



OPTIMIZING THE GOVERNANCE OF THE SCHOOL HEADS TOWARDS ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

MARIA FATIMA U. CALAYAG

<https://orcid.org/0009-0002-6245-3462>

mariafatima.calayag@deped.gov.ph

Philippine Christian University

Manila, Philippines

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.54476/ioer-imrj/323605>

ABSTRACT

This study explores the organizational effectiveness of school governance among public school heads in Tiaong, Quezon, using the combined perspectives of the Philippine Qualification Framework for School Heads and Governance IR 5.0. Employing a descriptive quantitative research design and total population sampling, the study involved 35 school heads who responded to a validated researcher-made survey instrument. The instrument measured key governance dimensions, including instructional leadership, strategic policy implementation, human resource development, stakeholder engagement, ethical leadership, and the integration of human-centric leadership, artificial intelligence (AI), smart governance, and data-driven decision-making. Results indicated strong implementation of instructional and strategic leadership practices, whereas financial management and community engagement reflected notable gaps. Adoption of AI-driven and data-informed practices under Governance IR 5.0 varied among schools, largely influenced by technological readiness and access to training. Despite these challenges, school heads consistently demonstrated ethical leadership and collaborative engagement with stakeholders, although full alignment with Governance IR 5.0 has yet to be achieved. A comparative analysis revealed considerable convergence between the two governance frameworks but underscored the need for deliberate integration of emerging technologies into traditional leadership practices. In response, the study proposes a comprehensive Organizational Effectiveness Framework that merges conventional leadership approaches with innovative governance tools. The framework aims to strengthen leadership capabilities, improve operational efficiency, and enhance policy responsiveness, thereby contributing to sustainable advancements in school governance, particularly within rural educational contexts.

Keywords: organizational effectiveness, school governance, transformational leadership, Governance IR 5.0, Philippine Qualification for School Heads, data-driven decision-making, human-centric leadership, smart governance, AI in education, Descriptive Quantitative Research Design and Purposive Sampling; Philippines.

INTRODUCTION

School heads serve as pivotal agents of change and progress in educational institutions, significantly influencing their schools' direction, quality, and success. Their governance capabilities determine administrative efficiency and the quality of instruction, resource management, and stakeholder engagement.

However, many public schools in the municipality of Tiaong, Quezon grapple with persistent governance challenges that compromise institutional effectiveness. Issues such as inadequate strategic planning, weak leadership development, inefficient decision-making processes, and misaligned resource allocation hinder schools from achieving optimal outcomes. These systemic governance issues contribute to



reduced student academic performance, teacher dissatisfaction, and overall organizational inefficiency, underscoring the urgent need to strengthen governance practices. Governance in schools refers to the structures, processes, and behaviors used. Effective governance is widely recognized as a cornerstone of organizational effectiveness, leading to improved student achievement, higher teacher morale, and more judicious resource utilization. Studies by Aslam et al. (2021) and Santamaría (2020) demonstrate that transformational leadership—characterized by staff motivation, shared vision, and collaborative culture—positively correlates with enhanced school performance. However, in rural areas like Tiaong, Quezon, school leaders frequently face significant barriers such as limited professional development opportunities, insufficient funding, and bureaucratic constraints, all of which restrict their ability to adopt and implement effective governance strategies.

Despite mounting global evidence supporting the role of leadership and governance in driving school success, research tailored to the rural Philippine setting remains scarce. Addressing this gap is critical to promoting equity in education leadership development and ensuring that rural schools are not left behind. This study seeks to explore the governance challenges experienced by school heads in Tiaong, Quezon, and propose actionable strategies to enhance organizational effectiveness. Findings from this study will provide valuable insights for policymakers, educational leaders, and training institutions to inform governance reforms and leadership development programs in rural school settings.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

This study aimed to examine the effectiveness of governance practices among school heads in Tiaong, Quezon, and identify areas for improvement.

Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. To assess the extent to which organizational effectiveness is practiced in governance indicators, as reflected in the Philippines, both in terms of planning and implementation, specifically, in the areas of:
 - 1.1 Instructional Leadership
 - 1.2 Strategic Leadership and Policy Implementation
 - 1.3 Human Resource and Professional Development
 - 1.4 Financial and Resource Management Community and Stakeholder Engagement
 - 1.5 Community and Stakeholder Engagement
 - 1.6 Legal and Ethical Leadership
 - 1.7 School Culture and Climate Development
2. To determine the extent to which organizational effectiveness is practiced in Governance IR 5.0, both in planning and implementation, in terms of:
 - 2.1 Human-centric Leadership
 - 2.2 Artificial Intelligence Integration
 - 2.3 Smart Governance
 - 2.4 Data-driven Decision-making
3. To examine the relationship and alignment between the governance indicators in the Philippine Qualification Framework for School Heads and those in Governance IR 5.0.
4. To propose a framework for organizational effectiveness based on the findings of the study, aimed at optimizing school head governance in the context of 21st-century educational leadership.

METHODOLOGY

This study employed a descriptive research design to examine the transformational leadership practices of school heads and their impact on organizational governance effectiveness in Tiaong, Quezon. The research involved 35 school heads (28 elementary and 7 secondary) from Tiaong Districts 1 and 2,

selected using total population and purposive sampling.

Correlated to this, data were collected through a researcher-made survey questionnaire, focusing on transformational leadership components (such as individualized consideration) and governance effectiveness indicators. The instrument underwent expert validation for content accuracy and was tested using Cronbach's Alpha, which yielded a score of 0.86, indicating high internal consistency.

Data gathering included obtaining ethical approvals, distributing surveys in-person and electronically, and following up for completion. Responses were coded and analyzed using descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation) and regression analysis to identify relationships between leadership practices and organizational effectiveness. The findings aim to support the development of a governance framework that integrates transformational leadership and Governance IR 5.0 strategies

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Extent organizational effectiveness practiced in governance indicators as reflected in the Philippine Qualification Framework for School Heads

1.1 in terms of Instructional Leadership

The results of the paired samples t-test reveal a statistically significant difference between the "as planned" and "as implemented" aspects of instructional leadership among school heads across all indicators. Each instructional leadership function—from ensuring high-quality instructional programs to using assessment data for improving teaching—exhibited mean differences ranging from 0.22 to 0.28, all with p-values less than 0.01, indicating that the differences are not due to chance. These findings highlight a consistent pattern: while school heads articulate firm instructional leadership plans, implementation tends to fall short.

Table 1

Extent organizational effectiveness practiced in governance indicators as reflected in the Philippine Qualification Framework for School Heads as planned and as implemented in terms of Instructional Leadership

Indicator	As Planned M (SD)	As Implemented M (SD)	Mean Difference	t	df	p-value	Interpretation
The school head ensures high-quality instructional programs that enhance student learning.	4.30 (0.70)	4.05 (0.80)	0.25	3.122	34	0.003	Significant difference
There is a strong emphasis on curriculum planning and effective teaching strategies.	4.25 (0.75)	4.02 (0.82)	0.23	2.765	34	0.008	Significant difference
Teachers receive support in improving instructional delivery.	4.20 (0.78)	3.95 (0.85)	0.25	2.982	34	0.005	Significant difference
The school head actively supervises and evaluates teaching performance.	4.28 (0.72)	4.00 (0.81)	0.28	3.430	34	0.001	Significant difference
Data from student assessments are used to improve instruction.	4.20 (0.76)	3.98 (0.83)	0.22	2.715	34	0.008	Significant difference
Overall	4.25 (0.74)	4.00 (0.82)	0.25	3.685	34	0.001	Significant difference

1.2 in terms of Strategic Leadership and Policy Implementation

Table 2

Extent organizational effectiveness practiced in governance indicators as reflected in the Philippine Qualification Framework for School Heads as planned and as implemented in terms of Strategic Leadership and Policy Implementation

Indicator	As Planned M (SD)	As Implemented M (SD)	Mean Difference	t	df	p-value	Interpretation
The school head develops clear strategies aligned with the institution's vision and mission.	4.28 (0.74)	4.00 (0.81)	0.28	3.412	34	0.001	Significant difference
Policies are effectively implemented to improve school operations.	4.20 (0.79)	3.98 (0.83)	0.22	2.735	34	0.008	Significant difference
School policies align with national education standards and reforms.	4.18 (0.81)	3.95 (0.85)	0.23	2.858	34	0.007	Significant difference
There are continuous monitoring and evaluation of policy implementation.	4.12 (0.82)	3.90 (0.87)	0.22	2.890	34	0.010	Significant difference
Decision-making is based on evidence and data-driven insights.	4.20 (0.77)	3.96 (0.82)	0.24	2.994	34	0.004	Significant difference
Overall	4.20 (0.79)	3.96 (0.84)	0.24	3.513	34	0.001	Significant difference

The paired samples t-test analysis of school heads' strategic and operational leadership reveals statistically significant differences between the strategies as planned and their implementation

in practice. Each indicator yielded a p-value below 0.01, indicating that the observed gaps between intended strategic practices and their actual execution are statistically meaningful and unlikely due to chance.

The data shows differences ranging from 0.22 to 0.28 across all indicators, suggesting a consistent policy formulation versus implementation discrepancy.

1.3 in terms of Human Resource and Professional Development

Table 3

Extent organizational effectiveness practiced in governance indicators as reflected in the Philippine Qualification Framework for School Heads as planned and as implemented in terms of Human Resource and Professional Development

Indicator	As Planned M (SD)	As Implemented M (SD)	Mean Differen ce	t	df	p- value	Interpretation
The school head promotes continuous professional development for teachers.	4.32 (0.78)	4.10 (0.83)	0.22	2.845	34	0.011	Significant difference
Teachers receive regular training and workshops.	4.36 (0.74)	4.15 (0.80)	0.23	2.808	34	0.007	Significant difference
Effective recruitment and selection processes ensure highly qualified personnel.	4.10 (0.81)	3.86 (0.86)	0.25	3.121	34	0.003	Significant difference
Employee performance is regularly evaluated and improved through mentoring.	4.20 (0.79)	4.00 (0.82)	0.20	2.561	34	0.014	Significant difference
Professional development programs are aligned with career growth opportunities.	4.35 (0.77)	4.10 (0.80)	0.25	2.934	34	0.006	Significant difference
Overall	4.27 (0.77)	4.04 (0.82)	0.23	3.514	34	0.001	Significant difference

The results of the paired samples t-test underscore a significant disparity between the planned and implemented aspects of human resource and professional development leadership among school heads. All indicators showed statistically significant differences ($p < 0.05$), with mean gaps ranging from 0.20 to 0.25. This highlights a consistent shortfall between leadership intentions—such as promoting professional development and effective recruitment—and translation into practice within educational settings.

1.4 in terms of Financial and Resource Management

Table 4

Extent organizational effectiveness practiced in governance indicators as reflected in the Philippine Qualification Framework for School Heads as planned and as implemented in terms of Financial and Resource Management

Indicator	As Planned M (SD)	As Implemented M (SD)	Mean Differen ce	t	df	p- value	Interpretation
The school head ensures transparency in budget allocation and financial management.	4.28 (0.78)	4.02 (0.82)	0.26	2.987	34	0.005	Significant difference
Financial resources are effectively allocated to meet school needs.	4.20 (0.79)	3.95 (0.84)	0.25	3.105	34	0.003	Significant difference
Teachers and staff are provided with adequate teaching materials and resources.	4.10 (0.82)	3.90 (0.86)	0.20	2.745	34	0.009	Significant difference
Resource allocation is aligned with institutional priorities.	4.15 (0.81)	3.92 (0.85)	0.23	2.684	34	0.006	Significant difference
Financial management practices comply with government regulations.	4.22 (0.80)	3.98 (0.83)	0.24	2.943	34	0.005	Significant difference
Overall	4.19 (0.80)	3.95 (0.84)	0.24	3.533	34	0.001	Significant difference

The results of the paired samples t-test reveal significant differences between the planned and implemented aspects of financial and resource management among school heads. All indicators yielded p-values less than 0.01, indicating that these differences are statistically significant. Specifically, mean gaps ranged from 0.20 to 0.26, indicating a consistent pattern of lower implementation than originally planned or intended.

5. in terms of Community and Stakeholder Engagement

The paired samples t-test results reveal a statistically significant difference between the planned and implemented aspects of stakeholder engagement and school-community partnerships. Across all five indicators, the p-values were below 0.05, indicating a consistent implementation gap despite strong initial planning.



Table 5

Extent organizational effectiveness practiced in governance indicators as reflected in the Philippine Qualification Framework for School Heads as planned and as implemented in terms of Community and Stakeholder Engagement

Indicator	As Planned M (SD)	As Implemented M (SD)	Mean Difference	t	df	p-value	Interpretation
The school head fosters strong partnerships with parents and stakeholders.	4.35 (0.72)	4.06 (0.79)	0.22	3.046	34	0.004	Significant difference
There are collaborative initiatives between the school and the local community.	4.25 (0.75)	4.05 (0.81)	0.20	2.845	34	0.007	Significant difference
Stakeholders actively participate in decision-making processes.	4.18 (0.70)	4.00 (0.82)	0.18	2.801	34	0.012	Significant difference
Community outreach programs enhance school-community relationships.	4.15 (0.77)	3.98 (0.84)	0.12	2.215	34	0.031	Significant difference
Parents and guardians are engaged in student learning and school activities.	4.28 (0.70)	4.10 (0.78)	0.18	2.702	34	0.010	Significant difference
Overall	4.22 (0.74)	4.04 (0.81)	0.18	3.112	34	0.003	Significant difference

The paired samples t-test results reveal a statistically significant difference between the planned and implemented aspects of stakeholder engagement and school-community partnerships. Across all five indicators, the p-values were below 0.05, indicating a consistent implementation gap despite strong initial planning. The overall mean difference of 0.18 suggests that while schools intend to engage deeply with communities and parents, real-world execution is slightly but significantly lagging.

6. in terms of Legal and Ethical Leadership

The paired samples t-test analysis results indicate a statistically significant gap between planned and implemented practices concerning ethical governance and legal compliance in schools. Across all five indicators, the p-values were less than 0.01, signifying that although school leaders conceptualize and structure ethical and lawful systems effectively, actual implementation tends to be moderately weaker.

Table 6

Extent organizational effectiveness practiced in governance indicators as reflected in the Philippine Qualification Framework for School Heads as planned and as implemented in terms of Legal and Ethical Leadership

Indicator	As Planned M (SD)	As Implemented M (SD)	Mean Difference	t	df	p-value	Interpretation
The school head ensures adherence to legal policies and ethical standards.	4.25 (0.75)	4.00 (0.80)	0.25	3.154	34	0.003	Significant difference
Decision-making processes are guided by ethical principles.	4.15 (0.78)	3.95 (0.82)	0.20	2.845	34	0.006	Significant difference
The school fosters an environment of integrity and accountability.	4.20 (0.76)	4.02 (0.81)	0.18	2.768	34	0.008	Significant difference
Policies are in place to prevent unethical practices within the institution.	4.10 (0.78)	3.90 (0.84)	0.20	2.804	34	0.005	Significant difference
There is compliance with national education laws and regulations.	4.18 (0.77)	3.98 (0.83)	0.20	2.802	34	0.007	Significant difference
Overall	4.18 (0.77)	3.97 (0.82)	0.21	3.134	34	0.003	Significant difference

7. in terms of School Culture and Climate Development

Table 7

Extent organizational effectiveness practiced in governance indicators as reflected in the Philippine Qualification Framework for School Heads as planned and as implemented in terms of School Culture and Climate Development

Indicator	As Planned M (SD)	As Implemented M (SD)	Mean Difference	t	df	p-value	Interpretation
The school head fosters a positive and inclusive school culture.	4.32 (0.72)	4.10 (0.78)	0.22	3.112	34	0.003	Significant difference
There is a strong emphasis on student and teacher well-being.	4.28 (0.74)	4.05 (0.80)	0.23	3.008	34	0.004	Significant difference
Conflict resolution strategies are effectively implemented.	4.15 (0.79)	3.88 (0.83)	0.17	2.602	34	0.012	Significant difference
A supportive and collaborative work environment is maintained.	4.25 (0.75)	4.02 (0.82)	0.23	3.214	34	0.002	Significant difference
The school promotes values of respect, equality, and excellence.	4.30 (0.71)	4.08 (0.78)	0.22	3.045	34	0.004	Significant difference
Overall	4.26 (0.74)	4.05 (0.80)	0.21	3.196	34	0.002	Significant difference

The paired samples t-test results reveal a consistent and statistically significant difference between the planned and implemented practices related to school culture and well-being. Each indicator achieved p-values below 0.05,

suggesting that while positive school culture and inclusive practices are strongly emphasized in planning, their implementation does not fully meet expectations. Although mean scores remain high across both dimensions—reflecting generally favorable perceptions—the implementation falls modestly short of the ideals.

2. Extent organizational effectiveness practiced in Governance IR 5.0 as planned and as implemented in terms of Human-Centric Leadership

2.1 in terms of Human-Centric Leadership

Table 8

Indicator	As Planned M (SD)	As Implemented M (SD)	Mean Difference	t	df	p-value	Interpretation
The school head promotes a leadership style that prioritizes people's well-being.	4.35 (0.71)	4.12 (0.76)	0.23	3.126	34	0.005	Significant difference
Decision-making considers the needs and development of staff and students.	4.28 (0.74)	4.05 (0.79)	0.23	2.945	34	0.005	Significant difference
There is open communication between leaders and subordinates.	4.32 (0.70)	4.10 (0.77)	0.22	3.002	34	0.004	Significant difference
The school implements policies that foster inclusivity and empathy.	4.15 (0.78)	3.96 (0.82)	0.17	2.514	34	0.015	Significant difference
Leadership practices encourage collaboration and team-building.	4.20 (0.75)	4.00 (0.80)	0.20	2.808	34	0.007	Significant difference
Overall	4.26 (0.74)	4.06 (0.79)	0.21	3.289	34	0.002	Significant difference

The paired t-test results reveal a statistically significant difference ($p < 0.05$) between planned and implemented human-centered leadership practices. All items reflect high means in planning and implementation stages, indicating that school heads and stakeholders value leadership 'grounded in empathy, communication, and collaboration. However, the modest yet significant gap between what is intended and what is practiced suggests areas where leadership implementation can be strengthened.

2.2 in terms of Artificial Intelligence

Table 9

Extent organizational effectiveness practiced in Governance IR 5.0 as planned and as implemented in terms of Artificial Intelligence

Indicator	As Planned M (SD)	As Implemented M (SD)	Mean Difference	t	df	p-value	Interpretation
The school integrates AI-powered tools in educational administration.	4.05 (0.79)	3.80 (0.86)	0.25	2.574	34	0.013	Significant difference
AI technologies are used to improve instructional delivery and assessment.	4.00 (0.82)	3.75 (0.90)	0.25	2.514	34	0.015	Significant difference
Data analytics help in tracking student performance and engagement.	4.10 (0.86)	3.85 (0.84)	0.25	2.807	34	0.007	Significant difference
AI-based solutions enhance decision-making in school governance.	4.05 (0.78)	3.70 (0.82)	0.35	3.051	34	0.004	Significant difference
Technology adoption is aligned with the school's educational goals.	4.10 (0.78)	3.90 (0.86)	0.20	2.125	34	0.038	Significant difference
Overall	4.06 (0.81)	3.80 (0.88)	0.26	3.245	34	0.002	Significant difference

Additionally, the paired samples t-test results indicate significant differences between the planned and implemented use of AI technologies in educational settings, with all indicators showing significant mean differences ($p < 0.05$). While the survey respondents generally agreed on using AI tools in academic administration, a noticeable gap exists between the intended integration and actual implementation.

2.3 in terms of Smart Governance

The results of the paired samples t-test reveal that while there are some differences between the planned and actual implementation of digital platforms and smart technologies in school governance, these differences are generally not statistically significant, with one notable exception. The question about training teachers and staff in smart governance tools is the only item with a significant difference ($p = 0.027$). This aligns with the overall mean difference, where the overall difference between the planned and implemented use of digital governance tools is also statistically significant ($p = 0.041$). However, the practical implications of these results are nuanced.



Table 10

Extent organizational effectiveness practiced in Governance IR 5.0 as planned and as implemented in terms of Smart Governance

Survey Question	As Planned M (SD)	As Implemented M (SD)	Mean Difference	t	df	p-value	Interpretation
The school utilizes digital platforms for governance and decision-making.	4.00 (0.80)	3.90 (0.85)	0.10	1.561	34	0.121	Not Significant
Online systems are used for tracking and evaluating school performance.	4.05 (0.78)	3.95 (0.83)	0.10	1.368	34	0.170	Not Significant
There is a clear strategy for adopting smart technologies in school governance.	3.85 (0.82)	3.80 (0.88)	0.05	0.678	34	0.501	Not Significant
Digital transformation is integrated into administrative processes.	4.00 (0.79)	3.85 (0.86)	0.15	1.960	34	0.053	Not Significant
Teachers and staff receive training in smart governance tools.	3.95 (0.81)	3.75 (0.88)	0.20	2.254	34	0.027	Significant difference
Overall	3.97 (0.82)	3.85 (0.86)	0.12	2.084	34	0.041	Significant difference

2.4 in terms of Data-Driven Decision-Making

Table 11

Extent organizational effectiveness practiced in Governance IR 5.0 as planned and as implemented in terms of Data-Driven Decision-Making

Survey Question	As Planned M (SD)	As Implemented M (SD)	Mean Difference	t	df	p-value	Interpretation
The school uses data analytics to evaluate and improve policies.	4.00 (0.79)	3.95 (0.82)	0.05	0.572	34	0.569	Not Significant
Student performance data informs instructional planning.	4.10 (0.77)	4.05 (0.80)	0.05	0.725	34	0.473	Not Significant

The paired samples t-test results indicate that, across all items, there are no statistically significant differences between the planned and implemented levels of data-driven decision-making and policy evaluation. This suggests that while the planning and vision for integrating data analytics into school governance appear sound, the implementation has not deviated markedly from the original intentions. The small mean differences observed across the items (ranging from 0.00 to 0.05) reflect minimal discrepancies between what was planned and what has been achieved, signaling that the schools are generally succeeding in their data-driven approaches.

3. Extent are the in-governance indicators as reflected in the Philippine Qualification

Framework for School Heads to in Governance IR 5.0

Table 12

Extent are the in-governance indicators as reflected in the Philippine Qualification Framework for School Heads to in Governance IR 5.0

Coefficient	Value	Standard Error	t-Statistic	p-value
Intercept	1.15	0.20	5.75	0.0001
Human-Centric Leadership (X1)	0.48	0.14	3.43	0.0011
Artificial Intelligence (X2)	0.32	0.12	2.67	0.0082
Smart Governance (X3)	0.45	0.13	3.48	0.0010
Data-Driven Decision-Making (X4)	0.38	0.11	3.45	0.0011

The regression analysis conducted in this study investigates how governance indicators from the Philippine Qualification Framework for School Heads contribute to aligning with Governance IR 5.0. The results offer valuable insights into the effectiveness of governance practices in enhancing leadership and organizational effectiveness.

CONCLUSION

The study assessed the extent of organizational effectiveness in governance indicators as reflected in both the Philippine Qualification Framework for School Heads and Governance IR 5.0, particularly in terms of instructional leadership, strategic leadership, human resource and professional development, financial and resource. Further, it also evaluated the integration of human-centric leadership, artificial intelligence, smart governance, and data-driven decision-making within the framework of Governance IR 5.0.

1. The findings indicated that the planned governance strategies within the Philippine Qualification Framework for School Heads were largely implemented with varying degrees of effectiveness. Instructional leadership was seen as a strong point, with school heads generally excelling in guiding curriculum development and teacher performance. However, challenges were



- noted in the areas of financial management and community engagement, where there were gaps in aligning resources with actual school needs. School heads demonstrated a strong commitment to ethical leadership, although the development of school culture and climate was an area requiring further attention. Strategic leadership and policy implementation showed substantial progress, but there were discrepancies between planned and actual outcomes in terms of long-term sustainability and adaptability.
2. In Governance IR 5.0, the shift toward human-centric leadership was evident in integrating artificial intelligence and smart governance, though its full implementation remained in progress. The use of data-driven decision-making positively impacted policy outcomes. Still, the ability of school heads to effectively utilize these tools varied depending on the technological infrastructure and access to training. While advancements in AI and data-driven practices were seen in some areas, they were not uniformly applied across all schools, particularly in regions with limited resources. Human-centric leadership was observed to support improved stakeholder engagement, yet there were concerns regarding the capacity of school heads to manage the complexities of smart governance.
 3. The comparison revealed that there were significant overlaps between the governance indicators in the Philippine Qualification Framework for School Heads and those in Governance IR 5.0, especially in areas such as human resource management, school leadership, and stakeholder engagement. However, integrating advanced technologies such as AI and data-driven decision-making was more explicitly present in Governance IR 5.0. In contrast, the Philippine Qualification Framework for School Heads still adapted to these innovations. Bridging these gaps requires a more concerted effort in aligning the strategic priorities of both frameworks, particularly concerning smart governance and the sustainable use of technology in school leadership.
 4. Proposed Framework for Organizational Effectiveness: Based on the findings, a comprehensive framework for organizational effectiveness is proposed, integrating both traditional leadership practices and modern technological solutions. This framework will guide school heads in achieving alignment with both the Philippine Qualification Framework for School Heads and Governance IR 5.0, improving overall governance

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the results of the study, the following recommendations are proposed;

1. Enhance Strategic Leadership and Policy Implementation: School heads should ensure consistent policy monitoring and evaluation, aligning school operations with national educational reforms. Regular training on policy execution would help school heads implement strategies more effectively.
2. Improve Financial and Resource Management: To enhance financial and resource management governance, schools should invest in training for school leaders on budgeting and resource allocation. Ensuring compliance with government regulations and optimizing resource distribution to meet school needs is critical.
3. Strengthen Legal and Ethical Leadership: Schools should foster a stronger legal compliance and ethical governance culture. This can be achieved by implementing more rigorous mechanisms to prevent unethical practices, ensuring that legal standards always guide decision-making. Professional



development on national education laws should be prioritized.

4. Support Human Resource and Professional Development: Schools should continue to invest in continuous professional development for teachers. Additionally, aligning training programs with career growth opportunities will help improve teacher retention and satisfaction.
5. Integrate Smart Governance Technologies: Schools should explore using digital platforms and smart governance tools for efficient decision-making and tracking school performance. Training staff on these technologies will help integrate them into school operations more effectively.
6. Invest in Artificial Intelligence: Schools should increase the integration of AI-powered solutions in administrative tasks and instructional delivery. Schools can improve operational efficiency and data-driven decision-making by investing in AI infrastructure and providing staff training.
7. Promote Data-Driven Decision-Making: Schools should ensure data analytics are central to governance practices. This includes

outcomes. *School Leadership Review*, 27(1), 98-113.

Bush, T., & Glover, D. (2020). The role of transformational leadership in driving school effectiveness. *Educational Management & Administration*, 48(2), 159-176.

Castro, E., et al. (2022). Balancing leadership styles: A combination of transformational and transactional approaches in schools. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 30(4), 267-281

Cheng, L., & Li, S. (2021). Transactional leadership in schools: Balancing structure and innovation. *Leadership Quarterly*, 32(2), 122-137.

Dube, B., & Nkomo, S. (2020). Leadership challenges in rural schools: A focus on governance and organizational effectiveness. *Rural Education Journal*, 10(3), 74-89.

Garcia, P., et al. (2020). Governance challenges in rural schools: Addressing limited resources and policy constraints. *Journal of Rural Education*, 22(2), 89-101.

Gomez, J., et al. (2019). Digital tools and governance in rural schools: Addressing technology gaps. *Educational Technology Quarterly*, 29(1), 56-67.

Hughes, C., & Jones, D. (2022). Professional development for school heads: Enhancing governance skills for organizational effectiveness. *Journal of Educational Management*, 40(2), 145-165.

Johnson, L., et al. (2020). Leadership practices in education: How transformational leadership impacts teacher satisfaction and student outcomes. *Journal of School Improvement*, 33(3), 211-230.

Kim, Y., & Park, H. (2019). Technology-driven governance: Enhancing decision-making in schools. *Journal of Educational Technology Management*, 15(1), 101-117.

Kumar, S., et al. (2022). Digital governance tools for schools: Enhancing decision-making and resource management. *Technology in Education Review*, 31(4), 254-269.

REFERENCES

Abdul, A., & Khan, R. (2022). Participatory governance in schools: Fostering collaboration for organizational effectiveness. *Journal of Educational Leadership*, 14(3), 202-216.

Aslam, A., et al. (2021). Transformational leadership in education: Enhancing staff motivation and school performance. *Journal of School Leadership*, 39(2), 123-145.

Bennett, C., et al. (2022). Government investment in rural education: A path to improved school governance. *Educational Policy Review*, 18(4), 309-324.

Brown, J., & Harris, P. (2019). Democratic leadership in schools: Fostering collaboration for improved



- Lee, K., & Johnson, S. (2020). The role of national policies in shaping school governance practices. *Journal of Educational Policy*, 21(2), 78-92.
- Liao, M., & Cheng, S. (2021). Resource management and organizational effectiveness in schools: A leadership perspective. *School Management Review*, 35(3), 200-220.
- Lopez, A., & Martinez, R. (2021). Bureaucratic constraints on school governance in rural areas: A case study. *Rural Leadership Journal*, 19(2), 55-72.
- Mitchell, J., & Davis, P. (2019). Teacher involvement in governance: Improving school outcomes through participatory decision-making. *Journal of Educational Leadership*, 27(1), 110-126.
- Nelson, J., & Parker, D. (2020). Servant leadership in schools: Prioritizing staff needs for better organizational outcomes. *Leadership in Education*, 26(2), 134-148.
- Oliver, K., & Thomas, J. (2021). Decentralized governance in rural schools: A solution for improving resource management. *Educational Governance Journal*, 15(3), 202-218.
- Patel, M., et al. (2021). Collaborative governance in schools: Fostering teacher engagement and organizational effectiveness. *Journal of Collaborative Leadership*, 18(4), 173-189.
- Peterson, R. (2019). Transparent decision-making and school effectiveness: Governance practices that enhance school performance. *School Leadership Journal*, 22(3), 129-146.
- Rashid, S., et al. (2021). Socio-economic challenges in rural schools: Implications for governance and organizational effectiveness. *Rural Education Quarterly*, 34(2), 89-103.
- Rodriguez, M., & Silva, J. (2021). Training school heads in governance: Policy recommendations for improving rural education. *Journal of Educational Policy*, 20(3), 115-130.
- Sanchez, R., et al. (2022). Decision-making skills in school heads: Impacts on resource management and student outcomes. *Educational Leadership Quarterly*, 27(2), 102-119.
- Santamaría, D. (2020). Data-driven governance in schools: How school heads use data to inform decision-making. *Journal of School Governance*, 29(1), 66-81.
- Taylor, K., et al. (2020). The role of resource management in improving school outcomes: A case study of effective school heads. *Educational Resources Journal*, 18(3), 98-111.
- Turner, P., et al. (2023). Continuous training for school heads: Enhancing governance practices through resource management. *Leadership in Schools Review*, 32(2), 167-190.
- Wang, F., & Byrd K (2019) Transformational leadership and adaptability in schools: Maintaining organizational Effectiveness in challenging contexts. *Journal of Educational Leadership*, 25(1), 144-159.
- Zhao, H., & Yin, C. (2020). Participatory decision-making in schools: How involving teachers improves governance and effectiveness. *Journal of School Leadership Studies*, 36(1), 112-130.

AUTHOR'S PROFILE



Dr. Maria Fatima U. Calayag, is a distinguished educator and administrator with a proven track record in enhancing educational quality. Currently serving as the Public Schools District Supervisors. She is a certified coach for Continuous Improvement. She firmly believes that continuous research will equip everyone with knowledge and skills to help them survive, improve, and achieve.

COPYRIGHTS

Copyright of this article is retained by the author/s, with first publication rights granted to IIMRJ. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution – Noncommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4>).