0.49	Excellent
Overall	3.69	0.48	Excellent

Legend: 1.0-1.74 (Poor); 1.75-2.49 (Fair); 2.50-3.24 (Good); 3.25-4.00 (Excellent)

It was seen in the result of the table 8 that the school heads achieved a very high score in Curriculum and Instruction in the School Based Management (SBM) framework. The overall mean is 3.69 with the Standard Deviation of 0.48, which is placed between Excellent (3.25 to 4.00). It means that the responses were consistent on the effectiveness of school heads in managing curriculum implementation and instruction. In the real school environment, this involves the Head of School actively monitoring the teaching and learning process through the checking of lesson plans, review of Daily Lesson Logs (DLL), classroom observation, provision of Technical Assistance to teachers to facilitate quality teaching and learning in order to meet the standards set by the Department of Education.

The best performing indicator, with an overall mean of 3.72, is that 'The curriculum is in line with the national standards'. This reflects that the school leaders give attention to the execution of the institutionalized curriculum and that classroom practices are relevant to the Most Essential Learning Competencies (MELCs) and DepEd's requirements. In real life, the school heads use the planning, teaching and learning patterns regularly to overcome problems and verify that the plan, the teaching and learning method, and the assessment. Classroom observations and post observation conferences are also used to give teachers Technical Assistance and recommendations to enhance classroom management and instruction.

Complementing this is the active involvement of school leaders in the performance monitoring of learners and instructional effectiveness through use of school-based monitoring systems with a mean score of 3.70, which is signalled in the sharing of the results with stakeholders. Many school leaders adopt the strategy of using their classroom observations, assessment information, and teacher monitoring of performance to identify strengths and areas for development, in their schools. Teacher support through Technical Assistance sessions and mentoring as well as LAC of teachers is often offered to enhance student engagement, assessment

techniques, and teaching strategies. The mean of the revised and improved tools (3.66) also demonstrates that school leaders ensure assessment tools are responsive to learner needs and consistent with the goals of the curriculum.

As a whole, the results showed that school heads are very effective in doing curriculum and instruction in the SBM. By participating in checking lesson plans, conducting classroom observations, monitoring lessons and technical assistance are all examples of their active involvement in maintaining learner centered and standards-based lessons. The school leaders also foster holistic development of the learner by fostering student accountability, responsibility and meaningful learning experiences. They are practices that help to enhance teaching quality, bolster teaching supervision and improve learning, in line with Constantinides and Eleftheriadou (2023).

Table 9*School Leaders' Performance in Accountability and Continuous Improvement*

Legend: 1.0-1.74 (Poor); 1.75-2.49 (Fair); 2.50-3.24 (Good); 3.25-4.00 (Excellent)

Indicator	Mean	SD	VI
1. Ensures that the roles and responsibilities of accountable persons and collective bodies are clearly defined and agreed upon by community stakeholders.	3.72	0.47	Excellent
2. Recognizes achievement of goals based on a collaboratively developed performance accountability system that addresses gaps through appropriate action.	3.67	0.49	Excellent
3. Continuously enhances the community-owned accountability system to ensure that management structures and mechanisms are responsive to emerging learning needs and demands.	3.70	0.48	Excellent
4. Conducts participatory assessment of performance regularly with the community, using results and lessons learned as the basis for feedback, technical assistance, recognition, and plan adjustment.	3.63	0.50	Excellent
Overall	3.68	0.49	Excellent

The table 9 reveals that the Accountability and Continuous Improvement on School Based Management (SBM) model has extremely high performance of the school head. The average 3.68 is within the range 3.25-4.00 and is considered to be Excellent. The respondents have a common opinion about school heads' effectiveness in promoting accountability and continuous school improvement, with a standard deviation of 0.49, thus consistent with Sison and Fuentes (2025).

The indicator with the best rating (mean value of 3.72) concerns the community's stakeholders' perception that the roles and responsibilities of accountable individuals and collective groups are expressed and accepted within the community.

This implies that school heads provide clarity in management, leaving staff and community members with an understanding of their roles and enabling them to play an effective role in running a school. The continuous development of the community owned accountability system (3.70) also indicates that leaders are not simply reactive as they strive to strengthen the school to deliver the learning environment that fits the needs

as they arise, echoing the findings of Beyioku et al (2026).

Goal in achieved with collaborative accountability system (3.67), suggests school head understand and value measurable goal achievements and will make good use of accountability systems to close the gap in an appropriate fashion. A periodic participation assessment with the community (3.63) might be viewed as having positive implications for feedback and technical assistance and the ability to adapt plans according to performance results. This means that accountability is an ongoing process of learning and improvement and will not be a one report tool.

Overall, the findings suggest that school leaders are successful in creating a culture of responsibility and continuous improvement. Those practices communicate clear expectations, involve active participation of the community, enable performance monitoring and adjustment of services to new needs, and ensure the creation of a system where school operations are clear, outcome driven and continuously developed to improve learning outcomes.

Table 10

School Leaders' Performance in the Management of Resources

Indicator	Mean	SD	VI
1. Undertakes regular resource inventory in collaboration with learning managers, facilitators, and community stakeholders as a basis for resource allocation and mobilization.	3.70	0.48	Excellent
2. Conducts regular, inclusive dialogues for planning and resource programming to continuously engage stakeholders and support the implementation of community education plans.	3.64	0.50	Excellent
3. Collaboratively develops and implements monitoring, evaluation, and reporting processes for effective resource management.	3.68	0.49	Excellent
4. Establishes and maintains a system that manages networks and linkages to strengthen and sustain partnerships for improving resource management.	3.67	0.49	Excellent
Overall	3.67	0.49	Excellent

Legend: 1.0-1.74 (Poor); 1.75-2.49 (Fair); 2.50-3.24 (Good); 3.25-4.00 (Excellent)

As observed from Table 10, the performance of school heads under the School Based Management (SBM) framework is very good in regard to resource management. The overall mean of 3.67 suggests that a school's overall effectiveness of resource management practices is equally enclosed in the range of 3.25 – 4.00 (considered Excellent), and the standard deviation of 0.49 suggests that most students have consistent views on the effectiveness of the schools' resource management. In the operational school, this involves the heads of the school who are actively involved in monitoring, deployment and management of school resources made in appropriate inventory systems, utilizing MOOE, coordinating with stakeholder(s) and implementing school improvement programs in order to utilize school resources effectively and efficiently.

The highest rated indicator (with a mean score of 3.70) is the regular performance of SRM together with learning managers, facilitators and community stakeholders. It shows the schools' heads engaging in the practice of monitoring classrooms, school inputs, school facilities, equipment and other resources to assess need and priorities within the school. To see how items are being stocked, damaged, or running low, inventory is

taken in several schools before and after every school year. School heads also liaise with teachers, property custodian, LGUs and stakeholders to determine the need for replacement or extra support of resources. One effective practice that schools can build upon is maintaining inventory and digital monitoring systems on a regular basis to ensure resources are accurately accounted for and reduced delays in distributing resources.

The development and implementation of monitoring and evaluation and reporting systems (3.68) suggest that accountability and appropriate documentation of school resource management is in practice. Financial Reports, Liquidation Reports, plans for procurement, and utilization reports are common in schools to be used for tracking the amount of money being spent on MOOE, and donated materials utilized. Another aspect capturing the heads' establishment of links and partnership with various stakeholders, such as LGUs, private organizations, parents, and community stakeholders, and therefore to access extra resources and support for school programs, was the government's creation of systems that support linkages and partnerships, at an average of 3.67. In response to intervention, regular consultation meetings and partnership programs; regular school-community projects which foster ongoing support of infrastructure, learning materials and student programs.

Also, the results indicated that planning and programming of resources through inclusive discussions achieved a mean of 3.64, which means that school heads involve stakeholders in decision making in planning and programming resources and school priorities. School improvement planning, discussions about the budget, and proposals for projects are often done through consultation with teachers, parents, the School Governing Councils (SGC) and community partners in order to ensure that resources meet the real needs of this school. The overall results show that the school leaders are able to utilize school resources effectively, both through systematic inventory, monitoring, reporting and collaboration with stakeholders. Improving the management of school resources at school, however, can be further improved as suggested by Hermogenes and Paglinawan (2024): strengthening inventory systems, enhancing transparency in financial reporting, expanding relationship with external stakeholders, and continuous training of the school resources management to ensure school development and achievement of education goals is sustainable.

IV. Significant Difference in the School Leaders' Strategic Partnership when grouped according to Designation.

Table 11

Significant differences in school leaders' strategic partnerships across designations

School Leader's Strategic Partnership Practices	Group	Mean	SD	F	Sig.
Stakeholder Engagement	T1-T3	3.69	0.39	1.391	0.250
	T4-T6	3.73	0.29		
	MT1-MT3	3.78	0.30		
Resource Mobilization	T1-T3	3.68	0.50	1.319	0.268
	T4-T6	3.66	0.34		
	MT1-MT3	3.8	0.30		
Policy Alignment	T1-T3	3.7	0.52	0.48	0.619

	T4-T6	3.71	0.30		
	MT1-MT3	3.78	0.35		
Communication and Transparency	T1-T3	3.68	0.41		
	T4-T6	3.67	0.32	1.288	0.277
	MT1-MT3	3.78	0.35		
Capacity Building Initiatives	T1-T3	3.68	0.46		
	T4-T6	3.7	0.45	0.836	0.434
	MT1-MT3	3.78	0.32		

Note: $Df=2.444$, Significant if $p<0.05$

The results of the One-Way ANOVA showed no significant differences that would attribute school leaders' perceptions of strategic partnership practices based on the student's designation (T1 = T3, T4 = T6, and MT1 = MT3) (see Table 11). All of the p values returned by the statistical analysis are greater than 0.05 indicating that there are no significant differences between the group.

The scores of the respondents in MT1-MT3 were slightly better than that of MT4-MT6 and T1-T3 schools when the average scores were compared. For instance, the mean ratings for T1-T3, T4-T6 and MT1-MT3 were 3.69, 3.73 and 3.78 on the Stakeholder Engagement (S), respectively. These are similar observations across the Resource Mobilization, Communication and Transparency, Policy Alignment and Capacity Building Initiatives. Although bringing some minor differences, the reported test values and/or level of significance suggest that the difference is not statistically significant, similar to that indicated by Torres et al. (2025).

Overall, the responses indicate that the view of school leaders' performance in strategic cooperation practices is quite comparable between all the responding organizations regardless of their nomination. The stakeholders agree that school leaders excel at stakeholder outreach, mobilization and policy alignment, transparent communication, and pro-capability building. Generally, the findings show consensus of what works well in relation to effective leadership which suggests an assessment in relation to school leaders in the groups.

A comparison of the strategic practices of school leaders within each of the rank groupings (T1–T3; T4–T6; and MT1–MT3) shows that there are no significant differences, suggesting that teachers at each rank generally have the same view of the practices involved in planning, implementing, and sustaining strategic partnerships. This outcome can be explained by the uniformity of partnership experiences and practices in DepEd's School Based Management (SBM) and Partnership Guidelines, which includes participation of stakeholders, resource mobilization, policy synchronization, communication and transparency, and partnership capacity building.

As school wide systems, not as designation specific experiences. Partnership activities are generally institutional activities planned and coordinated through the school's head and committees; therefore, teachers of all designations will participate in similar processes (consultations, school programs/projects, partnership reporting, and how stakeholders are recognized), and this may lead to joint interpretations within groups.

Furthermore, designation does not necessarily mean increased engagement in external linkages, since other roles, such as career advancement, teaching duties, and mentoring tend to correlate with designation as opposed to formal partnership responsibilities. In reality, a teacher in a lower rank might be given a committee assignment related to partnerships; or a master teacher might dedicate more time to instructional coaching; thus, partnerships may be assigned at various designations. The consistently high mean ratings in previous tables also point towards possible ceiling effect, or higher ratings of responses being more likely to be part of the "very great extent" range, creating less variation and making it more difficult to identify the significance of differences

between groups. Another possible reason for the minimal differences by designation is that the school leaders' practices (a common target) may be the same, or responses may be comparing the same system when evaluating school-wide partnerships. These conditions all may account for the lack of significant differences as reported by the ANOVA results, even in the face of small differences between group means.

The data in Table 12 shows no significant variation in the perceived state of school leaders' strategic partnership practices across years of service. In all, the p-values (Sig.) are greater than 0.05.

As far as the means of the ratings are concerned, the differences between the categories of years of service are slight. In the case of Stakeholder Engagement, the ranges are 3.68 (6-10 years) and 3.72 (21 years and above). The ratings in Resource Mobilization range from 3.65 to 3.74 on average, and the same trend is observed in Policy Alignment, Communication and Transparency, and Capacity Building Initiatives.

Table 12

Significant differences in school leaders' strategic partnerships across Years of Service.

School Leader's Strategic Partnership Practices	Group	Mean	SD	F	Sig.
Stakeholder Engagement	21 years and above	3.72	0.36	0.115	0.977
	16-20 years	3.71	0.35		
	11-15 years	3.71	0.35		
	6-10 years	3.68	0.45		
	1-5 years	3.69	0.35		
Resource Mobilization	21 years and above	3.65	0.40	0.496	0.739
	16-20 years	3.74	0.67		
	11-15 years	3.68	0.38		
	6-10 years	3.65	0.45		
	1-5 years	3.69	0.36		
Policy Alignment	21 years and above	3.73	0.49	0.28	0.891
	16-20 years	3.7	0.35		
	11-15 years	3.71	0.36		
	6-10 years	3.67	0.46		
	1-5 years	3.73	0.68		
Communication and Transparency	21 years and above	3.65	0.39	0.291	0.884
	16-20 years	3.69	0.38		
	11-15 years	3.67	0.38		
	6-10 years	3.68	0.47		
	1-5 years	3.72	0.35		
Capacity Building Initiatives	21 years and above	3.69	0.37	0.208	0.934
	16-20 years	3.7	0.38		
	11-15 years	3.67	0.39		
	6-10 years	3.7	0.62		
	1-5 years	3.72	0.35		

Note: Df=2.441, Significant if $p < 0.05$

Such numerical variations are small and insignificant. This shows that, regardless of how long school leaders have been serving, the respondents view their performance as consistent in strategic partnership practices, which aligns with the findings of Moore et al. (2024). School leaders are credited with engaging effectively with stakeholders, mobilizing resources, aligning policies, communicating transparently, and positioning capacity-creating programs across their experience levels. All in all, the results indicate the common sense that excellent leadership performance does not depend on leaders' years of service.

School leaders' strategic partnership practices may not vary with years of service because partnership work in schools is largely system-driven and standards-based rather than purely experience-dependent. Under School-Based Management (SBM), leaders are expected to implement common processes for stakeholder engagement, resource mobilization, policy compliance, transparency, and capacity building; these practices are routinized through school plans, committees, and required documentation, which tends to equalize implementation regardless of tenure (Department of Education, 2012). In addition, partnership activities often involve the same school-wide stakeholders and structures (e.g., PTA, LGU, NGOs), so teachers across groups observe similar leadership behaviors. This pattern is consistent with partnership frameworks that emphasize shared responsibility among schools, families, and communities rather than on leader seniority alone (Epstein et al., 2001).

Table 13

Significant difference in the performance when grouped according to designation

Performance	Group	Mean	SD	F	Sig.
Leadership and Governance	T1-T3	3.67	0.42	0.064	0.938
	T4-T6	0.33	0.04		
	MT1-MT3	0.38	0.06		
Curriculum and Instruction	T1-T3	3.68	0.43	0.4372	0.646
	T4-T6	0.34	0.04		
	MT1-MT3	0.39	0.06		
Accountability and Continuous Improvement	T1-T3	3.66	0.44	1.5026	0.224
	T4-T6	0.34	0.04		
	MT1-MT3	0.38	0.06		
Management of Resources	T1-T3	3.65	0.44	1.6908	0.186
	T4-T6	0.32	0.04		
	MT1-MT3	0.39	0.06		

Note: Df=2.441, Significant if $p < 0.05$

The results from Table 13 indicate that there is no significant difference between the perceived performance of school heads, analyzed based on the designations (T1, T3, T4, T6 and MT1, MT3). The p-values of all of School Based Management (SBM) areas (Leadership and Governance, Curriculum and Instruction, Accountability and Continuous Improvements, and Management of Resources) were higher than 0.05 as may be seen by the p-values which range from 0.186 to 0.938. This implies that the variations in the means of the designations are not significant.

The means of the respondents for the group (T1-T3) showed that generally the average performance

was between 3.65–3.68 across the four areas of performance. The differences between the T4, T6, MT1 and MT3 groups are very minor but do not appear to be significant. For example, in Leadership and Governance, the mean is 3.67 for T1–T3, 0.33 for T4–T6, and 0.38 for MT1–MT3. The other minor variations are observed in the Curriculum and Instruction, Accountability and Continuous Improvement and Management of Resources which was as supported by the study conducted by Zafeer et al. (2024).

The findings presented here would suggest that it is not the case that all designations have the same perception for school heads. Opinions differ depending on their roles, with those in T1-T3 roles having more or less consensus that school leaders are effective in leading and governing the school, managing curriculum and teaching, ensuring accountability and properly managing resources, as compared to those in T4-T6 positions or in a school leadership role (MT1 or MT3). On balance, it appears that designation is not an influence on school heads' perceived. Overall, it would appear that designation has nothing to do with how school heads are perceived.

Table 14

Significant difference in the performance when grouped according to years of service

Performance	Group	Mean	SD	F	Sig.
Leadership and Governance	21 years and above	3.62	0.37	0.635	0.638
	16-20 years	3.70	0.39		
	11-15 years	3.68	0.41		
	6-10 years	3.67	0.47		
	1-5 years	3.71	0.37		
Curriculum and Instruction	21 years and above	3.68	0.37	0.025	0.999
	16-20 years	3.70	0.40		
	11-15 years	3.69	0.42		
	6-10 years	3.68	0.48		
	1-5 years	3.69	0.38		
Accountability and Continuous Improvement	21 years and above	3.68	0.40	0.119	0.976
	16-20 years	3.66	0.41		
	11-15 years	3.70	0.42		
	6-10 years	3.69	0.47		
	1-5 years	3.67	0.39		
Management of Resources	21 years and above	3.66	0.40	0.226	0.924
	16-20 years	3.65	0.41		
	11-15 years	3.70	0.40		
	6-10 years	3.68	0.48		
	1-5 years	3.67	0.41		

Note: Df=2.441, Significant if $p < 0.05$

Table 14 shows no significant differences among school head's years of service regarding their perceived performance. Leadership and Governance, Curriculum and Instruction, Accountability and Continuous Improvement and Management of Resources are variables with a p-value of 0.05 or higher, with Leadership and Governance having a p-value of 0.638 and Accountability and Continuous Improvement having a p-value of 0.999. This shows that there is no significant difference in years of service for the respondent's perception of the performance of school heads, as done by Verano et al., (2024).

Viewing the group means, the rating is quite similar in all the years-of-service groups. For instance, in

Leadership and Governance, the mean scores are 3.62 for Cool Age category (21 years above) and 3.71 for Cool Age (1-5 years). In the area of Curriculum and Instruction, the scores are ranging from 3.68 to 3.70 while in Accountability and Continuous Improvement and Management of Resources, the same rate is observed. We cannot see difference in the groups and it is not large enough to count.

This suggests that regardless of the years that school heads have served and worked for, the respondents believe that there is no significant difference among them (Petalcorin & Tan, 2026). The school leadership seem to be effective in school leadership, curriculum management, instruction management, accountability and resource management. Overall, there was minimal difference between the perceptions of school heads' performance in the two groups based on years of service, suggesting that experience does not seem to vary perceptions of school heads' effectiveness.

The results of the One Ways ANOVA conducted revealed that there was no significant difference in students' perception of the performance of school leaders on the schools based on the factors of School Size (Small, Medium, Large) for all other factors except Curriculum and Instruction. In the instance of Leadership and Governance, Accountability and Continuous Improvement and Management of Resources, the values of p obtained are 0.138, 0.119 and 0.168 respectively which means that the difference in school size does not have a critical role in influencing the views of the responses with regards to the theories in these areas in relation to the performance of the school leaders in the respective areas.

In the area of Curriculum and Instruction however, the p-value is 0.003 which is less than the 5% threshold; that means that there are significant differences in perceived performance related to school size.

Table 15

Significant difference in the school leaders' performance when grouped according to the respondents' school size

School Leader's Performance	Group	Mean	SD	F	Sig.
Leadership and Governance	Mega Large	3.69	.37	1.92	.138
	Large	3.67	.45		
	Medium	3.63	.41		
	Small	3.88	.31		
Curriculum and Instruction	Mega Large	3.71	.37	5.2	.003
	Large	3.65	.47		
	Medium	3.69	.42		
	Small	3.92	.20		
Accountability and Continuous Improvement	Mega Large	3.68	.38	2.04	.119
	Large	3.65	.47		
	Medium	3.70	.43		
	Small	3.85	.25		
Management of Resources	Mega Large	3.71	.38	1.75	.168

Large	3.64	.47
Medium	3.62	.44
Small	3.81	.32

Note: Df=3.443, Significant if $p < 0.05$

In the area of Curriculum and Instruction however, the p-value is 0.003 which is less than the 5% threshold; that means that there are significant differences in perceived performance related to school size. The average of the group shows that respondents of small schools rated the school leaders' class highest (3.92), medium schools second (3.69), mega-large schools third (3.71) and large schools last (3.65). This suggests that principals of smaller schools are seen as more efficient than principals of larger schools at curriculum/teaching management, which was the conclusion of Casilla (2025).

The overall pattern of results indicates that school size hasn't had a significant impact on most domains of school leaders' activities. This exception in Curriculum and Instruction implies that the leaders in smaller schools have more time for teaching, learning and observe curriculum in practice closely, and are found to be more responsive towards students' needs. Overall, school leaders' effectiveness is rated as strong across all schools, as is their work with the curriculum, which is dependent on their size. School strategic partnership practices regarding curriculum and instructional issues can vary based on school size due to a number of factors: size influences instructional needs which can be served through partnerships and size influences capacity which may vary.

The context and size of larger schools as characterized by greater numbers of personnel, students and variety of learning needs often demand greater coordination with external stakeholders (e.g., LGUs, NGOs, HEIs, private partners) for teacher professional development, remediation programs, learning resources and enrichment activities. They may also be more visible and have more leverage, as a result of which it may be easier to recruit partner organizations and maintain programs consistent with instructional improvements. Alternatively, smaller schools may have better internal relations, but less time to dedicate to partnerships, less external opportunities, and less curriculum/ instructional support from partnerships. This highlights the role that organizational context and assets play in both what it means to be a good leader and how to drive school growth (Louis et al., 2010; Bryk et al., 2010; Valli, Stefanski, & Jacobson, 2014; Epstein et al., 2001) and that leadership and cross-boundary coordination are increasingly necessary to drive effective school/community partnerships, particularly as schools scale (Epstein et al., 2002).

VI. Test of Significant Relationship between the School Leaders' Strategic Partnership Practices and their School Leaders' Performance.

Table 16

Significant relationship between the school leaders' strategic partnership practices and their school leaders' performance

Strategic Partnership	Leadership and Governance	Curriculum and Instruction	Accountability and Continuous Improvement	Management of Resources
Stakeholder Engagement	0.686***	0.651***	0.679***	0.677***
Resource Mobilization	0.619***	0.577***	0.588***	0.607***
Policy alignment	0.588***	0.592***	0.592***	0.571***
Communication and Transparency	0.713***	0.762***	0.769***	0.760***
Capacity Building Initiatives	0.688***	0.699***	0.675***	0.690***

Table 16 presents the results that indicate the strategic partnership practices of school leaders is significantly and positively related to the practice accomplishment of School Based Management (SBM) in each area of the practices. The values of all correlation coefficients are positive and are statistically significant at 0.001 ($p < .001$), meaning that there are strong and meaningful relationships between the variables.

With the effective practices of the school leaders in stakeholder engagement, resource mobilization, policy alignment, communication and transparency, and capacity building initiatives, the school's leadership and governance, curriculum and instruction, accountability and continuous improvement, and resource management also is good. In the real school environment, it means deepening collaboration and strengthened partnerships will positively impact school operation, instructional management, and schools' overall performance.

Leadership and Governance (0.686), Curriculum and Instruction (0.651), Accountability and Continuous Improvement (0.679), and Management of Resources (0.677) moderately and positively correlated with the stakeholder engagement. These results suggest that with active participation of parents and other key stakeholders such as teachers, LGUs, alumni, and community members in the school activities and decision making, the school management practices become more efficient. Stakeholder participation during Brigada Eskwela, School Improvement Planning (SIP), feeding programs, and school projects also lead to better school facilities, learner support provision and program implementation in many schools. Teachers and stakeholders feel more cooperativeness when you feel that they are part of the school's decisions process; better coordination and greater support in terms of the school's goals. The results of the second order correlation analysis showed that resource mobilization exhibited a positive correlation with r values ranging from 0.577 to 0.619 that is similar to the results found by Arnold et al. (2021). This is representative of cases in which, with the help and support of the correct utilization of MOOE, donations from the LGUs and external support, learning materials, school facilities and education support are lacking, thereby enhancing the performance of the school.

Stable positive relationships were likewise found in Policy alignment with correlation scores from 0.571 to 0.592. This means that the education system is achieving better outcomes when school leaders are consistently working to link programs, partnerships, and activities with the policies and goals of the DepEd. School heads report the compliance of the DepEd Memoranda, as well as the verification of lesson plans and school reports through regular visits, and the verification of compliance requirement of school activities under

the law and policy. Open communication (0.713 – 0.769) and transparency of leadership (0.726 – 0.769) gave the strongest correlation, indicating that open communication and transparency of leadership go hand-in-hand in enhancing school performance. There are a number of cases in schools where regular consultations and staff meetings, financial reporting, transparency boards, and consultation with teachers and stakeholders contribute to trust and cooperation in the school community. When the heads-of-school have clearly communicated plans, school performance data and the use of resources, the teachers and stakeholders are more supportive and actively involved in school programs. This boosts accountability systems, enhances instructional coordination, and enhances the certainty of school leadership, as suggested by Bryk & Schneider (2002), Bryk (2010) and Epstein (2011).

The significant positive correlations from 0.675 to 0.699 were found for capacity building activities, meaning that professional development activities also have an impact on school performance. The regular LAC sessions, In-Service Training (INSET), mentoring, classroom observations and Technical Assistance programs are effective and supportive tools for teachers in actual school settings to enhance their classroom management, instructional practices, and assessment. The quality of teaching and learning enhances, learner performance improves and school operation is more effective when teachers are continuously assisted and trained. The results indicate a general connection between strategic partnership practices and effective school leadership and successful implementation of SBM. As de la Vega and Leiva-Guerrero (2026) argue, communication, stakeholder engagement, policy implementation, resource management and ongoing professional development at schools is likely to lead to good governance, quality teaching, robust accountability and sustainable school improvement.

The significant, strong positive correlations between school leaders' strategic partnership practices in communication and transparency and their performance in leadership and governance ($r = .713$), curriculum and instruction ($r = .762$), accountability and continuous improvement ($r = .769$), and management of resources ($r = .760$) at $p < .01$ imply that when leaders communicate clearly, share information openly, and practice transparent decision-making, their overall SBM performance tends to be higher across domains. In simple terms, communication and transparency build relational trust and shared understanding among teachers and stakeholders, thereby strengthening cooperation, supporting instructional monitoring and feedback, improving accountability through clearer roles and reporting, and increasing confidence in how resources are planned and used—key conditions for effective school improvement. This is consistent with research showing that trust and strong school–community ties enable coordinated improvement efforts (Bryk & Schneider, 2002; Bryk, 2010), and with partnership frameworks that emphasize communication as a core mechanism for engaging families and communities in school goals (Epstein, 2001).

Overall, the findings suggest that communication and transparency are strongly linked to better school performance. When school leaders consistently share clear information, invite feedback, and make decisions openly, stakeholders develop greater trust and are more willing to participate and cooperate. This supportive environment helps leaders implement instructional priorities more effectively, strengthen accountability systems through regular reporting and shared responsibilities, and manage resources with greater credibility and stakeholder support. In other words, open communication is not only a partnership practice but also a key condition that enables stronger leadership and governance, improved curriculum and instruction, continuous improvement, and responsible resource management.

5. Conclusions

In relation with the above-mentioned findings, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. There is no significant difference in the strategic partnership practices of school leaders when grouped according to the respondents' demographic profile. Therefore, the null hypothesis is supported.
2. There is no significant difference in the school leaders' performance when grouped according to designation and size of the school thus, the null hypothesis is partially supported.
3. There is a significant relationship between school leaders' strategic partnership practices and school performance. The null hypothesis is not supported.

References

- Aivalli, P., Dada, S., Gilmore, B., Srinivas, P. N., & De Brún, A. (2025). Power dynamics and intersectoral collaboration for health in low- and middle-income countries: A realist review. *Health Policy and Planning*, 40(6), 661–683. <https://doi.org/10.1093/heapol/czaf022>
- Alqarni, S. (2021). School governance and effectiveness: The interplay of leadership, Alqarni, S. (2021). School governance and effectiveness: The interplay of leadership, teacher collaboration, and accountability in educational reform. *Educational Research for Policy and Practice*, 20(3), 289–308. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10671-020-09279-4>
- Aldenmyr, S. I., Gradén, M., & Håkansson, J. (2025). Teacher leaders' capacity for school development. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2025.2512409>
- Alvarez, J. M. P., Mempin, R. C., Morales, R. J. G., & Ocampo, A. A. (2023). School management system and governance of elementary school heads as perceived by the school community. *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.22161/ijels.83.18>
- Alzouebi, K., Al Hammadi, D. Y., Ankit, A., & Abu Khurma, O. (2025). School innovation: Building a culture through leadership and stakeholder engagement. *Societies*, 15(4), 77. <https://doi.org/10.3390/soc15040077>
- Anyanwu, J. A., Thompson, C. C., & Mbonu, V. C. (2025). Stakeholder engagement in educational management and leadership for the implementation of core curriculum academic minimum standards in tertiary institutions in Nigeria. *Nnamdi Azikiwe University*. <https://file:///C:/Users/FonzyAaliyah/Downloads/613-Article%20Text-1251-1-10-20250224.pdf>
- Aquino, C. J. C., Afalla, B. T., & Fabelico, F. L. (2021). Managing educational institutions: School heads' leadership practices and teachers' performance. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 10(4), 1325–1333. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v10i4.21518>
- Arnold, T., Kleve, H., & Pieper, T. (2024). *Systems theory*. In *Handbook of theories in family business* (Chapter 108). Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781800888722.ch108>
- Aryani, R., & Haryadi, R. (2023). Principals' implementation of collaborative leadership to improve learning quality. *EduFisika: Jurnal Pendidikan Fisika*, 8(1), 6–15. <https://doi.org/10.5> Part III. SCHOOL LEADERS' SCHOOL PERFORMANCE IN TERMS OF SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT

(SBM) 9052/edufisika.v8i1.24602

- Ba, Y., Nair, S., & Kedia, M. (2024). Cross-sector collaboration, nonprofit readiness, and sustainability transitions. *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*, 53, 100933. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eist.2024.100933>
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Sage.
- Batiibwe, M. (2019). Using cultural-historical activity theory to understand how emerging technologies can mediate teaching and learning in a mathematics classroom: A literature review. *Research and Practice in Technology Enhanced Learning*, 14, 12. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41039-019-01110>
- Beyioku, J. B., Makinde, O. B., & Dairo, T. S. (2026). Stakeholder engagement and school-community relationships in educational management. *Zenodo*. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18721501>
- Bhandari, P. (2021). Correlational research: When and how to use. *Scribbr*. <https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/correlational-research/>
- Bryk, A. S., Sebring, P. B., Allensworth, E., Luppescu, S., & Easton, J. Q. (2010). *Organizing schools for improvement: Lessons from Chicago*. University of Chicago Press.
- Cagatan, A., & Quirap, E. (2024). Collaborative learning and learners' academic performance. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis*, 7(3). <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijmra/v7-i03-57>
- Campoli, A. K., Darling-Hammond, L., & Melnick, H. (2022). *Principal learning opportunities and school improvement: How leadership preparation and development support student outcomes*. Learning Policy Institute.
- Carvalho, M., Cabral, I., Verdasca, J., & Alves, J. (2021). Strategy and strategic leadership in education: A scoping review. *Frontiers in Education*, 6, 706608. <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/feduc.2021.706608/full>
- Casilla, A. P. (2025). Strengths of school-based management: A thematic study of leadership and stakeholder engagement in Level 3 schools. *International Journal of Research in Innovation and Social Science*, 12(2). <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.91200236>
- Chandratreya, A. (2024). *Partnering with families and local communities: Enhancing the learning environment*. [Unpublished manuscript].
- Chater, N., Zeitoun, H., & Melkonyan, T. (2022). The paradox of social interaction: Shared intentionality, we-reasoning, and virtual bargaining. *Psychological Review*, 129(3), 415–437. <https://doi.org/10.1037/rev0000343>
- Chrislip, D. D., & Larson, C. E. (1994). *Collaborative leadership: How citizens and civic leaders can make a difference*. Jossey-Bass.
- Cojorn, K., & Sonsupap, K. (2024). A collaborative professional development and its impact on teachers' ability to foster higher order thinking. *Journal of Education and Learning (EduLearn)*, 18(2), 561–569. <https://doi.org/10.11591/edulearn.v18i2.21182>
- Comighud, S. M., & Writes, S. (2021). Goal setting, monitoring and feedbacking practices as performance management mechanisms. *ResearchGate*. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.26781.84965>
- Constantinides, M., & Eleftheriadou, S. (2023). The role of leadership in communities of

- learning | Kāhui Ako: A systematic literature review. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 58, 341–359. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40841-023-00295-2>
- Cornico, G. (2025). Corporate social responsibility implementation of private lending institutions and its correlation with the academic performance of public elementary schools. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 3, 384. <https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2025.384>
- Daly, B. P., Resnikoff, A., & Litke, S. (2025). Effective school leadership for supporting students' mental health: Findings from a narrative literature review. *Behavioral Sciences*, 15(1), 36. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs15010036>
- Davis, J., & Thomas, A. T. (2022). Transformational leadership theory: A critical analysis with reference to banking sector. *Webology*, 19(1), 1735–188. <https://doi.org/10.14704/WEB/V19I1/XYZ>
- Day, C., Gu, Q., & Sammons, P. (2016). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: A systematic review of the international evidence. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 30(3), 107–130. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-03-2015-0020>
- de Jong, L., Meirink, J., & Admiraal, W. (2022). School-based collaboration as a learning context for teachers: A systematic review. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 112, 101927. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2022.101927>
- DeAngelis, C. A., & Presley, J. B. (2011). The role of school governance in the effectiveness of urban schools. *Urban Education*, 46(3), 540–563. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085911401756>
- Dederig, K., & Pietsch, M. (2025). School leader trust and collective teacher innovativeness: On individual and organisational ambidexterity's mediating role. *Educational Review*, 77(2), 351–380. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2023.2195593>
- De la Vega, L. F., & Leiva-Guerrero, M. V. (2026). Systemic leadership and educational equity: A review of proposals from international organizations. *Education Sciences*, 16(2), 251. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci16020251>
- Department of Education. (2012, November 29). *DO 83, s. 2012: Implementing guidelines on the revised School-Based Management (SBM) framework, assessment process and tool (APAT)*. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2012/11/29/do-83-s-2012-implementing-guidelines-on-the-revised-school-based-management-sbm-framework-assessment-process-and-tool-apat/>
- Department of Education. (2022). *Adoption of the basic education development plan 2030*. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/DO_s2022_024.pdf
- Department of Education. (2024). *DO s. 2024 no. 7 [PDF]*. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/DO_s2024_007.pdf
- Deysolong, J. (2023). The crucial role of parent involvement in the learning process of students. *International Journal of Value-Based Management*. <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.22999787>
- Eden, C., Onyebuchi, N., & Adeniyi, I. (2024). Parent and community involvement in education: Strengthening partnerships for social improvement. *International Journal of Applied Research in Social Sciences*, 6(3), 372–382. <https://doi.org/10.51594/ijarss.v6i3.894>
- Enad, F. (2025). School governance in complex contexts: A systems-informed framework for public school leadership. *Research Square*. <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-7167559/v1>

- Endo, S., Busari, A. H., & Abang Ibrahim, D. K. (2025). Exploring the relationship between strategic planning and educational performance: A systematic literature review. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 14(2), 926. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v14i2.31810>
- Ermita, L., & Baysa, M. L. (2025). Transformational leadership practices of school heads: Teachers' motivation and school performance. *Journal of Innovative Practices*, 3(3). <https://doi.org/10.60132/jip.v3i3.499>
- Epstein, J. L. (2001). *School, family, and community partnerships: Preparing educators and improving schools*. Westview Press.
- Evertson, D. (2020). *The influence of principal leadership on teacher collaboration: Does effective professional development mediate this effect?* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska]. DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska–Lincoln. <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1328&context=cehsedaddiss>
- Ewulley, F., Anlimachie, M. A., Abreh, M. K., & Mills, E. E. (2023). Understanding the nexus of school types, school cultures and educational outcomes and its implication for policy and practice. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 121, 102237. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2023.102237>
- Garet, M. S., Mitrano, S., Eisner, R., Kochanek, J. R., Jones, K. T., Ibis, M., & Estrada, S. (2021, August). *Continuous improvement in education settings: A literature review*. American Institutes for Research. <https://www.air.org/sites/default/files/2022-03/Continuous-Improvement-in-Education-Settings-A-Literature-Review-August-2021.pdf>
- Gower, G., Ferguson, C., & Forrest, S. (2020). Building effective school–community partnerships in Aboriginal remote school settings. *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education*, 50(2), 359–367. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jie.2020.11>
- Grissom, J. A., Egalite, A. J., & Lindsay, C. A. (2021). *How principals affect students and schools: A systematic synthesis of two decades of research*. The Wallace Foundation. <https://doi.org/10.59656/EL-SB1065.001>
- Grissom, J. A., Egalite, A. J., & Lindsay, C. A. (2021, February). *How principals affect students and schools: A systematic synthesis of two decades of research*. The Wallace Foundation. <https://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/Documents/How-Principals-Affect-Students-and-Schools.pdf>
- Guterman, A. (2023). *Stakeholder theory*. Business Expert Press.
- Harney, B. (2024). *Systems theory*. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781035308767.ch41>
- Harris, A., & Muijs, D. (2005). Leadership effectiveness in schools: A review of the literature. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 33(4), 387–408. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143205054618>
- Haryati, W., Kristiawan, M., & Puspita, Y. (2021). School principal strategy in improving the school-based management through the quality of education. *Education and Humanities Research*, 565, 65–72. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/353518266_School_Principal_Strategy_in_Improving_the_School_Based_Management_Through_the_Quality_of_Education
- Hermogenes, J. R., & Paglinawan, J. L. (2024). Managerial style, stakeholders' engagement on educational

leadership of school administrators. *ResearchGate*.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/386290546_MANAGERIAL_STYLE_STAKEHOLDERS_%27_ENGAGEMENT_ON_EDUCATIONAL_LEADERSHIP_OF_SCHOOL_ADMINISTRATOR_S

Hesselgreaves, H., French, M., Hawkins, M., Lowe, T., Wheatman, A., & Martin, M. (2021). New development: The emerging role of a 'learning partner' relationship in supporting public service reform. *Public Money & Management*, 41(8), 672–675.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09540962.2021.1909274>

Hornig, E. L., Klasik, D., & Loeb, S. (2010). Principals' time use and school effectiveness. *American Educational Research Journal*, 47(3), 703–730. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831209361204>

Jiang, H., Luo, Y., Xia, J., Hitt, M., & Shen, J. (2022). Resource dependence theory in international business: Progress and prospects. *Global Strategy Journal*, 13(1), 3–57. <https://doi.org/10.1002/gsj.1467>

Kaufman, E., Mitra, S., Anderson, J., Coartney, J., & Cash, C. (2020). Leading collaborative change in an educational organization. *Journal of Leadership Education*.
https://journalofleadershiped.org/jole_articles/leading-collaborative-change-in-an-educational-organization/

Kayser, D., & Kane, H. (2021). Weaving collaborative networks in Philadelphia: How the Philadelphia Higher Education Network for Neighborhood Development manages networks. *Social Innovations Journal*, 5. <https://socialinnovationsjournal.com/index.php/sij/article/view/615>

Krstevska, A., & Bajrami, D. (2023). The role of strategic planning in ensuring the success of education. *SEEU Review*, 18(1), 92–106. <https://doi.org/10.2478/seeur-2023-0050>

Kruse, S., Hackmann, D., & Lindle, J. (2020). Academic leadership during a pandemic: Department heads leading with a focus on equity. *Frontiers in Education*, 5, 614641.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2020.614641>

Lansing, A. E., Romero, N. J., Siantz, E., Silva, V., Center, K., Casteel, D., & Gilmer, T. (2023). Building trust: Leadership reflections on community empowerment and engagement in a large urban initiative. *BMC Public Health*, 23, 1252. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-023-16366-2>

Lapuz, M. C. L., & Pecajas, E. S. (2022). School heads' authority, accountability, and empowerment as functions of school performance. *International Journal of Novel Research in Humanity and Social Sciences*, 9(3), 69–83. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6701039>

Leithwood, K., Seashore Louis, K., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *How leadership influences student learning*. University of Minnesota, Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement.

Llego, M. (2020). *DepEd adopt-a-school program (ASP) toolkit*. TeacherPH.
<https://www.teacherph.com/depd-adopt-a-school-program-asp-toolkit/>

Loes, C. N. (2022). *The effect of collaborative learning on academic motivation*. Mount Mercy University.
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Lopez, V., Torres-Vallejos, J., Ascorra, P., Gonzales, L., Ortiz, S., & Bilbao, M. (2021). Contributions of individual, family, and school characteristics to Chilean students' social well-being at school. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 620895. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.620895>

Mahajan, R., Lim, W. M., Sareen, M., Kumar, S., & Panwar, R. (2023). Stakeholder theory. *Journal of*

- Business Research*, 166, 114104. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2023.114104>
- Maier, A., & Niebuhr, D. (2021). *California Community Schools Partnership Program: A transformational opportunity for whole child education*. Learning Policy Institute.
- Mailani, D., Hulu, M., Simamora, M., & Kesuma, S. (2024). Resource-based view theory to achieve a sustainable competitive advantage of the firm: Systematic literature review. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Sustainability Studies*, 4(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.31098/ijeass.v4i1.2002>
- Marks, H. M., & Printy, S. M. (2003). Principal leadership and school performance: An integration of transformational and instructional leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39(3), 370–397. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X03253412>
- Maqhubela, V. (2025). The effects of stakeholder collaboration on academic performance and institutional effectiveness: A case study of three secondary schools in the OR Tambo Inland District in the Eastern Cape of South Africa. *E-Journal of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences*, 185–200. <https://doi.org/10.38159/ehass.20256212>
- Matriano, M. T. (2024). *Organizational structure, its drawbacks and shortcomings and overall impact to organizational behavior*. [Unpublished manuscript].
- Mbanefo, M. (2022). Promoting educational resilience through effective strategic planning of students' learning outcomes by educational institutions. *Proceedings of the Tenth Pan-Commonwealth Forum on Open Learning*. <https://doi.org/10.56059/pcf10.4627>
- McLeod, S. (2025, April 18). Erik Erikson's stages of psychosocial development. *Simply Psychology*. <https://www.simplypsychology.org/Erik-Erikson.html>
- McTigue, E. M., Gourvennec, A. F., Solheim, O. J., & Jensen, M. T. (2023). Co-teaching implementation: How do school leaders support teachers? *Education Sciences*, 13(12), 1197. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13121197>
- Michigan State University Online. (n.d.). *The 4 I's of transformational leadership*. Retrieved from <https://www.michiganstateuniversityonline.com/resources/leadership/4-is-of-transformational-leadership/>
- Mifsud, D., & Wilkins, A. (2025). A systematic review of school governance literature between 2000 and 2023. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15700763.2025.2539791>
- Mincu, M. (2022). Why is school leadership key to transforming education? Structural and cultural assumptions for quality education in diverse contexts. *Frontiers in Education*, 7, 1000312. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2022.1000312>
- Minnaert, B. O., Russo, J. P., & Herman, M. (2020). Developing a partnership mindset in extension in 4-H programs. *Journal of Human Sciences & Extension*, 8(3). <https://www.jhseonline.com/article/view/837>
- Mizova, B., Parvanova, Y., & Peytcheva-Forsyth, R. (2026). Leading the digital transformation of education: The perspective of school principals. *Administrative Sciences*, 16(1), 57. <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci16010057>
- Molenaar, I., & Slegers, P. (2023). Multi-stakeholder collaboration and co-creation: Towards responsible application of AI in education. *OECD Digital Education Outlook*.

https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/2023/12/oecd-digital-education-outlook-2023_c827b81a/full-report/multi-stakeholder-collaboration-and-co-creation-towards-responsible-application-of-ai-in-education_07fbbd0d.html

- Moore, S. A., Sridhar, A., Taormina, I., Rajadhyaksha, M., & Azad, G. (2024). The perspective of school leaders on the implementation of evidence-based practices: A mixed methods study. *Implementation Research and Practice*, 5, 26334895231220279. <https://doi.org/10.1177/26334895231220279>
- National Association of Secondary School Principals. (2022). *Partnership opportunities*. <https://www.nassp.org/community/strategic-partnerships/>
- Nazeef, M., Khan, A., & Ali, J. (2024). Impact of collaborative learning on students' academic performance in teacher's education program. *Journal of Asian Development Studies*, 13, 1054–1068. <https://doi.org/10.62345/jads.2024.13.1.87>
- Nehez, J., & Blossing, U. (2020). Practices in different school cultures and principals' improvement work. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 24(3), 310–330. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2020.1759828>
- Ngobeni, S. (2024). Establishing sustainable school–community partnerships: Strategies for school management teams. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2024.2369987>
- Núñez-Canal, M., de Obesso Arias, M. M., Pérez-Rivero, C. A., & Álvarez-de-Mon, I. (2025). Stakeholder engagement and strategic innovation in higher education through AI competency. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2025.100920>
- Ong, C. (2016). 7 reasons why schools need strategic planning. *Envisio*. <https://envisio.com/blog/7-reasons-schools-need-strategic-planning/>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (n.d.). *Education GPS*. OECD. Retrieved September 2, 2025, from <http://gpseducation.oecd.org>
- Pana, E. (2024). School heads' instructional leadership and performance: Basis for strategic leadership program. *International Journal of Scientific and Management Research*, 7(2), 26–40. <https://doi.org/10.37502/IJSMR.2024.7203>
- Patta, E., & Williamson, O. U. (2024). Principals' educational resources management strategies for enhanced school development in Rivers State. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation*, 5(4), 122–126. <https://www.allmultidisciplinaryjournal.com/>
- Peña, I., Rincones, R., & Canaba, K. C. (2024). Forging partnerships: Preparing school leaders in complex environments. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, 19(1), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1177/19427751221133407>
- People in Need Philippines. (2024). *Effective collaboration and partnership: A civil society organization and local government unit coordination guide*. People in Need Philippines.
- Perez, A. (2022). The role of a school principal's practice of resource allocation and its relationship with a school's culture of collaboration. *Journal of Educational Leadership in Action*, 8(1). <https://digitalcommons.lindenwood.edu/ela/vol8/iss1/1>

- Petalcorin, J. G., & Tan, M. R. S. (2026). School governance, instructional quality, and stakeholder engagement: Their influence on school effectiveness through structural equation modeling. *Global Scientific and Social Research Review*.
<https://gssrr.org/JournalOfBasicAndApplied/article/view/17700>
- Resonance Global. (n.d.). *The guide to cross-sector collaboration*. Retrieved September 4, 2025, from <https://www.resonanceglobal.com/the-guide-to-cross-sector-collaboration>
- Rind, I. A. (2024). Leadership strategies in addressing out-of-school children: A comparative study of heads of government and public–private-managed schools in Sindh, Pakistan. *Education Sciences*, 14(11), 1230. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14111230>
- Samuel, K., & Kiu Publication Extension. (2024). The role of community partnerships in enhancing educational outcomes. *Kiu Journal of Education*, 5, 19–23.
- Sanchez, G. M., Labordo, E. L., & Martir, E. M. (2025). School heads' engagement, strategies and effectiveness on monitoring evaluation and adjustment (MEA). *International Journal of Science and Management Studies*, 7(6), 224–234.
- Sarmiento-Márquez, E. M., Pishtari, G., Prieto, L. P., & Poom-Valickis, K. (2023). The evaluation of school-university partnerships that improve teaching and learning practices: A systematic review. *Education Research Review*, 100509. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2023.100509>
- Schildkamp, K., van der Kleij, F. M., Heitink, M. C., Kippers, W. B., & Veldkamp, B. P. (2020). Formative assessment: A systematic review of critical teacher prerequisites for classroom practice. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 103, 101602. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jier.2020.101602>
- Sison, M. N., & Fuentes, H. C. (2025). Stakeholders' engagement and school performance: Basis for a proposed school-community partnership program. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 6(2), 608–620. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.06.02.16>
- Soriano, R. V. (n.d.). *Partnership Strategic Framework of DepEd* [PDF]. Department of Education.
- Stephens, K. R. (2020). Gifted education policy and advocacy: Perspectives for school psychologists. *Psychology in the Schools*, 57(10), 1640–1651. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.22415>
- Stumbera, B. (2021). Cultural-historical activity theory (CHAT): A structure for examining justice-centered leadership outcomes. *Journal of the California Association of Professors of Educational Administration*.
- Tan, C. Y., Dimmock, C., & Walker, A. (2021). How school leadership practices relate to student outcomes: Insights from a three-level meta-analysis. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 52(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/17411432211061445>
- Thant Sin, K. K. (2021). School-university partnerships in teacher education: Tension between partners and how they handle it. *GiLE Journal of Skills Development*, 1, 87–98. <https://doi.org/10.52398/gjsd.2021.v1.i1.pp87-98>
- Thomas, L. (2020). Simple random sampling. *Scribbr*. <https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/simple-random-sampling/>
- Tolo, A., Lillejord, S., Flórez Petour, M. T., & Hopfenbeck, T. N. (2020). Intelligent accountability in

- schools: A study of how school leaders work with the implementation of assessment for learning. *Journal of Educational Change*, 21(1), 59–82. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-019-09356-4>
- Torres, J. L., Zerna, L. G., Ampil, F. D. R., Silva, R. E., & Uy, F. T. (2025). Strategic leadership and contextual management: Elevating educational outcomes in Philippine schools. *ResearchGate*.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/388628520_Strategic_Leadership_and_Contextual_Management_Elevating_Educational_Outcomes_in_Philippine_Schools
- Ugochukwu, C. (2025, June 20). Transformational leadership style: How to inspire and motivate (S. McLeod, PhD, Reviewer). *Simply Psychology*.
<https://www.scirp.org/%28S%28ny23rubfvg45z345vbrep%29%29/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=3924016>
- Valli, L., Stefanski, A., & Jacobson, R. (2014). Professional learning communities: A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 84(4), 635–668.
<https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654314536982>
- Valk, A., & Kratovitš, M. (2021). *We collaborate with everyone, but with some more than others: Evidence of stakeholder collaboration among internal security professional higher education institutions. Empirical Research in Vocational Education and Training*, 13(1), 4. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40461-021-00110-6>
- Verano, V., Agrazamendez, D. D., Sarazain, K. S., & Bauyot, M. (2024). Strategic planning and management practices on quality education enhancement. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, VIII(IIIS), 2358–2366.
<https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.803173S>
- Vescio, V., Ross, D., & Adams, A. (2008). A review of collaborative professional learning and its relationship to teacher practices. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24(1), 80–91.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2007.01.004>
- Villasorda, G. A. C. (2024). School-based management (SBM) in elementary schools: Through the lens of teachers. *International Journal of Research Publications*, 149(1), 251–281.
<https://doi.org/10.47119/IJRP1001491520246511>
- Waerder, R., Thimmel, S., Englert, B., & Helmig, B. (2021). The role of nonprofit–private collaboration for nonprofits’ organizational resilience. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 33(4), 672–684. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-021-00424-9>
- Wang, H., & Ran, B. (2021). Network governance and collaborative governance: A thematic analysis on their similarities, differences, and entanglements. *Public Management Review*, 24(8), 1187–1211.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2021.2011389>
- World Bank. (2022, September 22). *The global partnership for education and the World Bank Group: The facts*. World Bank. <https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/education/brief/the-global-partnership-for-education-and-the-world-bank-group-the-facts>
- Wu, H., & Shen, J. (2022). The association between principal leadership and student achievement: A multivariate meta-meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review*, 35, 100423.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2021.100423>
- Wullschlegler, A., Daly, A. J., van Halem, N., Maag Merki, K., & Rechsteiner, B. (2025). Collaboration on

school improvement under different educational accountability systems in two countries. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 37, 303–329.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-025-09460-1>

Yang, Y., Zheng, Y., Guojie, X., & Tian, Y. (2022). The influence mechanism of strategic partnership on enterprise performance: Exploring the chain mediating role of information sharing and supply chain flexibility. *Sustainability*, 14(8), 4800. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14084800>

Zamiri, M., & Esmaeili, A. (2024). Strategies, methods, and supports for developing skills within learning communities: A systematic review of the literature. *Administrative Sciences*, 14(9), 231.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci14090231>

Zafeer, H. M. I., Maqbool, S., & Zeng, P. (2024). Inventive leadership styles and their impact for achieving sustainable development goals in education at secondary schools: A case study from Multan, Pakistan. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 11, 570.
<https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-03086-2>

Zhang, W., Zeng, X., Liang, H., Xue, Y., & Cao, X. (2023). Understanding how organizational culture affects innovation performance: A management context perspective. *Sustainability*, 15(8), 6644.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/su15086644>