



Leadership Practices And Stakeholders' Commitment in Schools' Delivery Services

Joy Z. Nagera, Annie Marmol-Dado, EdD

Mabini Colleges Graduate School

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.10200192>

Received: 16 February 2026; Accepted: 21 February 2026; Published: 28 February 2026

ABSTRACT

This study determined the leadership practices of school heads and the level of stakeholders' commitment in the delivery of school services in public elementary schools in Jose Panganiban West and East Districts, Division of Camarines Norte. Specifically, it determined leadership practices in planning and implementation, policy implementation and review, learning environment, learner discipline, management of relationships and school organizations, communication, rewards and recognition, and community engagement; determined stakeholders' commitment across these areas; analyzed differences in commitment among stakeholder groups; identified challenges; and proposed interventions.

Using a quantitative descriptive-comparative design, data were gathered from 16 school heads, 16 faculty presidents, 14 PTA presidents, and 12 Committee on Education chairpersons. Results showed that school heads demonstrated strong leadership in planning, policy implementation, communication, learning environment management, and community involvement. However, gaps were noted in collaboration, stakeholder engagement, community empowerment, performance evaluation, and recognition mechanisms. Teachers exhibited consistently high commitment across all areas, parents showed moderate to high commitment, while Committee on Education chairpersons demonstrated limited involvement, particularly in planning, policy understanding, and communication.

Significant differences in stakeholder commitment were found across all areas ($p < .01$), with notable variations in planning, policy implementation, learning environment, and learner discipline. Key challenges included limited stakeholder participation in policy review, low community involvement, weak partnerships, and insufficient empowerment. An Action Plan was developed to strengthen leadership practices, enhance stakeholder commitment, and improve collaboration, communication, and community engagement, contributing to more effective and inclusive school service delivery.

Keywords: Leadership practices, stakeholders' commitment, school's delivery services

INTRODUCTION

Education is crucial for developing human capital to achieve strategic goals. Effective schools rely on skilled governance and collaboration among school leaders and stakeholders (Leithwood et al., 2020). School leadership optimizes teacher efficiency and stakeholder commitment (Pont et al., 2008, as cited by Fabelico et al., 2021). Effective school leadership is key to improving educational quality and student outcomes. School heads influence planning, policy implementation, learning environment management, discipline, relationships, and stakeholder engagement, shaping teacher performance and overall school effectiveness (Richardson, 2024).

Stakeholder commitment, particularly from teachers, parents, and Committee on Education Chairpersons, is equally important. Active engagement supports collaboration, participatory governance, policy review, and community involvement, while weak commitment can hinder policy implementation and school improvement

(Mleczek & Kington, 2025). Strong collaboration among administrators, teachers, and parents is essential for implementing programs, though securing stakeholder commitment remains challenging (Wenger, et al., 2018). Schools should engage in outreach initiatives, leveraging the commitment of staff to promote local development (Bilbao et al., 2018) and should create platforms for sharing practices and foster a supportive culture to enhance student learning (Nebor, 2017).

Strong school-community partnerships improve program quality and resource use. Inclusive engagement by school leaders, teachers, and parents fosters a positive school climate, which encourages parental and community involvement (Communtzis-Page, 2017). Parental and community participation supports academic success, strengthens teacher support, enhances programs and school climate, develops parental skills, and increases overall community engagement, with studies showing up to 30% higher student achievement when parental involvement is above average (Henderson and Mapp, 2019).

Community stakeholder involvement is emphasized in RA 9155, also known as the "Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001," to ensure that schools reflect community values and meet the needs of all learners. DepEd Order 40, s.2015, underscores the significance of school-community relationships, involvement, and commitment, outlining various responsibilities of teaching staff in the Philippines. These include activities such as research, identifying potential partners, engagement, relationship growth, and monitoring and evaluation.

Recent international literature highlights the critical role of stakeholder engagement in education, showing both its theoretical importance and empirical effects across diverse contexts. For instance, research from Smith and Williams (2024) emphasizes that effective communication with parents and community members strengthens school-family partnerships and positively influences student motivation and achievement, underscoring how stakeholder engagement contributes to supportive educational environments. Studies focused on educational policy development in Europe illustrate that inclusive engagement in policy-making enhances policy legitimacy, transparency, and community support, although logistical and representational challenges persist, suggesting that developed systems still strive to broaden participation through adaptive processes and technology-enabled engagement (Hadijah, 2024).

In comparison, Philippine studies similarly validate the importance of stakeholder involvement but reveal context-specific dynamics and implementation challenges. Research on rural and remote Philippine schools finds moderately high stakeholder engagement practices but notes gaps in continuous engagement, communication, and collaborative decision-making that affect how effectively stakeholders contribute to school improvement and learning outcomes (Arguelles and Sarsale, 2025). Locally, investigations into School-Based Management (SBM) implementation also demonstrate a positive correlation between stakeholder engagement and school performance, signaling that decentralized governance can foster collaborative participation and better outcomes when stakeholders are actively involved (Ramos, 2025). While both international and Philippine contexts value stakeholder engagement, the Philippines often contends with structural and capacity constraints such as resource limits and governance challenges that can temper the depth and consistency of engagement compared with some developed systems where formalized mechanisms and technology play a larger role in sustaining ongoing stakeholder participation.

This study is theoretically anchored in Transformational Leadership, Distributed Leadership, and Stakeholder Theory to provide analytical depth in examining school heads' leadership practices and stakeholders' commitment. Transformational leadership explains how school heads influence commitment through vision-setting, motivation, ethical modeling, and recognition systems. The domains of planning, policy implementation, learning environment, communication, and rewards reflect leaders' capacity to inspire shared goals and foster intrinsic motivation among teachers, parents, and community members. When stakeholders demonstrate strong commitment, it may indicate that school heads effectively practice transformational behaviors that cultivate trust, engagement, and collective responsibility.

Distributed leadership and stakeholder theory further deepen the analysis by framing leadership as a shared and relational process. Distributed leadership emphasizes participatory decision-making in areas such as school



organizations, community engagement, and management of diverse relationships, suggesting that higher commitment emerges when stakeholders are actively involved rather than merely directed. Meanwhile, stakeholder theory highlights the importance of valuing and balancing the interests of different stakeholder groups, helping explain variations in commitment levels when respondents are grouped accordingly. Together, these theories guide the interpretation of findings, illuminate challenges in fostering engagement, and inform the design of interventions aimed at strengthening inclusive leadership practices and sustainable stakeholder commitment in school service delivery.

In the Schools Division Office of Camarines Norte, schools have different practices involving the school community, specifically in ensuring their commitment to the implementation of school programs, projects, and activities. Collaboration with the school community is significant in ensuring their commitment to the school's delivery of services. Thus, within this premise, the researcher was motivated to conduct this study to determine the leadership practices and stakeholders' commitment in the school's delivery services in the public Elementary School in Jose Panganiban West and East Districts in the Division of Camarines Norte.

This study aimed to determine the leadership practices of the school heads and stakeholders' commitment in school's delivery services in public elementary schools in Jose Panganiban West and East Districts in the Division of Camarines Norte. Specifically, it answered the following subproblems: 1) What is the leadership practices of the school heads along school planning and implementation, policy implementation and review, learning environment, learner discipline, and management of diverse relationships, management of school organizations, communications, rewards and recognition mechanisms, and community engagement? 2) What is the level of commitment of the school stakeholders in the delivery of school services along the aforementioned variables? 3) Is there significant difference between the leadership practices and commitment of the school stakeholders in the delivery of school services? 4) What are the challenges encountered by the school heads in influencing stakeholders' commitment in school's delivery of services? 5) What intervention may be proposed to enhance leadership practices of the school heads and stakeholders' commitment in schools' delivery of services?

This study proposed Integrated Leadership–Commitment–Service Delivery Model assumes that school heads' leadership practices encompassing planning, policy implementation, learning environment management, communication, stakeholder engagement, and organizational management directly and indirectly influence school service delivery outcomes through stakeholder commitment. Grounded in Transformational Leadership, leadership behaviors such as vision-setting, motivation, and recognition enhance stakeholders' emotional and professional commitment. Drawing from Distributed Leadership, participatory and shared decision-making processes further strengthen stakeholders' sense of ownership and accountability. Consistent with Stakeholder Theory, inclusive and responsive leadership fosters trust and sustained engagement among diverse stakeholder groups. The model therefore posits that effective leadership practices positively influence stakeholder commitment, which in turn improves school service delivery outcomes, while leadership also exerts a direct effect on service performance.

METHODOLOGY

This study utilized a quantitative method using a descriptive-comparative research design. Descriptive methods were used to determine the leadership practices of the school heads and stakeholders commitment in school's delivery of services along school planning and implementation, policy implementation and review, learner discipline, management of diverse relationships, management of school organizations, communications, rewards and recognition mechanisms, and community engagement and the level of commitment of the school stakeholders in the delivery of school services along aforementioned variables. Comparative methods, specifically the Kruskal-Wallis H test, were utilized to determine significant differences between the leadership practices and commitment of the school stakeholders in the delivery of school services.

The respondents of this study were composed of 16 public elementary school heads in Jose Panganiban West and East District holding a permanent plantilla position in the Division of Camarines Norte, 16 faculty (teachers)

presidents with a permanent teaching plantilla position in the DepEd Division of Camarines Norte, 14 school parent-teacher association presidents, and 12 chairpersons of the committee on education for school year 2024-2025. The researcher utilized survey questionnaire wherein were adopted in DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020. As to challenges, the indicators were subjected to reliability and validity test using Cronbach Alpha with a result of .732 which means that the indicators were reliable and valid.

Along leadership practices of the school heads in terms of school planning and implementation, policy implementation and review, learning environment, learner discipline, and management of diverse relationships, management of school organizations, communications, rewards and recognition mechanisms, and community engagement and level of commitment of the school stakeholders in the delivery of school services- weighted mean was employed. Kruskal-Wallis H test was employed to determine significant difference between the leadership practices and commitment of the school stakeholders in the delivery of school services Meanwhile, frequency count and percentage techniques were used to quantify the challenges encountered by the school heads in influencing stakeholders’ commitment in school’s delivery of services

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This part presents the results of the data analysis in response to the problems covered by this study.

Leadership Practices of the School Heads

School Planning and Implementation. Table 1 presented the leadership practices of the school heads along school planning and implementation. The findings of the study reveal a generally strong performance of school heads in terms of school planning and implementation. Based on the responses of school heads (SH), teachers (T), parents (P), and committee on education chairpersons (CE), the data indicate very high often perfect perceptions of competence, particularly in the first three indicators such as demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the phases of development and implementation of school plans aligned with the institutional goals and policies, developing and implementing with the planning team school plans aligned with institutional goals and policies and engaging the school community in the development and implementation of school plans aligned with the institutional goals and policies.

Table 1 Leadership Practices of the School Heads Along School Planning and Implementation

Indicators	SH (16)		T (16)		P (14)		CE (12)	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the phases of development and implementation of school plans aligned with the institutional goals and policies.	16	100	16	100	14	100	12	100
Develop and implement with the planning team school plans aligned with institutional goals and policies.	16	100	16	100	14	100	12	100
Engage the school community in the development and implementation of school plans aligned with the institutional goals and policies.	16	100	16	100	14	100	12	100



Share with fellow school heads best practice in the development and implementation of school plans aligned with the institutional goals and policies.	5	31.25	5	31.25	6	42.9	6	50
---	---	-------	---	-------	---	------	---	----

However, a notable weakness emerges in the fourth indicator, relating to the sharing of best practices with fellow school heads. Across all respondent groups, 100% affirmed that school heads demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the phases of school plan development and implementation, develop and implement school plans with a planning team, and engage the school community in these processes. These consistently high ratings indicate that school heads are perceived to be highly competent, collaborative, and aligned with institutional goals and policies.

Meanwhile, the fourth indicator "share with fellow school heads best practice in the development and implementation of school plans aligned with institutional goals and policies" garnered significantly lower agreement across all groups with 31.25% (SH and T), 42.9% (P), and 50% (CE). This significant difference revealed a critical gap in leadership behavior: school heads may have been performing well within their schools but were not widely perceived as engaging in peer-to-peer collaboration or dissemination of effective practices.

Based on the semi-structured interviews, several Committee on Education chairpersons noted that sharing best practices among school heads happens only occasionally. They expressed that when innovative strategies and experiences are not widely communicated across schools, they often feel less informed and less able to actively support initiatives. As a result, their involvement tends to be more cautious, reflecting a focus on internal school processes rather than district-wide collaboration, which limits their sense of collective responsibility in promoting school improvement.

Policy Implementation and Review. Table 2 presented the leadership practices of the school heads along policy implementation and review. The findings reveal a strong consensus among school heads (SH), teachers (T), parents (P), and the committee on education chairpersons (CE) that school heads demonstrate exemplary leadership in the knowledge, implementation, and stakeholder engagement aspects of policy implementation and review. Specifically, all respondents (100%) across the four groups agreed that school heads demonstrate knowledge and understanding of policy implementation and review to ensure that school operations align with national and local laws, regulations, and issuances, undertake the actual implementation and review of policies to maintain this alignment within their schools and engage stakeholders actively in improving the implementation of reviewed policies. This unanimous affirmation shows that school heads apply regulatory knowledge effectively while promoting inclusive, participatory leadership. The engagement of teachers, parents, and education committees in policy reviews reflects a collaborative culture essential for legitimacy and compliance.

Table 2 Leadership Practices of the School Heads Along Policy Implementation and Review

Indicators	SH (16)		T (16)		P (14)		CE (12)	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of policy implementation and review to ensure that school operations are consistent with national and local laws, regulations, and issuances.	16	100	16	100	14	100	12	100
Undertake policy implementation and review in the school to ensure that operations are consistent with national and local laws, regulations, and issuances.	16	100	16	100	14	100	12	100

Engage stakeholders in improving the implementation of reviewed policies to ensure consistency of school operations with national and local laws, regulations, and issuances.	16	100	16	100	14	100	12	100
Recommend to higher authorities the enhancement of policies relevant to school operations based in implementation and review.	11	68.75	10	62.5	10	71.4	8	67

However, the data revealed a notable decline in the fourth indicator, recommendation of policy enhancements to higher authorities, with positive responses ranged from 62.5% (teachers) to 71.4% (parents). In the context of this present study, while school heads excelled in internal policy implementation and review, they were perceived as less consistently engaged in advocating for policy changes at higher levels of governance. This discrepancy highlighted an important gap between policy compliance and policy influence. These results were supported by Hernandez et al., (2023) that providing leadership training focused on policy advocacy could have enhanced the responsiveness and adaptability of educational policies and empower school heads not only as implementers but also as contributors to policy development. Thus, in the locale of the study, school heads and teachers were provided series of capability building activities improving and or enhancing their competencies along policy implementation and review.

Based on the semi-structured interviews, several Committee on Education chairpersons noted that while school heads demonstrate thorough knowledge and consistently engage stakeholders in policy implementation and review, fewer schools actively recommend policy enhancements to higher authorities. CE members shared that this limited upward communication makes it challenging for them to advocate or provide feedback on policy improvements, which can reduce their active participation and influence in shaping school operations. They explained that without regular recommendations or insights from schools, their role often becomes more observational than collaborative, limiting opportunities to contribute meaningfully to policy development.

Learning Environment. Table 3 presented the leadership practices of the school heads along learning environment. As can be seen from the Table 3, all respondents (100%) of school heads, teachers, parents, and committee on education chairpersons affirmed that school heads demonstrate understanding of managing a learner-friendly, inclusive, and healthy learning environment, actively manage such an environment in their respective schools and engage the wider school community in maintaining these conditions. These findings demonstrate that school heads are perceived not only as knowledgeable but also as active facilitators and managers of school environments that promote inclusivity, safety, and well-being. Importantly, this includes both the physical safety of the learning space and the psychosocial climate that supports learning for all.

Table 3 Leadership Practices of the School Heads Along Learning Environment

Indicator	SH (16)		T (16)		P (14)		CE (12)	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Demonstrate understanding of managing a learner-friendly, inclusive and healthy learning environment.	16	100	16	100	14	100	12	100
Manage a learner-friendly inclusive and healthy environment.	16	100	16	100	14	100	12	100
Engage the wider school community in maintaining a learner-friendly, inclusive, and healthy learning environment.	16	100	16	100	14	100	12	100

Empower the wider school community in promoting and sustaining a learner-friendly, inclusive, and healthy learning environment.	16	100	16	100	6	42.9	6	50
---	----	-----	----	-----	---	------	---	----

The fourth indicator “empower the wider school community in promoting and sustaining a learner-friendly, inclusive and healthy learning environment” reveals a significant decline in positive responses from parents with 42.9%, committee on education chairperson with only 50%. This result suggests that while school heads and teachers perceive efforts to empower the school community as strong and sufficient, parents and community leaders feel less engaged or empowered in sustaining the school’s learning environment. This discrepancy may indicate that school heads are successfully involving the community in activities but may fall short of truly empowering them, meaning giving them shared ownership, decision-making roles, or sustained leadership in school initiatives.

Based on the semi-structured interviews, Committee on Education chairpersons acknowledged that school heads consistently understand, manage, and involve the school community in maintaining a learner-friendly, inclusive, and healthy environment. However, they noted that empowering the wider community to actively promote and sustain this environment occurs less frequently, with only about half of the CE respondents observing such initiatives. CE members explained that while schools effectively implement inclusive practices internally, broader community empowerment is limited, which reduces opportunities for stakeholders to take ownership and support long-term sustainability of the learning environment.

Learner Discipline. Table 4 presented the leadership practices of the school heads along learner discipline. Learner discipline remains one of the most critical components of effective school leadership, as it directly impacts student behavior, school climate, and overall academic achievement. Based on the findings from the survey, school heads are universally perceived as exemplary in leading all aspects of learner discipline, with 100% positive responses from all four respondent groups, school heads, teachers, parents, and the committee on education, across all four indicators.

All respondents agreed that school heads demonstrate full knowledge and understanding of national and local policies related to learner discipline. This reflects the school heads’ strong grasp of Department of Education (DepEd) issuances, such as DepEd Order No. 40, s. 2012 (Child Protection Policy) and other relevant legal frameworks that guide student conduct and due process in the school setting. Such a result confirms that school leaders are not only compliant with formal policies but are also well-informed interpreters and communicators of discipline-related policies, an essential foundation for fair and consistent implementation.

Table 4 Leadership Practices of the School Heads Along Learner Discipline

Indicators	SH (16)		T (16)		P (14)		CE (12)	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of existing national and local policies related to learner discipline.	16	100	16	100	14	100	12	100
Implement learner discipline policies that are developed collaboratively with stakeholders including parents, school personnel and the community.	16	100	16	100	14	100	12	100
Ensure that learner discipline policies developed with stakeholders are integrated into various school processes and are applied consistently at all times, by all school personnel at all levels.	16	100	16	100	14	100	12	100

Lead concerted efforts among stakeholders to develop and implement effective learner discipline policies to support student growth and whole school improvements.	16	100	16	100	14	100	12	100
---	----	-----	----	-----	----	-----	----	-----

This level of understanding is critical to protecting students' rights while promoting accountability and respect within the school. This finding was supported by Sittar et al., (2022), that leadership training is important in strengthening school heads' understanding of national policy frameworks to ensure proper implementation at the school level and that well-trained school leaders are more effective in applying discipline policies fairly and consistently.

Management of Diverse Relationships. Table 5 presented the leadership practices of the school heads along management of diverse relationships. The findings reveal that all respondent groups (100%) agreed that school heads demonstrate strong interpersonal skills in engaging with authorities, colleagues, parents, and other community members. This includes the ability to communicate clearly, mediate conflicts, encourage collaboration, and inspire shared commitment to learner success. Such a result reflects the school heads' capacity to model professional conduct and inclusive communication, creating an atmosphere of trust and cooperation. These interpersonal competencies are essential to fostering a culture of collaboration and psychological safety within schools, which has been strongly correlated with higher learner engagement and performance (Huber & Pruitt, 2024).

Table 5 Leadership Practices of the School Heads Along Management of Diverse Relationships

Indicators	SH (16)		T (16)		P (14)		CE (12)	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Demonstrate skills in dealing with authorities, colleagues, parents, and other stakeholders to encourage an enabling and supportive environment for learners.	16	100	16	100	14	100	12	100
Build constructive relationships with colleagues, parents, and other stakeholders to foster an enabling and supportive environment for learners.	16	100	16	100	14	100	12	100
Support school personnel in strengthening relationships with authorities, colleagues, parents, and other stakeholders to maintain an enabling and supportive environment for learners.	16	100	16	100	14	100	12	100
Exhibit exemplary skills in strengthening relationships with authorities, colleagues, parents, and other stakeholders to sustain an enabling and supportive environment for learners.	16	100	16	100	14	100	12	100

Relationship-building extends beyond cordiality to fostering trust, mutual respect, and shared accountability. School heads are expected to cultivate relationships that advance school goals while supporting the well-being of learners and staff. This finding aligns with Eisenschmidt et al. (2024), who noted that transparent, respectful, and purposeful engagement by school leaders enhances cooperation and reduces conflict. Moreover, all respondents (100%) agreed that school heads actively support personnel in managing stakeholder relationships, promoting a culture of openness and collaboration. Likewise, unanimous agreement affirmed that school heads demonstrate exemplary skills in sustaining long-term partnerships, reflecting consistency, transparency, effective conflict resolution, and a strong long-term vision.

Management of School Organizations. Table 6 presented the leadership practices of the school heads along management of school organizations. The findings revealed that all respondent groups, 100% of school heads, teachers, parents, and committee on education chairpersons affirmed that school heads demonstrate a strong

understanding of policies and guidelines related to the management of school organizations. This includes DepEd orders and local issuances concerning the operation of student governments, teachers’ organizations, and PTAs. This indicates that school leaders are well-versed in the legal and regulatory frameworks that govern organizational operations in schools. Their knowledge ensures compliance with standards and promotes consistency in how these bodies function across the school system.

Table 6 Leadership Practices of the School Heads Along Management of School Organizations

Indicators	SH (16)		T (16)		P (14)		CE (12)	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of policies and guidelines on managing school organizations, such as learner organizations, faculty clubs and parent-teacher associations, in support of the attainment of institutional goals.	16	100	16	100	14	100	12	100
Manage school organizations, such as learner organizations, faculty clubs and parent teacher associations, by applying relevant policies and guidelines to support the attainment of institutional goals.	16	100	16	100	14	100	12	100
Evaluate the accomplishment of school organizations, such as learner organizations, faculty clubs and parent teacher associations, to determine their impact on the attainment of institutional goals.	6	37.5	6	37.5	6	42.9	6	50
Exhibit exemplary practice in managing school organizations, faculty clubs and parent teacher associations, to support the attainment of institutional goals.	12	75	10	62.5	7	50	7	58

Along indicator 2, all respondents (100%) agreed that school heads effectively apply relevant policies and guidelines in managing school organizations, reflecting strong procedural leadership and alignment of organizational activities with school goals. In contrast, Indicator 3 showed a notable decline, with only 37.5%–50% of respondents agreeing that school heads evaluate organizational accomplishments to assess their impact. This highlights a gap in monitoring and evaluation, suggesting that while implementation is strong, systematic outcome assessment remains limited. The fourth indicator reinforces this concern, as only 50%–75% of respondents agreed that school heads demonstrate exemplary practices in managing school organizations. This suggests that while basic functions are performed effectively, fewer school heads exhibit innovative, strategic, or transformational leadership. Stakeholders appear to expect stronger direction, deeper collaboration, and more initiatives through school organizations that directly support student achievement and community engagement.

Based on the semi-structured interviews, Committee on Education chairpersons observed that school heads demonstrate strong knowledge and application of policies in managing school organizations, such as learner organizations, faculty clubs, and parent-teacher associations. However, CE members noted that evaluating the accomplishments of these organizations occurs less consistently, with only half reporting regular assessment of their impact on institutional goals. They also mentioned that exemplary practices in managing these groups are observed in just over half of the cases, suggesting that while foundational management is solid, consistent monitoring and modeling of best practices are limited, which may affect stakeholders’ active engagement and the overall effectiveness of school organizations.

Communications. Table 7 presented the leadership practices of the school heads along communications. Remarkably, all four respondent groups 100% of school heads, teachers, parents, and committee on education

responded positively to all four communication-related indicators. This uniformity signals that school heads are perceived as highly competent, consistent, and exemplary communicators, both within and beyond the school setting.

Specifically, the first indicator assessed whether school heads demonstrate competent speaking, writing, and digital communication skills in their interactions with various stakeholders. Full agreement from all groups (100%) indicates that school heads are confident and capable communicators across multiple platforms ranging from face-to-face meetings and written correspondences to digital tools such as messaging apps, email, or online learning platforms. The second indicator builds on the first by evaluating whether school heads communicate effectively for the purpose of facilitating collaboration and support. Again, a perfect score from all stakeholders suggests that communication by school leaders is not merely functional, but also strategic, inclusive, and partnership oriented. This reflects a leadership style that prioritizes open dialogue, transparency, and community-building, all of which are essential for collective problem-solving and shared decision-making.

Table 7 Leadership Practices of the School Heads Along Communications

Indicators	SH (16)		T (16)		P (14)		CE (12)	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Demonstrate competent skills in speaking and writing, as well as in utilizing communication platforms, in communicating with teachers, learners, parents and other stakeholders.	16	100	16	100	14	100	12	100
Communicate effectively in speaking and in writing to teachers, learners, parents and other stakeholders, through positive use of communication platforms, to facilitate information sharing, collaboration and support.	16	100	16	100	14	100	12	100
Mentor school personnel in communicating effectively in speaking and in writing, as well as in the positive use of communication platforms, to facilitate information sharing, collaboration, and support.	16	100	16	100	14	100	12	100
Exhibit exemplary skills in communicating effectively in speaking and in writing to teachers, learners, parents and other stakeholders to facilitate information sharing, collaboration and support, and to ensure positive use of communication platforms within and beyond the school.	16	100	16	100	14	100	12	100

In the third indicator, respondents were asked whether school heads serve as mentors to school personnel, guiding them in improving their own communication skills. All stakeholders (100%) again affirmed this practice. This implies that communication is not just a personal strength of school heads but a distributed leadership function where school heads actively build the communication capacities of teachers and staff. The last indicator focused on whether school heads exhibit exemplary communication skills that promote not just collaboration but also positive school branding and community perception, both internally and externally. The unanimous 100% response confirms that school heads are not only effective communicators but also strategic leaders who use communication as a tool for advocacy, influence, and relationship-building beyond the school gates. This type of leadership characterized by clarity of vision, persuasive dialogue, and responsive messaging is essential in today’s context, where school heads must often engage with LGUs, NGOs, alumni associations, and other external partners. As confirmed by Banoğlu et al., (2025) exemplary school leaders recognize the communicative

aspects of their role as central to organizational success, influencing school climate, community support, and institutional trust.

Rewards and Recognition Mechanisms. Table 8 presented the leadership practices of the school heads along rewards and recognition mechanisms. The findings revealed that all respondents (100%) affirmed that school heads actively reward and recognize learners, school personnel, and other stakeholders for their exemplary performance and/or sustained support. This practice aligns with transformational leadership principles, which emphasize the importance of recognizing individual contributions as a way of building commitment and trust. As supported by De Guzman (2025), recognition practices enhance intrinsic motivation, especially when the acknowledgment is timely, sincere, and tied to clear goals. In the current study, the unanimous response across all groups suggests that this leadership competency is both visible and well-implemented.

Table 8 Leadership Practices of the School Heads Along Rewards and Recognition Mechanisms

Indicators	SH (16)		T (16)		P (14)		CE (12)	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Reward and recognize learners, school personnel and other stakeholders for exemplary performance and or support.	16	100	16	100	14	100	12	100
Implement a school rewards system to recognize and motivate learners, school personnel and other stakeholders for exemplary performance and or continued support.	16	100	16	100	14	100	12	100
Work with school personnel to encourage stakeholders to support the implementation of the school rewards system in recognizing and motivating learners, school personnel and other stakeholders to sustain exemplary performance and or continued support.	16	100	16	100	14	100	12	100
Institutionalize the implementation of the school rewards system with support from the wider school community in recognizing and motivating learners, school personnel and other stakeholders for sustained exemplary performance and/or continued support.	16	100	16	100	14	100	12	100

Similarly, in the second indicator, 100% of respondents confirmed that school heads implement formal rewards systems to recognize and motivate learners, school staff, and other stakeholders. This indicates that recognition is not treated as an ad hoc or informal activity, but rather, is institutionalized through a structured framework likely involving specific criteria, award categories, and ceremonial practices.

For the third indicator, it explores whether school heads work collaboratively with school personnel to implement the rewards system. Once again, 100% of respondents affirmed this, suggesting that the leadership approach is participatory and inclusive. Rather than imposing top-down decisions, school heads appear to involve teachers and other staff in shaping and executing recognition activities, which increases ownership and relevance. Finally, for the fourth indicator, it confirms that school heads have institutionalized the rewards system with support from the wider school community. The unanimous agreement across all stakeholder groups indicates that the rewards and recognition mechanisms are deeply embedded in the school culture and are supported by parents, community members, and local partners.

Community Engagement. Table 9 presented the leadership practices of the school heads along community engagement. The findings reveal an exceptionally strong performance by school heads in community engagement, as evidenced by unanimous positive responses (100%) from all stakeholder groups, school heads (SH), teachers (T), parents (P), and the committee on education chairpersons (CE) across all four key indicators.

Table 9 Leadership Practices of the School Heads Along Community Engagement

Indicators	SH (16)		T (16)		P (14)		CE (12)	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Involve the community, such as parents, alumni, authorities, industries, and other stakeholders, in school programs, projects and activities to gain support for learner development, as well as school and community improvement.	16	100	16	100	14	100	12	100
Initiate partnerships with the community, such as parents, alumni, authorities, industries, and other stakeholders, to strengthen support for learner development, as well as school community improvement.	16	100	16	100	14	100	12	100
Empower the community, such as parents, alumni, authorities, industries, and other stakeholders, to participate in addressing concerns on learner development, as well as school and community improvement.	16	100	16	100	14	100	12	100
Lead the community, including parents, alumni, authorities, industries and other stakeholders, in creating collaborative actions in solving complex issues on learner development, as well as school and community improvement.	16	100	16	100	14	100	12	100

All respondents affirmed that school heads actively engage diverse community members, such as parents, alumni, authorities, and industries, in school programs, ensuring broad support for learner development and school

improvement. This reflects collaborative leadership that promotes shared ownership and participatory governance, consistent with findings that strong community involvement enhances student outcomes and sustainability (Anderson-Butcher et al., 2022). Likewise, stakeholders confirmed that school heads proactively initiate community partnerships, demonstrating strategic leadership in expanding resources and networks. By linking schools with industries, civic groups, and government units, school heads strengthen learning opportunities and community integration, aligning with the “boundary-spanning” role of effective 21st-century school leaders (Lansing et al., 2023).

The third indicator showed unanimous agreement that school heads effectively empower community stakeholders to participate in decision-making and collective problem-solving, reflecting distributed leadership and community-based management that foster trust and innovation (Lansing et al., 2023). Likewise, the final indicator revealed 100% agreement that school heads successfully mobilize communities through collaborative action to address learner development and school improvement, indicating strong trust, shared vision, and effective community leadership (Paulus & Zakso, 2024).

Level of Commitment of the School Stakeholders in the Delivery of School Services

School Planning and Implementation. As can be seen from Table 10, the indicator with the highest weighted

mean was teachers demonstrated a very high level of commitment in understanding how school plans are developed and aligned with school goals with a weighted mean of 4.63.

Table 10 Level of Commitment of the School Stakeholders in the Delivery of School Services along School Planning and Implementation

Indicators	Teachers		Parents		Comm. Educ	
	WM	Int.	WM	Int.	WM	Int.
Understanding how school plans are developed and aligned with the school's goals and policies.	4.63	VHC	3.64	HC	2.08	SC
Contribute to the development and support the implementation of our school plans.	4.38	VHC	3.00	MC	2.25	SC
Participate in activities that engage the school community in the planning and implementation of school goals.	4.25	VHC	3.21	MC	3.17	MC
Sharing and applying effective classroom strategies that support school plans and goals.	3.50	VHC	3.36	MC	2.17	SC
Overall Weighted Mean	4.19	HC	3.30	MC	2.42	SC

Rating Scale	Descriptive Interpretation	
4.20 – 5.00	Very Highly Committed	(VHC)
3.40 – 4.19	Highly Committed	(HC)
2.60 – 3.39	Moderately Committed	(MC)
1.80 – 2.59	Slightly Committed	(SC)
1.00 – 1.79	Not at all Committed	(NAAC)

Meanwhile, the indicator with the lowest weighted mean was their commitment to sharing and applying effective classroom strategies to support school plans and goals was also high with a weighted mean of 3.50. The overall weighted mean of 4.19 indicates that teachers are highly committed to school planning and implementation. As to the responses of the parents, they exhibited a moderate level of commitment, with an overall weighted mean of 3.30. The indicator with the highest weighted mean was commitment in understanding how school plans are developed and aligned with school goals with a weighted mean of 3.64, but their commitment decreased in contributing to the development and support of school plans with a weighted mean of 3.00.

As to the responses of the committee on education chairpersons, they demonstrated a slightly committed level, with an overall weighted mean of 2.42. The indicator with the highest weighted mean was their commitment in participating in activities that engage the school community in planning and implementation with a weighted mean of 3.17 while understanding how school plans are developed and aligned with the school’s goals and policies with a weighted mean of 2.08 interpreted as slightly committed.

Based on the semi-structured interviews, Committee on Education chairpersons reported low commitment to school planning and implementation, with limited understanding of how plans are developed and minimal participation in supporting or applying school goals. They explained that their engagement is often constrained

by competing responsibilities, unclear role expectations, and infrequent opportunities to contribute meaningfully to planning activities. As a result, while they express willingness to support schools, their actual involvement remains low, reflecting structural and contextual barriers that limit active participation in the planning process.

Policy Implementation and Review. Table 11 shows that teachers demonstrated outstanding commitment to policy implementation and review, with a very high overall weighted mean of 4.55. Their strongest area was understanding school policies and their alignment with national and local regulations, with a weighted mean of 4.63.

Table 11 Level of Commitment of the School Stakeholders in the Delivery of School Services along Policy Implementation and Review

Indicators	Teachers		Parents		Comm. Educ	
	WM	Int.	WM	Int.	WM	Int.
Understanding the key school policies and how they relate to national and local regulations.	4.63	VHC	2.71	MC	2.50	SC
Following and supporting the implementation of school policies in my professional duties.	5.00	VHC	4.14	HC	2.58	SC
Giving input during the review of school policies and discuss them with colleagues and leaders.	4.06	HC	3.00	MC	2.25	SC
Sharing feedback on school policies to help improve their effectiveness.	4.50	VHC	3.21	MC	2.33	SC
Overall Weighted Mean	4.55	VHS	3.27	MC	2.42	SC

Rating Scale	Descriptive Interpretation	
4.20 – 5.00	Very Highly Committed	(VHC)
3.40 – 4.19	Highly Committed	(HC)
2.60 – 3.39	Moderately Committed	(MC)
1.80 – 2.59	Slightly Committed	(SC)
1.00 – 1.79	Not at all Committed	(NAAC)

Meanwhile, participation in policy review and discussions, though slightly lower, remained high with a weighted mean of 4.06. These findings indicate strong policy knowledge and compliance but suggest the need to further encourage collaborative engagement in policy review. This aligns with Smith and Brown (2023), who emphasized that teacher involvement in policy processes enhances compliance, effectiveness, and responsive school governance.

For parents, the overall commitment to policy implementation and review was moderate, with a weighted mean of 3.27. Their highest commitment was in supporting policy implementation through collaboration (4.14, highly committed), indicating willingness to engage when informed, while their lowest was understanding school policies and their alignment with broader regulations (2.71, moderately committed). Committee on Education

chairpersons showed slight commitment, with an overall weighted mean of 2.42. Their highest rating was support in implementing policies (2.58, slightly committed), and the lowest was participation in policy review (2.25, slightly committed). These findings align with Kumar and Lee (2023), who noted that external governance bodies often have limited engagement in policy implementation without systematic strategies, highlighting the need for structured communication and capacity-building initiatives.

Based on the semi-structured interviews, Committee on Education chairpersons reported low commitment to policy implementation and review, reflected in their limited understanding of key school policies and minimal participation in supporting or providing feedback on policy processes. They explained that their engagement is constrained by limited involvement in decision-making, unclear expectations of their advisory role, and competing responsibilities outside the school context. As a result, despite recognizing the importance of school policies, CE chairpersons’ actual contribution to policy review and improvement remains low, highlighting a gap between expressed willingness and active participation in shaping school operations.

Learning Environment. Table 12 presented the level of commitment of the school stakeholders in the delivery of school services along learning environment. For the group of teachers, they demonstrated a strong commitment to fostering inclusive, healthy, and supportive learning environments, with an overall weighted mean of 4.17, which corresponds to a highly committed interpretation.

Table 12 Level of Commitment of the School Stakeholders in the Delivery of School Services along Learning Environment

Indicator	Teachers		Parents		Comm. Educ	
	WM	Int.	WM	Int.	WM	Int.
Understanding how to create an inclusive, healthy, and supportive environment for all learners.	4.63	VHC	4.00	HC	2.25	SC
Applying strategies and routines that support a safe and inclusive learning environment.	4.00	HC	2.43	SC	1.58	NAC
Engaging parents and community members in classroom or school activities that promote learner well-being.	4.31	VHC	4.14	HC	3.25	MC
Helping build the capacity of the school community to support and maintain inclusive and healthy learning spaces.	3.75	HC	2.43	SC	3.17	MC
Overall Weighted Mean	4.17	HC	3.25	MC	2.56	SC

Rating Scale	Descriptive Interpretation	
4.20 – 5.00	Very Highly Committed	(VHC)
3.40 – 4.19	Highly Committed	(HC)
2.60 – 3.39	Moderately Committed	(MC)
1.80 – 2.59	Slightly Committed	(SC)
1.00 – 1.79	Not at all Committed	(NAAC)

Specifically, the indicator with the highest weighted mean was understanding how to create an inclusive, healthy, and supported environment for all learners with a weighted mean of 4.63 interpreted as very highly committed. Meanwhile, the indicator with the lowest weighted mean was helping build the capacity of the school community to support and maintain these environments with 3.75 interpreted as highly committed.

For the group of parents, they exhibited a moderate level of commitment, with an overall weighted mean of 3.25, reflecting fair participation in fostering inclusive and healthy learning environments. Their highest commitment was engaging in school activities that promote learner well-being (4.14, highly committed), while their lowest was applying strategies to maintain a safe and inclusive learning environment and building community capacity (2.43, slightly committed). This suggests that parents are willing to participate in school-led initiatives but are less involved in implementing inclusive practices at home or contributing to wider community efforts. This finding was supported by Barce (2025) who found that parental involvement in school wellness initiatives is often hindered by limited access to resources and insufficient communication from schools regarding their roles.

For the group of Committee on Education chairpersons demonstrated the lowest level of commitment, with an overall weighted mean of 2.56, interpreted as slightly committed. Their highest engagement was in activities promoting learner well-being (3.25, moderately committed), while the lowest was in applying strategies to support a safe and inclusive learning environment (1.58, not at all committed). This low commitment may reflect unclear mandates or insufficient training, consistent with Patel and Martinez (2022), who noted that external education committees often struggle to engage effectively without explicit roles in policy advocacy and community mobilization.

Based on the semi-structured interviews, Committee on Education chairpersons reported low commitment to supporting the learning environment, with minimal understanding and participation in creating inclusive, healthy, and supportive spaces for learners. They noted that they rarely engage in classroom or school activities and have limited involvement in helping build the capacity of the school community to sustain such environments. CE chairpersons explained that competing responsibilities, lack of clear guidance on their role, and limited opportunities to participate contribute to their low engagement, resulting in a gap between their willingness to support schools and their actual contributions to fostering a learner-friendly environment.

Learner Discipline. As can be gleaned from the Table 13, the findings reveal significant variations, highlighting both strengths and areas that require attention. For the group of teachers, they show a very high level of commitment in all aspects of learner discipline, with an overall weighted mean of 4.80, corresponding to a “very highly committed” interpretation.

Table 13 Level of Commitment of the School Stakeholders in the Delivery of School Services along Learner Discipline

Indicator	Teachers		Parents		Comm. Educ	
	WM	Int.	WM	Int.	WM	Int.
Familiarizing the national and local policies related to learner discipline.	4.56	VHC	4.14	HC	3.25	MC
Help implement discipline policies that were created with stakeholder participation.	5.00	VHC	3.00	MC	3.42	HC
Consistently apply school discipline policies in my classroom and other school settings.	5.00	VHC	2.57	MC	1.33	NAC



Contribute to discussions and efforts that enhance learner discipline across the school.	4.63	VHC	4.43	VHC	2.25	SC
Overall Weighted Mean	4.80	VHC	3.54	HC	2.56	SC

Rating Scale	Descriptive Interpretation	
4.20 – 5.00	Very Highly Committed	(VHC)
3.40 – 4.19	Highly Committed	(HC)
2.60 – 3.39	Moderately Committed	(MC)
1.80 – 2.59	Slightly Committed	(SC)
1.00 – 1.79	Not at all Committed	(NAAC)

They actively help implement these policies, especially those developed collaboratively with stakeholders and consistently apply discipline policies in classroom and school-wide settings with a weighted mean of 5.00 interpreted as very highly committed, respectively. Meanwhile, the indicator with the lowest weighted mean was familiarizing the national and local policies related to learner discipline with a weighted mean of 4.56 interpreted as very highly committed.

As to the responses of the parents, it indicates a high level of commitment overall, with an overall weighted mean of 3.54, interpreted as “highly committed.” Specifically, the indicator with the highest weighted mean was they contribute actively to discussions aimed at improving discipline within the school with a weighted mean of 4.43 indicating a willingness to participate in governance and support roles. Meanwhile, the indicator with the lowest weighted mean was consistently apply school discipline policies in classroom and other school setting with a weighted mean of 2.57 interpreted as moderately committed.

The findings suggest that parents are highly committed to supporting learner discipline through active participation in school discussions and governance. However, their lower consistency in applying discipline policies at home or in school settings indicates a gap between involvement in planning and practical enforcement highlighting the need for guidance and support to strengthen home–school collaboration in promoting student accountability.

For the Committee on Education chairpersons, the data showed the lowest commitment to learner discipline, with an overall weighted mean of 2.56, interpreted as slightly committed. Their highest engagement was supporting the implementation of collaboratively developed discipline policies (3.42, highly committed), while their lowest was consistently applying these policies in practice (1.33, not at all committed). This finding was supported by Jackson and Patel (2023), who observed that external committees often have unclear roles in discipline enforcement, limiting their effectiveness unless integrated into school leadership structures. Enhancing committee on education chairperson’s role through clearer mandates and capacity building could improve their commitment and contribution.

Based on the semi-structured interviews, Committee on Education chairpersons reported low commitment to learner discipline, with limited familiarity with school policies and minimal involvement in applying or supporting discipline initiatives. They noted that, although they recognize the importance of contributing to discussions or policy implementation, their engagement is hindered by unclear role expectations, competing responsibilities, and infrequent opportunities to participate in school-level discipline efforts. Consequently,

while CE chairpersons express willingness to support schools, their actual participation in promoting and sustaining learner discipline remains low.

Management of Diverse Relationships. Table 14 shows that teachers demonstrate very high commitment to professional relationships. Their highest-rated indicator was showing respect and effective communication with school leaders, colleagues, parents, and stakeholders (5.00, very highly committed), while their lowest was collaborating with colleagues and families to support learning (4.50, very highly committed). These findings indicate strong interpersonal skills that foster a positive school climate, though there is room to further enhance collaborative efforts to provide a more cohesive and supportive learning environment.

Table 14 Level of Commitment of the School Stakeholders in the Delivery of School Services along Management of Diverse Relationships

Indicators	Teachers		Parents		Comm. Educ	
	WM	Int.	WM	Int.	WM	Int.
Demonstrate respect and effective communication when engaging with school leaders, colleagues, parents, and other stakeholders.	5.00	VHC	5.00	VHC	4.17	HC
Working collaboratively with colleagues and families to provide a supportive learning environment.	4.50	VHC	4.14	HC	3.50	HC
Assisting fellow staff in maintaining positive relationships with students, parents, and school leaders.	4.75	VHC	4.29	VHC	3.33	MC
Modeling respectful and inclusive behavior when dealing with the school community.	4.88	VHC	5.00	VHC	3.58	HC
Overall Weighted Mean	4.78	VHC	4.61	VHC	3.65	HC

Rating Scale	Descriptive Interpretation	
4.20 – 5.00	Very Highly Committed	(VHC)
3.40 – 4.19	Highly Committed	(HC)
2.60 – 3.39	Moderately Committed	(MC)
1.80 – 2.59	Slightly Committed	(SC)
1.00 – 1.79	Not at all Committed	(NAAC)

For parents, the highest-rated indicators were demonstrating respect and effective communication with school stakeholders and modeling respectful, inclusive behavior, both with a weighted mean of 5.00, interpreted as very highly committed. Their lowest-rated indicator was collaborating with colleagues and families to support learning, with a weighted mean of 4.14, interpreted as highly committed. For Committee on Education chairpersons, the highest-rated indicator was demonstrating respect and effective communication with school leaders, colleagues, parents, and stakeholders, with a weighted mean of 4.17, interpreted as highly committed. The lowest-rated indicator was assisting staff in maintaining positive relationships with students, parents, and school leaders, with a weighted mean of 3.33, interpreted as moderately committed.

Based on the semi-structured interviews, Committee on Education chairpersons demonstrated moderate commitment to managing diverse relationships, with an overall weighted mean of 3.65 (high commitment only in some areas). They reported engaging respectfully with school leaders and stakeholders but noted that their collaboration with staff and active support in maintaining positive relationships is less consistent. CE chairpersons explained that while they value respectful and inclusive interactions, their limited time, competing responsibilities, and unclear guidance on their role in relationship management constrain deeper, sustained involvement across the school community.

This level of commitment was supported by Lee and Garcia (2023) indicating that external committees or advisory bodies often engage at a supportive level but may lack the direct involvement of teachers and parents in daily school interactions. Strengthening the CE’s role through clearer engagement protocols and capacity-building may enhance their contributions to relationship management. Management of School Organizations. As revealed in Table 15, the group of teachers demonstrate a very high level of commitment with an overall weighted mean of 4.33, indicating strong commitment in managing school organizations.

Table 15 Level of Commitment of the School Stakeholders in the Delivery of School Services along Management of School Organizations

Indicators	Teachers		Parents		Comm. Educ	
	WM	Int.	WM	Int.	WM	Int.
Awareness of the policies governing school organizations like student councils, faculty clubs, and PTAs.	5.00	VHC	5.00	VHC	2.92	MC
Help manage or support the operation of school organizations in line with school policies.	4.25	VHC	3.43	HC	2.25	SC
Reflect on and provide input regarding the impact of school organizations on achieving school goals.	4.13	HC	3.14	MC	2.75	MC
Actively contribute to the effective functioning of school organizations to enhance student and school outcomes.	3.94	HC	3.71	HC	4.42	VHC
Overall Weighted Mean	4.33	VHC	3.82	HC	3.08	MC

Rating Scale	Descriptive Interpretation	
4.20 – 5.00	Very Highly Committed	(VHC)
3.40 – 4.19	Highly Committed	(HC)
2.60 – 3.39	Moderately Committed	(MC)
1.80 – 2.59	Slightly Committed	(SC)
1.00 – 1.79	Not at all Committed	(NAAC)

Specifically, the indicator with the highest weighted mean was awareness of the policies governing school organizations like student councils, faculty clubs, and PTAs with a weighted mean of 5.00 interpreted as very highly committed while the indicator with the lowest weighted mean was actively contribute to the effective functioning of school organizations to enhance student and school outcomes with a weighted mean of 3.94 interpreted as highly committed.

For the group of parents, they show a high level of commitment with an overall average weighted mean of 3.82. They are fully aware of policies governing school organizations with a weighted mean of 5.00, reflecting a strong foundational understanding. However, parents also provide moderate input on the effectiveness of these organizations with a weighted mean of 3.14 interpreted as moderately committed. For the group of the committee on education chairpersons, it shows moderate commitment with an overall weighted mean of 3.08. Specifically, the indicator with the highest weighted mean was actively contributing to the effective functioning of school organizations with a weighted mean of 4.42 interpreted as very highly committed while the indicator with the lowest weighted mean was help manage or support the operation of school organizations in line with school policies with a weighted mean of 2.25 interpreted as slightly committed.

Based on the semi-structured interviews, Committee on Education chairpersons showed low to moderate commitment in managing school organizations. They reported limited awareness and involvement in supporting student councils, faculty clubs, and PTAs, and provided minimal input on the organizations’ impact on school goals. CE chairpersons explained that competing responsibilities, unclear expectations of their role, and infrequent opportunities to participate in organizational management contribute to their low engagement, even though they occasionally contribute to specific initiatives that enhance school outcomes.

The findings imply that Education Committee chairpersons in the locale of this study can contribute meaningfully to the functioning of school organizations when directly involved, as shown by their very high commitment in this area. However, their lower commitment to helping manage or support the operations of these organizations in alignment with school policies suggests a gap between active participation and policy-aligned leadership. This indicates the need for clearer guidance, stronger policy orientation, and capacity-building to ensure that their involvement not only supports organizational activities but also aligns with established guidelines and governance expectations.

Table 16 Level of Commitment of the School Stakeholders in the Delivery of School Services along Communications

Indicators	Teachers		Parents		Comm. Educ	
	WM	Int.	WM	Int.	WM	Int.
Using effective speaking, writing, and digital communication when interacting with learners, colleagues, parents, and stakeholders.	4.50	VHC	3.29	MC	2.33	SC
Communicate in a respectful and constructive manner using appropriate communication platforms to support learning and collaboration.	4.63	VHC	4.43	VHC	4.25	VHC
Help colleagues improve their communication skills and use of platforms when needed.	4.00	HC	2.86	MC	2.33	SC
Setting a good example in communicating clearly and positively with the school community.	5.00	VHC	4.57	VHC	3.75	HC
Overall Weighted Mean	4.53	VHC	3.79	HC	3.17	MC

Rating Scale	Descriptive Interpretation	
4.20 – 5.00	Very Highly Committed	(VHC)
3.40 – 4.19	Highly Committed	(HC)
2.60 – 3.39	Moderately Committed	(MC)
1.80 – 2.59	Slightly Committed	(SC)
1.00 – 1.79	Not at all Committed	(NAAC)

This finding was corroborated by Lee et al., (2023) highlighting that external education committees often face challenges in consistently engaging with school organizational structures due to limited access, competing priorities, or unclear mandates.

Communications. Table 16 shows that teachers demonstrate a very high level of commitment to communication, with an overall weighted mean of 4.53, using speaking, writing, and digital platforms effectively. Their highest-rated indicator was setting a positive example for the school community (5.00, very highly committed), while the lowest was helping colleagues improve their communication skills (4.00, highly committed). These findings suggest that teachers are strong communicators who model exemplary practices, though slightly less engaged in mentoring peers due to time constraints, workload, limited training, and lack of recognition. This aligns with Sofia, Sari, and Azizah (2023), who highlight the importance of effective communication in building trust, support, and enhanced teacher performance.

Parents demonstrated a high level of commitment to communication, with an overall weighted mean of 3.79. Their highest-rated indicator was setting a good example by communicating clearly and positively with the school community (4.57, very highly committed), while the lowest was helping others improve communication skills (2.86, moderately committed). These findings suggest that parents actively model positive communication, supporting a respectful and collaborative environment, but are less involved in mentoring or collaborative communication. Factors such as limited knowledge, time constraints, perceived responsibility of school staff, lack of structured opportunities, and low confidence may explain this gap. This aligns with Cook (2024), who emphasizes that effective school-parent communication is critical for improving student outcomes.

Moreover, Committee on Education chairpersons demonstrated moderate commitment to communication, with an overall weighted mean of 3.17. They showed very high commitment in respectful and constructive communication (4.25), but were slightly committed in using effective communication methods, including digital platforms, and in helping colleagues improve these skills (2.33 each). These findings suggest that while they communicate respectfully, limited digital skills, time constraints, unclear role expectations, lack of training, and resistance to new methods reduce their engagement in modern, collaborative communication practices. This aligns with Smith (2023), who emphasizes the need for initiatives that strengthen family engagement and improve information sharing.

Based on the semi-structured interviews, Committee on Education chairpersons showed low to moderate commitment in school communications. They reported limited use of effective speaking, writing, and digital platforms to interact with the school community and minimal support in helping colleagues improve communication practices. CE chairpersons explained that their involvement in communication is constrained by unclear role expectations, limited opportunities to participate actively, and competing responsibilities, resulting in engagement that is more occasional than consistent, even though they recognize the importance of clear and constructive communication.

Rewards and Recognition Mechanisms. Table 17 presented the level of commitment of the school stakeholders in the delivery of school services along rewards and recognition mechanisms. Based on the Table, the group of

teachers emerged as the most committed group, with an average weighted mean of 4.72, indicating a very highly committed level across all indicators. Notably, teachers attained a perfect score of 5.00 on the indicator acknowledging and appreciating learners and colleagues for their achievements and contributions. This finding reflects teachers’ intrinsic motivation and professional dedication to fostering a positive school climate through recognition. Recognition motivates teachers intrinsically by validating their efforts, enhancing their sense of purpose, and reinforcing the meaningful impact of their work. It fosters personal satisfaction, professional pride, and continued dedication, driven by internal rewards rather than external incentives.

The lowest-rated indicator for teachers was supporting the implementation of the school rewards system to motivate positive behavior and performance, with a weighted mean of 4.50, interpreted as very highly committed. This suggests that while teachers strongly support the rewards system, there is still room to further enhance their involvement in recognizing and reinforcing positive behavior and performance. Moreover, Committee on Education chairpersons demonstrated a highly committed level of involvement, with an overall weighted mean of 4.08. Their highest-rated indicator was acknowledging and appreciating learners and colleagues (4.25, very highly committed), while the lowest was encouraging learners and parents to support school recognition programs (3.92, highly committed). These findings suggest that while they actively promote a positive school climate, there is room to strengthen community participation in recognition initiatives. Engaging students and parents more fully can enhance the impact of rewards programs and foster a culture of appreciation and motivation, consistent with Del Rosario et al. (2024), who highlighted that community involvement in recognition systems builds collaboration, ownership, and accountability.

Table 17 Level of Commitment of the School Stakeholders in the Delivery of School Services along Rewards and Recognition Mechanisms

Indicators	Teachers		Parents		Comm. Educ	
	WM	Int.	WM	Int.	WM	Int.
Acknowledging and appreciating learners and colleagues for their achievements and contributions.	5.00	VHC	2.57	SC	4.25	VHC
Support the implementation of the school rewards system to motivate positive behavior and performance.	4.50	VHC	2.43	SC	4.00	HC
Encourage learners and parents to support the school’s recognition programs.	4.63	VHC	3.00	MC	3.92	HC
Help promote a culture of recognition in school activities and classroom routines.	4.75	VHC	2.86	MC	4.17	HC
Overall Weighted Mean	4.72	VHC	2.71	MC	4.08	HC
Rating Scale	Descriptive Interpretation					
4.20 – 5.00	Very Highly Committed		(VHC)			
3.40 – 4.19	Highly Committed		(HC)			
2.60 – 3.39	Moderately Committed		(MC)			
1.80 – 2.59	Slightly Committed		(SC)			
1.00 – 1.79	Not at all Committed		(NAAC)			

In contrast, parents showed the lowest level of commitment, with an overall weighted mean of 2.71, interpreted as moderately committed. Their highest-rated indicator was encouraging learners and parents to support recognition programs (3.00, moderately committed), while the lowest was supporting the implementation of the school rewards system to motivate positive behavior and performance (2.43, slightly committed). This suggests limited parental involvement in reinforcing the school’s recognition initiatives.

Community Engagement. Table 18 presented the level of commitment of the school stakeholders in the delivery of school services along community engagement. As can be gleaned from the Table, the study reveals that group of teachers emerged as the most highly committed group, with an overall weighted mean of 4.59, interpreted as very highly committed. Their highest-rated indicator was involving parents and community stakeholders in class and school activities that support student growth (4.88), reflecting their active role in fostering inclusive and collaborative learning environments. The lowest-rated indicator was participation in broader school-community efforts to address learner and school challenges (4.25, very highly committed).

These findings indicate that teachers are strongly committed to engaging stakeholders for student growth, promoting shared responsibility and community ownership. Slightly lower engagement in broader community initiatives may stem from time constraints, heavy workloads, limited recognition, role perceptions, or insufficient training. This aligns with Bantilan et al. (2024), who noted that teacher commitment is enhanced in school cultures that value collaboration and inclusive practices, and that policies supporting teacher agency in stakeholder engagement further strengthen commitment.

Table 18 Level of Commitment of the School Stakeholders in the Delivery of School Services along Community Engagement

Indicators	Teachers		Parents		Comm. Educ	
	WM	Int.	WM	Int.	WM	Int.
Involving parents and community stakeholders in class and school activities that support student growth.	4.88	VHC	4.00	HC	3.92	HC)
Supporting efforts to build partnerships between the school and the community to enhance learning.	4.63	VHC	4.00	HC	4.25	VHC
Encourage parents and local stakeholders to contribute ideas and solutions for school improvement.	4.63	VHC	4.43	VHC	3.92	HC
Participate in school-community efforts aimed at addressing challenges in learner and school development.	4.25	VHC	4.57	VHC	4.17	HC
Overall Weighted Mean	4.59	VHC	4.25	VHC	4.06	HC

Rating Scale	Descriptive Interpretation	
4.20 – 5.00	Very Highly Committed	(VHC)
3.40 – 4.19	Highly Committed	(HC)
2.60 – 3.39	Moderately Committed	(MC)
1.80 – 2.59	Slightly Committed	(SC)
1.00 – 1.79	Not at all Committed	(NAAC)

Parents demonstrated a very highly committed level of engagement, with an overall weighted mean of 4.25. Their strongest involvement was in participating in school-community efforts to address learner and school development challenges (4.57). This suggests that parents are proactively invested in their children's success, motivated to support problem-solving initiatives, and engaged through structured opportunities provided by schools. Their participation reflects a co-partnership approach, contributing to both academic and non-academic aspects of school improvement.

The variation in parents' commitment levels, very high in community engagement but moderate in rewards and recognition can be explained by differences in perception, opportunity, and relevance of their involvement. Parents often participate actively in community engagement because these activities, such as school events, outreach programs, and volunteer initiatives, provide visible, tangible ways to support the school and their children. These activities are directly meaningful to parents, align with their sense of responsibility, and allow them to interact socially with teachers, staff, and other parents, which naturally encourages higher engagement.

In contrast, rewards and recognition mechanisms are often perceived as administrative or internal processes managed primarily by school heads and staff. Parents may have limited involvement in designing, implementing, or receiving recognition programs, making these activities less accessible or personally relevant. This lack of direct participation and visible impact can reduce their motivation and sense of ownership, resulting in a moderate level of commitment. Essentially, parents are more committed to activities where their contributions are evident and meaningful (community engagement) and less engaged in areas where roles are less defined or indirect (rewards and recognition).

Meanwhile, Committee on Education chairpersons exhibited a highly committed level of involvement, with an overall weighted mean of 4.06. Their highest-rated indicator was supporting school-community partnerships to enhance learning (4.25, very highly committed), while the lowest-rated indicators were involving parents and community stakeholders in class activities and encouraging them to contribute ideas for school improvement (3.92, highly committed).

These findings suggest that while Education Committee chairpersons actively foster partnerships, their direct engagement with parents and stakeholders is slightly lower, likely due to time constraints, a focus on policy over hands-on involvement, limited opportunities, reliance on teachers, and lack of facilitation training. This aligns with Cabarillos (2024), who noted that community stakeholder engagement is often project-based or invitation-dependent, and without formal structures and consistent communication, involvement may remain irregular despite willingness to contribute.

Difference in the Level of Commitment of the School Stakeholders in the Delivery of School Services when Respondents are Grouped

Table 19 presents the results of the Kruskal–Wallis H test on the level of commitment of school stakeholders in the delivery of good services when grouped as school heads, teachers, parents, and committee on education members. The results reveal that in all areas of commitment, the computed chi-square (χ^2) values yielded p-values less than .01, indicating statistically significant differences among the stakeholder groups. Specifically, significant differences were noted in the areas of school planning and implementation ($\chi^2 = 39.482$, $p = .000$), policy implementation and review ($\chi^2 = 45.776$, $p = .000$), learning environment ($\chi^2 = 40.911$, $p = .000$), and learner discipline ($\chi^2 = 44.870$, $p = .000$). Likewise, significant variations in responses were also observed in management of diverse relationships ($\chi^2 = 24.797$, $p = .000$), management of school organizations ($\chi^2 = 28.214$, $p = .000$), communications ($\chi^2 = 33.046$, $p = .000$), rewards and recognition mechanisms ($\chi^2 = 36.247$, $p = .000$), and community engagement ($\chi^2 = 12.912$, $p = .005$).

The findings suggest that stakeholders differ in how they perceive and demonstrate their level of commitment across the various dimensions of school service delivery. In the context of this present study, school heads may place greater emphasis on planning and policy review due to their leadership role, while teachers may be more concerned with classroom management, learning environment, and learner discipline. Parents and committee

members, on the other hand, may prioritize community engagement and recognition mechanisms. This aligns with Gulac (2023), who found that stakeholder involvement in strategic school planning increases commitment to policy implementation and overall performance, emphasizing the importance of engaging stakeholders beyond their traditional roles.

Table 19 Test for Significant Difference in the Level of Commitment of the School Stakeholders in the Delivery of School Services

Commitment	χ^2	p-value	df	Remarks
School planning and implementation	39.482	.000	3	Significant
Policy implementation and review	45.776	.000		Significant
Learning environment	40.911	.000		Significant
Learner Discipline	44.870	.000		Significant
Management of diverse relationships	24.797	.000		Significant
Management of school organizations	28.214	.000		Significant
Communications	33.046	.000		Significant
Rewards and recognition mechanism	36.247	.000		Significant
Community engagement	12.912	.005		Significant

p-value<.01 significant level

Another implication is that these role-based differences can lead to fragmentation in school planning and service delivery if not effectively addressed. Without a unified vision and collaborative decision-making processes, efforts may become disjointed. Cabanilla et al., (2024) support this concern that teacher commitment, where they emphasize the need for aligned goals among school actors to enhance overall performance. Their research suggests that strong teacher engagement in school initiatives is dependent on clear communication and a shared purpose with school leadership.

The findings emphasize the need for structured collaboration and inclusive communication among stakeholders. Schools should adopt participatory governance models that empower all groups to contribute meaningfully to school improvement, moving beyond mere consultation. This is supported by Inso-Anog et al. (2024), who found that teacher retention and job satisfaction improve when educators feel involved and valued in decision-making, showing that inclusive participation drives both commitment and stability. Additionally, capacity-building is crucial for areas where stakeholder involvement is weaker. For instance, parents may benefit from training in policy implementation or school management, while teachers may need support in community engagement strategies. Cadiong (2024) notes that professional commitment is closely linked to developing leadership skills, which can be nurtured across all stakeholder groups to enhance overall school performance and engagement.

Challenges Encountered by the School Heads in Influencing Stakeholders’ Commitment in School’s Delivery of Services

Table 20 presented the challenges faced by school heads in influencing stakeholders’ commitment in school’s delivery of services. Based on Table 20, the challenges with the highest rating were limited stakeholder involvement in policy review, low community involvement in school activities, difficulty in establishing

sustainable partnerships and community members not empowered to take initiative (100%). All respondents identified these as a critical challenge.

Table 20 Challenges Encountered by the School Heads in Influencing Stakeholders’ Commitment in School’s Delivery of Services

Indicators	f	%	Rank
Lack of collaboration within the planning team	10	62.50	11
2. Minimal stakeholder engagement	12	75.00	6.5
3. Limited stakeholder involvement in policy review	16	100	2.5
4.Lack of systematic feedback for policy enhancement	12	75.00	6.5
5.Engage the wider school community in maintaining a learner-friendly, inclusive and healthy learning environment.	10	62.50	11
6.Empower the wider school community in promoting and sustaining a learner-friendly, inclusive and healthy learning environment.	10	62.50	11
7.Limited stakeholder involvement in policy development	10	62.50	11
8.Weak stakeholder collaboration in sustaining discipline programs	12	75.00	6.5
9.Ineffective management and oversight of school organizations	10	62.50	11
10.Lack of monitoring and evaluation mechanisms	12	75.00	6.5
11.Limited proficiency in communication skills	5	31.25	14.5
12.Ineffective use of communication platforms	5	31.25	14.5
13.Low community involvement in school activities	16	100	2.5
14.Difficulty in establishing sustainable partnerships	16	100	2.5
15.Community members not empowered to take initiative	16	100	2.5

The finding on limited stakeholder involvement in policy review was supported by Rizvi and Lingard (2022) that inclusive policy review processes are crucial for ensuring that policies remain relevant and effective. Without regular input from all stakeholders, especially teachers, parents, and students, policies may fail to address the real issues facing the school community.

A key challenge identified was low community involvement in school activities, reported by all respondents. Community engagement is vital for supporting school programs and fostering local ownership and responsibility. Another significant challenge, also reported by 100% of respondents, is difficulty in establishing sustainable partnerships. School heads struggle to build long-term, mutually beneficial relationships that offer resources and opportunities. Nguyen and Nguyen (2023) highlight that such partnerships enhance school infrastructure and enrichment programs. Without them, schools may face challenges in adapting to new needs and accessing external expertise.



Another related challenge is empowering community members to take initiative, reported by 100% of respondents. Many school heads noted that community stakeholders are not sufficiently enabled to assume leadership roles or actively contribute to school improvement. Additionally, limited communication skills, affecting 31.25% of respondents, hinder clear and effective interactions between school heads, staff, and stakeholders. Effective communication is essential for building relationships, aligning goals, and ensuring understanding of policies and expectations. Similarly, 31.25% of respondents identified ineffective use of communication platforms as a challenge, further limiting information sharing and collaboration. As supported by Petre et al., (2025) schools must invest in and optimize digital communication platforms to reach a broader audience and foster better engagement. These findings imply the need for more inclusive, collaborative, and participatory approaches in school governance.

Intervention to Enhance Leadership Practices of the School Heads and Stakeholders' Commitment in Schools' Delivery of Services

An Action Plan entitled: Comprehensive Stakeholder and Community Development Plan was proposed to enhance school heads' leadership practices and strengthen stakeholder commitment in service delivery. The plan addresses gaps in collaboration, stakeholder engagement, policy support, community empowerment, organizational evaluation, and recognition, while also targeting areas where stakeholders' involvement is weaker, such as strategy application, policy implementation, reward systems, and organizational management. These interventions aim to foster greater engagement, shared accountability, and more effective school service delivery.

The proposed action plan aims to: (1) enhance school leadership through improved collaboration, community engagement, and organizational accountability, including peer learning, policy review, and organizational evaluation; (2) strengthen stakeholder commitment, particularly of parents and Committee on Education chairpersons, via capacity-building, structured participation, and formal roles in planning, discipline, and recognition; and (3) increase meaningful community involvement in school activities and policy review through partnerships, empowerment initiatives, and structured engagement. These recommendations align with Republic Act 9155 and DepEd Orders 73, s. 2012 and 24, s. 2020, emphasizing participatory governance and stakeholder collaboration.

With these, to enhance leadership practices and address challenges school heads face in engaging stakeholders in service delivery, the researcher proposed interventions in the form of an Action Plan entitled: Comprehensive Stakeholder and Community Development Plan. The use of this Action Plan may begin once it has been thoroughly evaluated by the Schools Division Office. Certain sections may still be revised following a consultative meeting with school administrators and division officials. After this, the schools may adopt the proposed interventions to enhance leadership practices and address the challenges encountered by the school heads in influencing stakeholders' commitment in schools' delivery of services.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions were arrived at: 1) School heads demonstrate strong leadership in planning, policy implementation, communication, and community engagement, but gaps remain in collaboration, stakeholder involvement, community empowerment, and performance evaluation. 2) Teachers show the highest commitment, parents moderate, and Committee on Education chairpersons limited but meaningful, indicating the need to strengthen engagement and collaborative practices. 3) Commitment levels vary significantly ($p < .01$) across planning, policy, learning environment, and discipline, highlighting the need for balanced collaboration and shared responsibility. 4) Key challenges include limited stakeholder involvement in policy review, low community participation, weak partnerships, insufficient empowerment, and gaps in communication and digital platform use. 5) An Action Plan of interventions was proposed to enhance leadership practices, improve stakeholder commitment, and promote more effective, inclusive, and sustainable school management.



RECOMMENDATION

The following recommendations to the area of research and development are hereby given: 1) establish regular forums, workshops, or learning circles for school heads, teachers, parents, and committee members to share best practices and innovations. 2) encourage active participation of all stakeholders in policy recommendation and review to ensure inclusiveness and responsiveness. 3) implement community empowerment initiatives such as volunteer programs, capacity-building sessions, and partnership projects. 4) create formal recognition programs to acknowledge outstanding leadership and stakeholder contributions. 5) use multiple communication platforms for open, consistent, and accessible information-sharing among stakeholders. 6) provide training on effective communication, conflict management, and digital engagement. 7) organize continuous training and workshops to develop leadership, teamwork, and participatory governance skills. 8) implement the proposed action plan after evaluation by the schools division office to guide enhanced stakeholder commitment. 9) encourage future research to expand scope, include diverse stakeholders, and evaluate intervention effectiveness.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The researcher would like to extend her deepest sincerest gratitude to all the people who helped him in any manner and who shared their knowledge to make this research a reality: her thesis adviser Annie Marmol-Dado, EdD, to the Dean of Graduate School, Sonia S. Carbonell, PhD for the guidance, patience and encouragement to pursue his research and for the feedback to continue and push through with her research; the panel chairman, Anicia S. Madarang, EdD, members, Jennifer S. Rubio, PhD and Shirly C. Dioneda, EdD, for the constructive criticism which allowed for a better version of her research.

REFERENCES

1. Leithwood, K., Harris, A., Hopkins, D., (2020) Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited,” *School Leadership & Management*, vol. 40, no. 1, pp. 5-22, 2020, doi: 10.1080/13632434.2019.1596077
2. Pont, B., Nusche, D., Moorman, B., (2008) *Improving school leadership, Volume 1: Policy and practice*. Australia: OECD Publications, 2008. <https://www.oecd.org/edu/school/44374889.pdf>
3. Fabelico, F. L., Aquino, C. J. C., & Afalla, B. T. (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>
4. Richardson, L. (2024). The role of educational leadership in enhancing student engagement and learning outcomes. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*, 28(S2), 1-2. Vol: 28 Issue: 2S. <https://www.abacademies.org/articles/the-role-of-educational-leadership-in-enhancing-student-engagement-and-learning-outcomes.pdf>
5. Mleczko, A. & Kington, A., (2025) *The Impact of School Leadership on Parental Engagement: A Study of Inclusion and Cohesion*. *International Research in Education*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5296/ire.v1i1.3844>
6. Wenger, E., McDermont, R., & Snyder, W. M. (2018). *Cultivating communities of practice*. Boston: Harvard University Business School Press. https://books.google.com.ph/books/about/Cultivating_Communities_of_Practice.html?id=m1xZuNq9RygC&redir_esc=y
7. Bilbao, P.P., Corpuz, B.B., Llagas, A.T., and Salandanan G.G. (2018). *The Teaching Profession* 2nd ed. Quezon City: Adriana Printing Co., Inc. https://books.google.com.ph/books/about/The_Teaching_Profession.html?id=v3v7vQEACAAJ&redir_esc=y
8. Nebor, J.N. (2017). *The Role of the Teacher in School community Relations*. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED287827> on March 4, 2024. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED287827.pdf>

9. Communtzis-Page, G. (2017). Critical issue: Creating the school climate and structures to support parent and family involvement. Appalachia Educational Laboratory & the North Central Regional Education Laboratory. <https://www.ncrel.com/>. Code of Ethics for Professional Teachers, Article III.
10. Henderson, A. T., & Mapp, K. L. (2019). A new wave of evidence: The impact of school, family, and community connections on student achievement. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED474521>
11. Republic Act No. 9155. Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001. <https://elibrary.judiciary.gov.ph/thebookshelf/showdocs/2/7353>
12. DepEd Order 40, s.2015 Guidelines on K to 12 Partnership <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2015/08/28/do-40-s-2015-guidelines-on-k-to-12-partnerships/>
13. DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020. National Adoption and Implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/DO_s2020_024-.pdf
14. Smith, J., & Williams, L. (2024). The Role of Stakeholder Engagement in Enhancing Educational Outcomes in South Africa. *Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan dan Pemikiran Islam* 2(2):155-163. DOI:10.71305/jmpi.v2i2.85
15. Hadijah, N., (2024). Stakeholder Engagement in Educational Policy Development *Eurasian Experiment Journal of Arts and Management (EEJAM)* Volume 6 Issue 1 2024. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/385904915_Stakeholder_Engagement_in_Educational_Policy_Development
16. Arguelles, R., & Sarsale, M., (2025). Stakeholder engagement practices in rural and remote schools: Insights from Filipino school leaders *March 2025 Issues in Educational Research* 35(1):42-60. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/392499586_Stakeholder_engagement_practices_in_rural_and_remote_schools_Insights_from_Filipino_school_leaders
17. Ramos, a., (2025). Exploring the Implementation of the Revised School-Based Management System to the Stakeholder Engagement and School Performance: Basis for Developing Strategies Addressing Organizational Challenges. *EPR International Journal of Research & Development (IJRD)*. <https://cdn.epratrustpublishing.com/article/202504-02-021206.pdf>
18. Hernandez, M. M., Mendoza, S. D. C., & Pacheco, M. M. (2023). Innovative leadership practices and management styles of school heads in the Schools Division of Bulacan. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 4(2), 1–10. <https://ijmaberjournal.org/index.php/ijmaber/article/view/1135>
19. DepEd Order No. 40, s. 2012 – DepEd Child Protection Policy. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/DO_s2012_40.pdf
20. Sittar, K., Munawar, S., & Alvi, G. F. (2022). School leadership development program on the performance of secondary school heads. *Global Educational Studies Review*, 7(I I). <http://dx.doi.org/10.31703/gesr.2022>
21. Huber, S. G., & Pruitt, J. (2024). Transforming education leadership through multiple approaches to develop and support school leadership. *Education Sciences*, 14(9), 953. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14090953>
22. Banoğlu, K., Karataş, İ. H., & Gümüş, S. (2025). School principals' networking preferences for instructional and administrative advice-seeking relations: Insights from inferential social network analysis. *Journal of Educational Administration*. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/17411432241303673>
23. Eisenschmidt, E., Kumpas-Lenk, K., Vanari, K., Arus, H., & Ivanova, K. (2024). Fostering collaborative school improvement in Estonian schools. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/10526846241245085>
24. De Guzman, M. (2025) Motivational Factors on Teacher's Commitment and Professional Development. https://library.usant.edu.ph/cgi-bin/koha/opac-detail.pl?biblionumber=18947&shelfbrowse_itemnumber=24743
25. Anderson-Butcher, D., Bates, S., Lawson, H. A., Childs, T. M., Iachini, A. L., (2022) The Community Collaboration Model for School Improvement: A Scoping Review. *Educ. Sci.* 2022, 12(12), 918; <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci12120918>



26. Lansing AE, Romero NJ, 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*. 2023 Jun 28;23(1):1252. doi: 10.1186/s12889-023-15860-z.
27. Paulus, P., Zakso, A., (2024) Participatory Leadership of the School Principal in Developing the Quality of Education Services at State Senior High School 1 Menyuke April 2024 *Jurnal Pendidikan Sosiologi dan Humaniora* 15(1):104. DOI:10.26418/j-psh.v15i1.76365
28. Kumar, S., & Lee, A. (2023). Governance and stakeholder participation in education policy: Challenges and opportunities. *International Journal of Educational Policy*, 10(2), 78–94. <https://doi.org/10.1080/edu.2023.1012345>
29. Barce, L. D., (2025) Parental Involvement in Schools: Barriers, Challenges, and Strategies. *Br. J. Arts Humanity.*, 2025; 7(3), 461-469 | doi: 10.34104/bjah.02504610469
30. Patel, R., & Martinez, L. (2022). Enhancing community engagement in inclusive education policies: Challenges and strategies. *Journal of Educational Policy and Leadership*, 19(2), 89–105. <https://doi.org/10.1080/edu.2022.00987>
31. Jackson, P., & Patel, R. (2023) Community involvement in school governance: Challenges in discipline management. *International Journal of Educational Leadership*, 18(3), 104–119. <https://doi.org/10.1080/ijel.2023.00456>
32. Lee, J., & Garcia, M. (2023). Community committees and school collaboration: A study of engagement and impact. *Journal of School Leadership and Management*, 21(1), 45–61. <https://doi.org/10.1080/jslm.2023.00321>
33. Lee, J., Kim, S., & Roberts, A. (2023). Challenges and opportunities for external committees in school governance. *International Journal of School Management*, 18(3), 102–118. <https://doi.org/10.1080/ijisma.2023.00945>
34. Sofia, N., Sari, R., & Azizah, L. (2023). Leadership communication competencies among school principals: Implications for teacher trust and support. *Journal of Educational Management*, 18(1), 65-82. <https://ejournal.uksw.edu/kelola/article/view/10331>
35. Cook, A. (2024). Effective communication strategies between schools and parents to improve student outcomes. *Journal of Educational Leadership*, 45(2), 123-139. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00131245221110556>
36. Smith, J. (2023, March 12). New Haven Public Schools launches Apptegy to improve family engagement. *New Haven Register*. <https://www.nhregister.com/news/education/article/new-haven-communication-platform-apptegy-20239674.php>
37. Del Rosario, J. S.; Panganiban, R. F., Castillo, R. D., (2024) Project 2Rs (Reward and Recognitions): Strategy to Empower the Level of Parental Involvement in New Normal Education. <https://e-saliksik.deped.gov.ph/research-bulletin-project-2rs-reward-and-recognitions-strategy-to-empower-the-level-of-parental-involvement-in-new-normal-education/>
38. Cabarillos, R. D. (2024). Exploring stakeholders' engagement in school development: A mixed-methods investigation of insights and strategies. *Southeast Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*. Retrieved from <https://cmc.edu.ph/research/index.php/journals/article/view/155>
39. Gulac, A. (2023). Stakeholders' Involvement in School Strategic Planning as Correlate of Implementation Commitment and School Performance. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 11(5), 490-501. <https://ejournals.ph/article.php?id=21515>
40. Cabanilla, A. B., Pontillas, P. V., & Comon, J. D. (2024). Teachers' Commitment and Their Performance in Naawan District, Misamis Oriental. *European Modern Studies Journal*, 8(3). DOI:10.59573/emsj.8(3).2024.19
41. Inso-Anog, M. D., de Vera, J. V., & Peteros, E. D. L. (2024). Examining teacher retention through the lens of job satisfaction and commitment in a Philippine private school. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.23.9.13>
42. Cadiong, A. M. (2024). Competence, Leadership Skills, and Professional Commitment of Elementary Teachers in the National Capital Region, Philippines. *Dinkum Journal of Social Innovations*, 3(12), 646-663. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2024.1110025>
43. Rizvi, F., & Lingard, B. Rinne, R., (Eds.). (2022). *Reimagining globalization and education*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003207528>



44. Nguyen, D., Dinh, H.-V. T., & Nguyen, N.-P. (2023). School–University Partnerships in Vietnam: Insights, Reflections, and Recommendations. *International Perspectives on School-University Partnerships* (pp. 69-83). Springer Verlag. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-99-0807-3_6
45. Petre, I. L., Hristache, D. A., Dobrescu, M. M., Constantin, A., Dumitra, E., Radu, C., (2025). Digital Communication in Higher Education Settings: A Pilot Study on Students’ Behavioural Trends. *Sustainability* 2025, 17(7), 3038; <https://doi.org/10.3390/su17073038>
46. Republic Act 9155. Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001. https://lawphil.net/statutes/repacts/ra2001/ra_9155_2001.html
47. DepEd Order No. 73, s. 2012 - Guidelines on the Assessment and Rating of Learning Outcomes Under the K to 12 Basic Education Curriculum. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2012/09/05/do-73-s-2012-guidelines-on-the-assessment-and-rating-of-learning-outcomes-under-the-k-to-12-basic-education-curriculum/>
48. DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020. National Adoption and Implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/DO_s2020_024-.pdf