Data-Driven Decision Making, Resource Allocation Management, and Professional Development on the Curriculum Implementation Practices of School Administrators

[1]Melisa R. Sumbilon, PhD Candidate and [2]Gladys S. Escarlos, PhD

[1]Graduate Student, Department of Professional Education, College of Education, Central Mindanao University, Musuan, Maramag, Bukidnon, Philippines

[2]Faculty, Department of Professional Education, College of Education, Central Mindanao University, Musuan, Maramag, Bukidnon, Philippines

DOI: https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.1026EDU0223

Received: 18 April 2026; Accepted: 24 April 2026; Published: 09 May 2026

ABSTRACT

This study examined the influence of data-driven decision making, resource allocation management, and professional development on the curriculum implementation practices of school administrators in Region X for the school year 2025–2026. A total of 540 school administrators were randomly selected as participants. Utilizing a descriptive-correlational design, the study assessed the levels of key variables and determined their relationships and predictive effects on curriculum implementation practices. Findings revealed that school administrators demonstrated a highly data-driven approach, highly managed resource allocation, and very highly developed professional competencies. Curriculum implementation practices were likewise rated as very highly practiced, indicating consistent and effective execution of instructional leadership functions. Correlation analysis showed that all independent variables significantly relate to curriculum implementation, with professional development exhibiting the strongest relationship. Regression analysis further indicated that the model significantly predicts curriculum implementation, with instructional management, disciplinary skill, and communication skill emerging as the strongest predictors, followed by data usage purpose and financial and budgeting practices. The study concludes that curriculum implementation is a continuous and integrated process primarily driven by leadership competencies, supported by data-informed decision-making and strategic resource utilization. It recommends strengthening ICT capacity, infrastructure, and integrated leadership frameworks. Future research may further validate the model across diverse contexts.

Keywords: data usage purpose, data literacy, financial and budgeting practices, instructional management, communication skill

INTRODUCTION

Curriculum implementation is a critical aspect of the educational process, as it translates policies, learning standards, and instructional frameworks into actual classroom practices that directly influence student learning outcomes. It involves the systematic execution of curriculum plans, the alignment of instructional strategies with learning objectives, and the continuous monitoring and evaluation of teaching practices. Effective implementation ensures that school administrators are able to guide and monitor curriculum delivery while adapting strategies to meet the diverse needs of learners.

School administrators play a crucial role in shaping curriculum implementation practices. As instructional leaders, they are responsible for guiding teachers, monitoring classroom instruction, allocating resources, and fostering professional growth to ensure that curriculum objectives are met. Their decisions and leadership practices influence how consistently and effectively the curriculum is delivered across grade levels and subject areas. Successful curriculum implementation therefore depends not only on the quality of the curriculum itself, but also on the administrative practices that support its implementation.

Despite its recognized importance, curriculum implementation remains a persistent challenge in many school systems. Research by Nevenglosky (2018) and Karakuş (2021) emphasizes that effective implementation extends beyond written curriculum guides and requires strong leadership practices at the school level. However, school administrators often encounter difficulties in monitoring instruction, providing adequate learning resources, and supporting teachers' instructional competence. Inadequate professional development opportunities, as highlighted by Bhasin (2018) and Rahman et al. (2018), have contributed to inconsistencies in teacher preparedness and uneven curriculum delivery across schools. Providing targeted and continuous professional development, however, enables school administrators, particularly principals, to enhance their skills, knowledge, competencies, and leadership abilities, thereby improving their practices and supporting more effective curriculum implementation.

One key leadership practice that significantly influences curriculum implementation is data-driven decision making. Data-driven administrators rely on systematic analysis of student performance, instructional outcomes, and school operations to inform planning, monitoring, and evaluation of curriculum implementation. Access to reliable and timely data systems enables administrators to track curriculum progress, identify learning gaps, and make evidence-based instructional adjustments (Mandinach & Gummer, 2016; Doğan & Demirbolat, 2021). Schools with functional technological infrastructure and organized data systems demonstrate stronger alignment between curriculum goals and instructional practices, as administrators are better equipped to guide teaching strategies and monitor learning outcomes.

The presence of a strong data-use culture further strengthens curriculum implementation practices. When administrators encourage regular analysis and collaborative discussion of data, teachers become more aware of curriculum expectations and student performance trends. Aligning school goals with data insights allows administrators to improve instructional supervision, ensure adherence to learning standards, and provide targeted feedback to teachers (Doğan & Demirbolat, 2021). Such practices promote continuous improvement and refinement of curriculum delivery (Bickmore et al., 2020).

Administrators' data literacy is equally vital in sustaining effective curriculum implementation. The ability to interpret data trends, draw meaningful conclusions, and translate findings into instructional actions allows school leaders to adjust monitoring strategies and integrate evidence into school improvement plans. Studies indicate that administrators with higher data literacy demonstrate stronger curriculum fidelity and improved instructional outcomes (Hamilton et al., 2009; Doğan & Demirbolat, 2021).

Another crucial factor influencing curriculum implementation practices is resource allocation management. Strategic planning, distribution, and utilization of financial, physical, and instructional resources directly support the delivery of curriculum objectives. Jacob-Dedumo et al. (2023) emphasize that effective resource management ensures transparency, maximizes resource utility, and aligns school expenditures with curricular priorities. Administrators who prioritize instructional materials, facilities, and human resources create learning environments that are conducive to effective teaching and learning.

Empirical evidence supports the role of resource allocation in strengthening curriculum implementation. World Bank (2017) guidelines and studies by Ojuok et al. (2020) highlight those targeted investments in instructional resources enhance teaching effectiveness. In resource-constrained and rural settings, administrators with strong financial management skills are better able to mobilize support, maintain adequate facilities, and ensure access to qualified teachers, thereby minimizing barriers to curriculum delivery (Matowo & Tenha, 2023).

Professional development further complements data-driven decision making and resource allocation in shaping curriculum implementation practices. Continuous professional development equips administrators with the competencies necessary for instructional supervision, curriculum monitoring, and teacher support. Enhanced communication skills such as effective feedback, collaborative dialogue, and conflict resolution enable administrators to share monitoring results, guide instructional improvement, and strengthen teacher capacity (Peretomode & Dinzie, 2019). Well-planned professional development initiatives also help administrators respond to curriculum reforms and emerging instructional demands.

Despite the presence of national policies and reforms such as DepEd Orders and Republic Act 9155 (Basic Education Governance Act), Philippine schools continue to face challenges in curriculum implementation. Limited data-driven decision making, insufficient and uneven resource allocation, inconsistent professional development opportunities, and increasing administrative workloads often constrain administrators' ability to effectively oversee curriculum delivery. These conditions underscore the need to examine how specific administrative practices influence curriculum implementation outcomes.

Given these considerations, there is a clear need to investigate how data-driven decision making, resource allocation management, and professional development collectively influence the curriculum implementation practices of school administrators. While previous studies have highlighted individual challenges such as insufficient resources or inadequate teacher training, there is limited research that examines how these factors interact to affect administrators' capacity to implement the curriculum effectively, particularly in the context of Northern Mindanao.

Conducting this study will provide evidence-based insights that can guide administrators in developing more strategic approaches to leadership, resource management, and professional development ultimately enhancing the quality and consistency of curriculum delivery. This research will be conducted during the school year 2025-2026, focusing on school administrators within the boundaries of Region X – Northern Mindanao, offering timely and region-specific data that can inform both local and national policy-making, as well as targeted school improvement initiatives.

Statement of the Problem

This study aimed to examine the curriculum implementation practices of school administrators by analyzing the influence of data-driven decision making, resource allocation management, and professional development.

Specifically, the study sought to answer the following research questions:

1. What level of data-driven decision making do school administrators demonstrate in terms of:

a. technological infrastructure and hardware;

b. data usage culture;

c. data usage purpose; and

d. data literacy?

2. What level of resource allocation management do school administrators possess in terms of:

a. infrastructure development;

b. instructional materials;

c. student-support activities; and

d. financial management and budgeting practices?

3. What level of professional development do school administrators receive in terms of:

a. Communication skill;

b. instructional management;

c. information, communication and technology development; and

d. disciplinary skills?

4. What level of curriculum implementation do school administrators practice in terms of:

a. monitoring practices;

b. supervisory practices;

c. evaluation practices; and

d. capacity building and adaptive practices?

5. Is there a significant relationship between the curriculum implementation practices of school administrators and:

a. data-driven decision making;

b. resource allocation management; and

c. professional development?

6. Which of the variable singly or in combination best predict the curriculum implementation practices of school administrators?

Hypothesis of the Study

The following null hypotheses were formulated and tested in this study at the 5% level of significance.

H_o1: There is no significant relationship between the curriculum implementation practices of school administrators and:

a. data-driven decision making,

b. resource allocation management, and

c. professional development.

H_o2: There is no variable that best predicts the curriculum implementation practices of school administrators.

Scope and Delimitation of the Study

This study was conducted among school administrators in Region X during School Year 2025–2026. It focused on examining the influence of data-driven decision making, resource allocation management, and professional development on the curriculum implementation practices of school administrators.

The study was delimited to four major variables: data-driven decision making, resource allocation management, professional development, and curriculum implementation practices. These variables were measured using adapted and validated instruments from established studies to ensure reliability and contextual relevance.

Specifically, data-driven decision making was delimited to four dimensions: technological infrastructure and hardware, data usage culture, data usage purpose, and data literacy, adapted from the work of Doğan and Demirbolat (2021). This instrument consisted of forty (40) indicators designed to assess the availability of data systems, the culture and purpose of data use, and administrators' competence in interpreting and applying data to support curriculum-related decisions.

Resource allocation management was delimited to four sub-variables: infrastructure development, instructional materials, student-support activities, and financial management and budgeting practices, adapted from Jacob-Dedumo et al. (2024). This section of the instrument contained forty (40) indicators that evaluated how school

administrators planned, allocated, managed, and monitored resources to support effective curriculum delivery and school operations.

Professional development was confined to four dimensions: communication skills, instructional management, information and communication technology (ICT) development, and disciplinary skills, adapted from Peretomode and Dinzie (2019). This part included forty (40) indicators focusing on the leadership competencies and professional capacities of school administrators that supported teacher development and curriculum implementation.

Curriculum implementation practices were delimited to four domains: monitoring practices, supervisory practices, evaluation practices, and capacity building and adaptive practices, adapted from Osuji and Etuketu (2019). This section comprised forty (40) indicators that assessed how school administrators ensured effective, responsive, and sustained implementation of the curriculum.

The study utilized quantitative methods, and the primary respondents were public school administrators (principals, assistant principals, and school heads) within Region X – Northern Mindanao. Private school administrators were not included to maintain uniformity in the governance and policy context of the Department of Education.

Moreover, administrators assigned to schools located in geographically isolated, remote, or conflict-prone areas that were logistically difficult to reach were excluded from the sample due to accessibility limitations and security concerns. The study did not cover other factors outside the identified variables, such as organizational culture, digital competence, teacher performance, or student achievement outcomes, as these were beyond the scope of the investigation. The results were therefore limited to the variables under study and could not be generalized to other regions or non-DepEd institutions without similar contextual conditions.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The study utilized descriptive-correlational and causal-comparative designs to answer the research questions. It was descriptive in nature, as it aimed to interpret data obtained from the exogenous variables, including data-driven decision making, resource allocation management, and professional development, in relation to the school administrators' curriculum implementation practices, which served as the endogenous variable. Most of the data were quantifiable, and the principles of quantitative-descriptive research guided the collection and analysis of the data. Furthermore, Pearson's product-moment correlation was employed to examine the relationships between two or more variables. Stepwise multiple linear regression analysis was conducted to identify the variables that most significantly predicted school administrators' curriculum implementation practices.

Locale of the Study

The study was conducted across the 10 school divisions of the Department of Education (DepEd) Region X during the school year 2024–2025. DepEd Region X, Northern Mindanao, covered a total land area of 17,855 square kilometers, encompassing 85 municipalities and 2,020 barangays. The region comprised five provincial school divisions: the landlocked Bukidnon in the south, Misamis Oriental in the north, the island province of Camiguin in the northeast, and Lanao del Norte and Misamis Occidental in the west. Within these provinces were nine city school divisions, namely: Cagayan de Oro, El Salvador, Gingoog, Iligan, Malaybalay, Ozamiz, Oroquieta, Tangub, and Valencia.

The general educational landscape in Region X reflected a commitment to improving access to quality education. Schools often served as key drivers of community development, and various programs were implemented to enhance educational outcomes. Despite challenges such as limited resources, infrastructure constraints, and varying levels of educational attainment among the population, efforts were made to implement innovative teaching strategies and improve the qualifications of educators. The presence of 2,148 schools

underscored the importance of education in fostering community growth and development within the region. The locale of this study in Region X encompassed a rich cultural and educational heritage, set against a backdrop of diverse economic activity and environmental conditions. The focus on school administrators was particularly significant, as they played a crucial role in shaping the educational experiences of students across the region.

Research Participants

This study employed a stratified random sampling technique to systematically select respondents from a total population of 2,107 school administrators across the Schools Division Offices (SDOs) in Region X. The strata were defined based on the SDOs within the region to ensure proportional representation from each division. Within each stratum, respondents were further drawn from school administrators at the elementary, junior high school, and senior high school levels. Since administrators across these levels perform comparable leadership and management functions—particularly in curriculum implementation—no further distinction was made between elementary and secondary administrators during the analysis.

Although Region X is composed of 14 Schools Division Offices, only 10 divisions were included in the study due to practical considerations such as logistical limitations, geographical dispersion, and accessibility constraints that could affect the efficiency and consistency of data collection. Moreover, the inclusion of all divisions was not deemed necessary to achieve the statistical requirements of the study, as a sufficiently large and representative sample of divisions can already yield reliable and generalizable findings (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). The 10 SDOs were therefore selected through simple random sampling, ensuring that each division had an equal chance of inclusion and maintaining fairness and impartiality in the selection process.

From these selected divisions, a total sample of 540 school administrators was randomly chosen as respondents. To ensure balanced representation across all participating SDOs, proportional allocation was applied within the stratified sampling framework. Each division's sample size was computed based on its proportionate share of the total population of 2,107 administrators. Specifically, the number of administrators in each division was divided by the total population and then multiplied by the target sample size of 540. This procedure ensured that divisions with a larger number of school heads, such as the Schools Division of Bukidnon, received a correspondingly larger sample allocation, while smaller divisions were proportionately represented. This approach-maintained representativeness and strengthened the validity of the study's findings.

Research Instruments

This study utilized a structured survey questionnaire composed of four major parts corresponding to the main variables of the study: Data-Driven Decision Making, Resource Allocation Management, Professional Development, and Curriculum Implementation Practices of School Administrators. Permission from the original authors of the adapted instruments was secured prior to data collection. The questionnaire underwent expert validation and pilot testing to establish its reliability, validity, and clarity prior to its full-scale administration. A total of 30 school administrators from the Division of Davao de Oro, in Nabunturan, Davao de Oro, participated in the pilot testing. Their responses were used to evaluate the internal consistency of the instrument and to identify items that required refinement in terms of wording, clarity, and relevance. This process ensured that the final questionnaire was clear, context-appropriate, and suitable for use in the actual data collection phase.

Part I of the instrument measured the level of data-driven decision making demonstrated by school administrators. Adapted from Doğan and Demirbolat (2021), this section consisted of 40 items distributed across four sub-variables: Technological Infrastructure and Hardware, Data Usage Culture, Data Usage Purpose, and Data Literacy, with ten items per sub-variable. The items assessed administrators' ability to access and utilize data, promote a culture of data use, apply data to improve school performance, and demonstrate competence in interpreting and using data for evidence-based decisions. The instrument was found to be highly reliable, with a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.971, indicating excellent internal consistency and a high level of reliability, suggesting that the items consistently measured the construct of data-driven decision making. Each item was rated on a five-point Likert scale as follows:

Scale on the levels of data-driven decision making:

Scale	Range	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
1	1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree (SD)	Not Data-Driven
2	1.51-2.50	Disagree (D)	Slightly Data-Driven
3	2.51-3.50	Moderately Agree (MA)	Moderately Data-Driven
4	3.51-4.50	Agree (A)	Highly Data-Driven
5	4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree (SA)	Very Highly Data-Driven

Part II of the study focused on Resource Allocation Management and aimed to evaluate the practices of school administrators in managing various resources within the school setting. The instrument used for this assessment was adapted from the study of Jacob-Dedumo et al. (2024) and comprised a total of 40 items. These items were organized into four key areas, each containing ten items: Infrastructure Development, which examined the planning, improvement, and maintenance of school facilities; Instructional Materials, which assessed the provision and management of teaching and learning resources; Student-Support Activities, which evaluated the support services and programs available to enhance student welfare and development; and Financial Management and Budgeting Practices, which focused on the administrators' effectiveness in planning, allocating, and monitoring financial resources. This structured approach allowed for a comprehensive evaluation of how school administrators allocated and managed resources to support both teaching and learning outcomes. The instrument was found to be highly reliable, with a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.973, indicating excellent internal consistency. Each statement was rated on a five-point Likert scale.

Scale on the levels of resource allocation management:

Scale	Range	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
1	1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree (SD)	Not Managed at all
2	1.51-2.50	Disagree (D)	Slightly Managed
3	2.51-3.50	Moderately Agree (MA)	Moderately Managed
4	3.51-4.50	Agree (A)	Highly Managed
5	4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree (SA)	Very Highly Managed

Part III focused on Professional Development. Adapted from Peretomode and Dinzei (2019), it was designed to assess how school administrators facilitated the growth and advancement of teaching staff. It consisted of 40 items divided into four sub-variables. The first sub-variable, Communication Skills, evaluated administrators' ability to communicate effectively with teachers, staff, students, and parents, including active listening, conflict resolution, report preparation, and maintaining professionalism. The second sub-variable, Instructional Management, measured the administrators' support for teachers' lesson preparation, monitoring of classroom and student attendance, provision of feedback, and ensuring the availability of instructional resources. The third sub-variable, ICT Development, examined administrators' competence in utilizing technology for professional and administrative purposes, including email management, internet usage, digital file organization, and communication tools. The fourth sub-variable, Disciplinary Skills, assessed administrators' ability to maintain discipline, provide exemplary leadership, encourage self-development among teachers and students, enforce rules, and make informed decisions that improved school productivity. The instrument was found to be highly reliable, with a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.977, indicating excellent internal consistency. Each statement was rated on a five-point Likert scale.

Scale on the levels of professional development support:

Scale	Range	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
1	1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree (SD)	Not Developed at all
2	1.51-2.50	Disagree (D)	Slightly Developed
3	2.51-3.50	Moderately Agree (MA)	Moderately Developed
4	3.51-4.50	Agree (A)	Highly Developed
5	4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree (SA)	Very Highly Developed

Part IV examined the Curriculum Implementation Practices of School Administrators, focusing on how they planned, coordinated, and oversaw the delivery of the curriculum. The instrument, adapted from Osuji and Etuketu (2019), evaluated the extent to which school administrators planned, coordinated, and oversaw curriculum delivery. The instrument consisted of 40 items across four sub-variables. The first sub-variable, Monitoring Practices, assessed administrators' tracking of student conduct, staff performance, curriculum adherence, classroom interactions, use of instructional resources, and timely submission of assessments. The second sub-variable, Supervisory Practices, measured the administrators' supervision of teachers' instructional delivery, classroom management, provision of guidance, facilitation of reflective sessions, and promotion of shared responsibility for instructional quality. The third sub-variable, Evaluation Practices, examined administrators' evaluation of teaching effectiveness, alignment of instruction with curriculum goals, assessment methods, utilization of evaluation results to improve instruction, and integration of feedback into school improvement plans. The fourth sub-variable, Capacity Building and Adaptive Practices, evaluated how administrators promoted teacher capacity through professional development programs, fostered collaboration among staff, facilitated access to instructional resources, implemented data-informed decision-making, and adjusted leadership strategies to meet evolving school needs. The instrument was found to be highly reliable, with a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.990, indicating excellent internal consistency. Each statement was rated on a five-point Likert scale.

Scale on the level of curriculum implementation practices:

Scale	Range	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
1	1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree (SD)	Not Practiced at all
2	1.51-2.50	Disagree (D)	Slightly Practiced
3	2.51-3.50	Moderately Agree (MA)	Moderately Practiced
4	3.51-4.50	Agree (A)	Highly Practiced
5	4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree (SA)	Very Highly Practiced

Data Gathering

Prior to the conduct of the study, the researcher first secured a recommendation for approval duly signed by the dissertation adviser and the college dean of the university. The researcher also obtained approval from the Research Ethics Committee (REC) of Central Mindanao University. Upon securing all necessary permissions, the questionnaires were distributed to the respective respondents, and the collected data were subsequently summarized, analyzed, and interpreted. An intent letter was then submitted to the DepEd Region X Director to request permission to conduct the study. Upon approval, letters of intent, together with the approved documents, were forwarded to the various Schools Division Offices, Public Schools District Offices, and subsequently to the respective schools.

Pilot testing of the research instrument was conducted in Region XI, Division of Davao de Oro, Nabunturan, Davao de Oro. Approval for the pilot testing was likewise secured from the Schools Division Superintendent to ensure adherence to proper research protocols. After obtaining all necessary permissions, consent forms were distributed to the respondents, clearly informing them of their rights and the voluntary nature of their participation.

During the conduct of the study, the respondents, who were school administrators from Region X, were given two weeks to complete the questionnaires. Both printed questionnaires and Google Forms were utilized to accommodate the wide scope and large number of participants. Upon retrieval, the data were tallied, tabulated, scored, and classified according to the research problems of the study. Appropriate statistical techniques were then applied for data analysis. Furthermore, the study ensured that all responses remained completely anonymous, thereby maintaining confidentiality throughout the entire research process.

Data Analysis

To determine the levels of data-driven decision making, resource allocation management, professional development, and curriculum implementation practices of school administrators, descriptive statistics such as

mean and rank were employed. The Pearson-product moment correlation was used to examine whether significant relationships existed among these variables and their influence on the administrators' overall effectiveness in curriculum implementation. To identify the variable or combination of variables that best predicted curriculum implementation practices, a stepwise multiple-linear regression analysis was conducted.

Ethical Consideration

To formally initiate the study, the researcher ensured compliance with established ethical research protocols. Approval was sought from the Research Ethics Committee (REC) of the university prior to any fieldwork. Once approval was granted, the researcher proceeded with data collection. An ethics statement was provided to all study participants, outlining the ethical principles that guided the research. This statement included information on informed consent, ensuring that participants were aware of their voluntary participation and their right to withdraw at any point without any consequences. Confidentiality was also emphasized, assuring participants that their identities and personal information would be protected and securely stored throughout the study. The ethics statement was submitted alongside the letter of permission and the REC approval notice to maintain transparency and foster trust in the research process. Additionally, the ethics statement was addressed to the DepEd Region X Director, Schools Division Superintendents, Public Schools District Supervisors, Districts In-Charge, and School Administrators. A formal approval note, signed by the relevant authorities, accompanied the letter before it reached the respondents. To uphold confidentiality, participants' names remained anonymous throughout the study.

DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

Table 1 presents the overall data-driven decision making of school administrators across four key dimensions: technological infrastructure and hardware, data usage culture, data usage purpose, and data literacy. The overall mean of 4.37, interpreted as Highly Data-Driven, indicates that administrators consistently apply data-driven practices across multiple aspects of school leadership. Among the dimensions, the highest-rated indicator is Data Usage Purpose (M = 4.49), showing that administrators are highly focused on using data to inform decisions and achieve school goals. This is followed by Data Literacy (M = 4.37) and Data Usage Culture (M = 4.36), reflecting strong skills, collaborative practices, and a supportive environment for data use. The lowest-rated, though still highly rated, is Technological Infrastructure and Hardware (M = 4.26), suggesting that while infrastructure is adequate, there may be minor gaps in hardware, software, or technical support that could be further strengthened.

Table 1. Overall data-driven decision making of school administrators

INDICATORS	MEAN	QUALITATIVE INTERPRETATION
Technological Infrastructure and Hardware	4.26	Highly Data-Driven
Data Usage Culture	4.36	Highly Data-Driven
Data Usage Purpose	4.49	Highly Data-Driven
Data Literacy	4.37	Highly Data-Driven
Overall Mean	4.37	Highly Data-Driven

LEGEND:

Scale	Range	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
1	1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree (SD)	Not Data-Driven
2	1.51-2.50	Disagree (D)	Slightly Data-Driven
3	2.51-3.50	Moderately Agree (MA)	Moderately Data-Driven
4	3.51-4.50	Agree (A)	Highly Data-Driven
5	4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree (SA)	Very Highly Data-Driven

The findings indicate that school administrators are overall highly data-driven, effectively integrating data into decision-making, cultivating a collaborative data culture, and demonstrating strong competency in data literacy. While technological infrastructure is slightly lower, the strong emphasis on purpose, literacy, and

culture suggests that administrators are able to leverage existing resources effectively to guide evidence-based practices and support curriculum implementation. This reflects administrators' proactive approach to monitoring student performance, adjusting strategies, and aligning instructional practices with school goals. Furthermore, the high levels of data literacy and purposeful use indicate that leaders can interpret, communicate, and apply data insights in ways that foster shared responsibility among staff, enhance collaboration, and strengthen accountability. Despite minor gaps in hardware or technical support, the overall data-driven orientation promotes informed planning, timely interventions, and continuous improvement, reinforcing a culture of professional growth and evidence-based innovation in the school setting.

The findings on overall data-driven decision making are supported by studies showing that systematic data use enables administrators to make evidence-based decisions, monitor classroom practices, and optimize resources for both immediate and long-term outcomes (Nurzen, 2022; Osuji & Etuketu, 2019; Mandinach & Gummer, 2016). Data-literate leaders actively engage teachers in interpreting results, adjust strategies based on evidence, and communicate findings transparently, thereby fostering a collaborative and improvement-oriented school culture (Doğan & Demirbolat, 2021; Datnow & Park, 2022). Strong infrastructure, purposeful data use, and administrator competence collectively enhance curriculum implementation, professional development, and student outcomes. While school administrators in Region X demonstrate strong data-driven decision-making practices that support evidence-based leadership and instructional improvement, sustaining these gains requires continued strengthening of data systems, leadership capacity, and collaborative data use to fully maximize their impact on school effectiveness.

Table 2 presents the overall resource allocation management of school administrators. The overall mean of 4.44, interpreted as Highly Managed, indicates that administrators effectively allocate and oversee school resources across multiple domains, ensuring that infrastructure, instructional materials, student-support activities, and financial practices are strategically managed. Among the subcategories, Financial and Budgeting Practices received the highest rating (M = 4.55, Very Highly Managed), highlighting administrators' strong capabilities in strategic planning, transparency, and monitoring of financial resources. Instructional Materials (M = 4.41), Student-Support Activities (M = 4.38), and Infrastructure Development (M = 4.27) were also highly managed, reflecting comprehensive attention to resource planning, program support, and facility maintenance.

Table 2. Overall resource allocation management of school administrators

INDICATORS	MEAN	QUALITATIVE INTERPRETATION
Infrastructure Development	4.27	Highly Managed
Instructional Materials	4.41	Highly Managed
Student-Support Activities	4.38	Highly Managed
Financial and Budgeting Practices	4.55	Very Highly Managed
Overall Mean	4.44	Highly Managed

LEGEND:

Scale	Range	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
1	1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree (SD)	Not Managed at all
2	1.51-2.50	Disagree (D)	Slightly Managed
3	2.51-3.50	Moderately Agree (MA)	Moderately Managed
4	3.51-4.50	Agree (A)	Highly Managed
5	4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree (SA)	Very Highly Managed

The findings imply that school administrators consistently demonstrate strong competency in resource allocation, effectively planning, monitoring, and aligning financial management, instructional materials, student-support activities, and infrastructure development with school goals. Financial and budgeting practices appear particularly well-managed, reflecting strategic fund allocation, transparency, and proactive problem-solving that enhance operational efficiency and stakeholder trust. While infrastructure, instructional materials,

and student-support programs are effectively managed, there is potential to further strengthen long-term planning, equitable access, and program sustainability. These practices suggest that administrators are leveraging resources strategically to support curriculum implementation, optimize learning environments, and address students' academic and emotional needs, fostering a balanced leadership approach that promotes both school effectiveness and sustained educational outcomes.

The findings of the study are supported by various studies emphasizing that effective resource allocation and management are critical to successful curriculum implementation. Research highlights that school administrators' strategic planning and distribution of financial, physical, human, and technological resources directly influence the availability of instructional materials, maintenance of learning spaces, teacher development, and student-support services, thereby improving teaching quality and student outcomes (Cristina et al., 2018; and Farley-Ripple & Grajeda, 2019; Roadmunk, 2024; Gurnov, 2019). These studies collectively underscore that deliberate, well-monitored, and responsive resource management is essential for operational efficiency, equity, and the sustained effectiveness of educational programs.

Table 3 shows the overall professional development of school administrators in Region X revealed an overall mean of 4.55, interpreted as Very Highly Developed. Among the specific domains, communication skill received the highest mean (4.61), followed by disciplinary skill (4.55), instructional management (4.53), and ICT development (4.50), which was rated as Highly Developed. These results indicate that school administrators consistently demonstrated strong competencies across key professional domains, including effective communication, instructional leadership, technology integration, and disciplinary practices, with only minor variation in ICT-related skills.

These findings imply that administrators are well-prepared to lead their schools, support teachers, and enhance student outcomes. Strong professional development across these domains equips leaders to foster collaboration, guide instructional practices, manage technological resources, and maintain a positive school climate. The high level of competency observed suggests that ongoing training and experience have enabled administrators to translate professional skills into effective school leadership, ultimately improving overall school performance and curriculum implementation.

Table 3. Overall professional development of school administrators

INDICATORS	MEAN	QUALITATIVE INTERPRETATION
Communication Skill	4.61	Very Highly Developed
Instructional Management	4.53	Very Highly Developed
ICT Development	4.50	Highly Developed
Disciplinary Skill	4.55	Very Highly Developed
Overall Mean	4.55	Very Highly Developed

LEGEND:

Scale	Range	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
1	1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree (SD)	Not Developed at all
2	1.51-2.50	Disagree (D)	Slightly Developed
3	2.51-3.50	Moderately Agree (MA)	Moderately Developed
4	3.51-4.50	Agree (A)	Highly Developed
5	4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree (SA)	Very Highly Developed

The findings are supported by literature emphasizing the critical role of continuous and structured professional development in effective school leadership. Research highlights that professional growth enhances administrators' knowledge, competencies, and leadership practices, enabling them to monitor and support teachers, implement curriculum effectively, integrate technology, and maintain a positive school climate

(Bhasin, 2018; Boren et al., 2017; Peretomode, 2019). Sustained professional learning equips leaders to respond to evolving educational challenges and align their practices with institutional goals and contextual needs, fostering overall school effectiveness (Young & Crow, 2017). While many studies focus on aspiring principals, evidence shows that ongoing development for experienced administrators is equally important to maintain high levels of competence and leadership efficacy (Lazenby et al., 2020).

Table 4. Overall curriculum implementation practices of school administrators

INDICATORS	MEAN	QUALITATIVE INTERPRETATION
Monitoring Practices	4.53	Very Highly Practiced
Supervisory Practices	4.60	Very Highly Practiced
Evaluation Practices	4.59	Very Highly Practiced
Capacity Building and Adaptive Practices	4.62	Very Highly Practiced
Overall Mean	4.59	Very Highly Practiced

LEGEND:

Scale	Range	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
1	1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree (SD)	Not Practiced at all
2	1.51-2.50	Disagree (D)	Slightly Practiced
3	2.51-3.50	Moderately Agree (MA)	Moderately Practiced
4	3.51-4.50	Agree (A)	Highly Practiced
5	4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree (SA)	Very Highly Practiced

Table 4 shows that school administrators consistently practice curriculum implementation across all dimensions, with an overall mean of 4.59, interpreted as Very Highly Practiced. Capacity-building and adaptive practices received the highest rating (4.62), followed closely by supervisory practices (4.60), evaluation practices (4.59), and monitoring practices (4.53). These results indicate that principals in the study area actively engage in planning, guiding, assessing, and supporting instructional processes. Their comprehensive approach reflects not only a commitment to maintaining curriculum fidelity but also an ability to respond dynamically to emerging educational needs, ensure resource availability, and strengthen teacher capacity.

The findings imply that effective curriculum implementation depends on the administrators' ability to integrate multiple leadership functions monitoring, supervising, evaluating, and fostering capacity-building into daily school operations. Principals who provide structured guidance, continuous professional development, and adaptive support create environments that empower teachers, enhance instructional quality, and maintain alignment with curriculum objectives. Such practices enable timely interventions, ensure the proper use of instructional resources, and foster a culture of accountability and continuous improvement, ultimately improving student learning outcomes and school performance.

These results are supported by both local and international studies. In the Philippines, effective administration, proper planning, and resource management are critical for successful curriculum implementation, whereas weak program administration and insufficient teacher preparation hinder outcomes (Acosta & Acosta, 2016; Sarmiento & Orale, 2016; Ednave et al., 2018; Alegado, 2018). Globally, research echoes this pattern: teacher training and administrative support facilitate implementation, while lack of preparation and insufficient resources constrain it (Rahman et al., 2019; Kimosop, 2018; Guerrero, 2019; Li & Jones, 2019; Nawaz & Akbar, 2019). Adherence to curricular mandates, strategic planning, and effective management of facilities and resources are consistently highlighted as enablers for achieving high-quality learning outcomes (Tarusan & Nabos, 2024; Roman, 2019).

Table 5. Correlation between the dependent and independent variables

VARIABLES	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT (r)	P-VALUE
Data-Driven Decision Making	.667	.000**
Technological Infrastructure and Hardware	.435	.000**
Data Usage Culture	.581	.000**
Data Usage Purpose	.676	.000**
Data Literacy	.557	.000**
Resource Allocation Management	.680	.000**
Infrastructure Development	.589	.000**
Instructional Materials	.465	.000**
Student-Support Activities	.595	.000**
Financial and Budgeting Practices	.681	.000**
Professional Development	.877	.000**
Communication Skill	.767	.000**
Instructional Management	.762	.000**
ICT Development	.712	.000**
Disciplinary Skill	.791	.000**

*** p<0.01 (2-tailed), NS = Not Significant*

Table 5 presents the correlations between the curriculum implementation practices of school administrators and the three main independent variables: data-driven decision-making, resource allocation management, and professional development. The results reveal that all three variables exhibit strong positive correlations with curriculum implementation practices, with all correlations significant at $p < 0.01$. Among them, professional development shows the highest correlation ($r = .877$, $p = .000$), followed by disciplinary skill ($r = .791$, $p = .000$) and data-driven decision-making ($r = .667$, $p = .000$). These findings indicate that administrators' ability to develop staff, manage resources strategically, and use data effectively plays a significant role in ensuring the fidelity, quality, and effectiveness of curriculum implementation in schools.

Examining on data-driven decision-making, the sub-variables—data usage culture ($r = .581$, $p = .000$), data usage purpose ($r = .676$, $p = .000$), and data literacy ($r = .557$, $p = .000$) demonstrate strong correlations with curriculum implementation. This suggests that administrators who cultivate a culture of using data, understand how to interpret and apply it, and align its use with purposeful goals are better able to monitor teaching, guide instructional practices, and make evidence-based adjustments. By leveraging accurate and timely data, school leaders can identify gaps in teaching and learning, track student progress, and provide actionable feedback to teachers, which directly supports curriculum fidelity and student achievement.

The findings are consistent with the study of Doğan and Demirbolat (2021) and Datnow and Park (2022), which emphasize that data-literate administrators actively involve teachers in interpreting assessment results, adjust instructional plans accordingly, and communicate findings transparently, ensuring that assessments are aligned with instructional objectives. Furthermore, the findings are consistent with Osuji and Etuketu (2019), who highlight that capacity-building practices are strengthened as data informs the design of professional development seminars, resource allocation advocacy, and context-responsive instructional adaptations, thereby fostering a culture of continuous professional growth and data-informed innovation.

In relation to resource allocation management, the sub-variables—financial and budgeting practices ($r = .681$, $p = .000$), infrastructure development ($r = .589$, $p = .000$), access to instructional materials ($r = .465$, $p = .000$), and student-support activities ($r = .595$, $p = .000$)—also show strong positive correlations with curriculum implementation. These findings highlight that administrator who strategically manage school resources ensure that teachers have the necessary tools, facilities, and support systems to implement the curriculum effectively. Adequate resourcing allows for smooth instructional delivery, facilitates innovative teaching practices, and supports student engagement, all of which contribute to achieving the intended learning outcomes.

As Betingo (2025) emphasizes, effective resource allocation improves operational efficiency and drives stakeholder satisfaction, fostering continuous organizational improvement. Jacob-Dedumo et al. (2023) further highlight that aligning resource allocation with educational objectives maximizes utility, ensures transparency, and allows administrators to implement curriculum reforms effectively. Ngigi, & Tanui, (2019) emphasizes that comprehensive fiscal planning ensures alignment between resources and educational objectives, promoting equity and overall instructional quality. Financial management, therefore, is not merely administrative but a strategic leadership function that directly contributes to improved educational outcomes and student achievement (Aliyu, 2018). Additionally, Palestina et al. (2020) found that support from school leaders, particularly time allocation for planning and professional learning, is a prominent facilitator. Conversely, inadequate leadership support and insufficient funding and instructional materials are major barriers (Palestina et al., 2020). Similar findings in other contexts stress the importance of effective leadership and resource management in enabling curriculum success (Kimosop, 2018; Rahman et al., 2019).

Professional development stands out as the most influential variable, with sub-variables such as instructional management ($r = .762$, $p = .000$), communication skills ($r = .767$, $p = .000$), ICT development ($r = .712$, $p = .000$), and disciplinary skills ($r = .791$, $p = .000$) showing very strong correlations with curriculum implementation. This demonstrates that principals who prioritize continuous capacity-building for themselves and their staff enable teachers to enhance pedagogical strategies, adopt new technologies, and manage classrooms effectively. Investing in professional growth ensures that instructional practices remain current, responsive, and aligned with curriculum objectives, thereby improving both teacher performance and student learning outcomes.

Boren et al. (2017) asserted that principals must be continuous, lifelong learners to remain responsive to the evolving challenges of modern education systems. Young and Crow (2017) highlighted that effective school leadership depends on sustained professional development that supports administrators throughout their careers. Rohmad et al, (2024) highlight that the professional development of school administrators is essential for effective curriculum implementation, as it equips principals with competencies in instructional leadership, resource management, and collaborative practices that enhance teaching quality and improve students' academic performance.

Given the results of the correlation analysis, the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant relationship between curriculum implementation practices and the variables of data-driven decision-making, resource allocation management, and professional development is rejected. The findings clearly demonstrate that all three variables have statistically significant and strong positive relationships with curriculum implementation practices at $p < 0.01$. This implies that improvements in administrators' competencies in utilizing data, managing resources efficiently, and engaging in continuous professional development are associated with enhanced quality, fidelity, and effectiveness of curriculum implementation in schools.

The findings of this study are strongly supported by existing literature, which consistently emphasizes that effective school leadership practices are critical to successful curriculum implementation. Studies have shown that data-driven decision-making enables administrators to make informed instructional adjustments and promote a culture of continuous improvement (Datnow & Park, 2022; Doğan & Demirbolat, 2021). Similarly, strategic resource allocation ensures that schools are equipped with the necessary financial, material, and infrastructural support to facilitate effective teaching and learning (Jacob-Dedumo et al., 2023; Ngigi, & Tanui, (2019). Moreover, sustained professional development enhances administrators' and teachers' competencies in instructional leadership, communication, and the integration of technology, ultimately improving classroom practices and student outcomes (Boren et al., 2017; Young & Crow, 2017; Rohmad et al., 2024). Collectively, these studies affirm that the integration of data use, resource management, and continuous capacity-building forms a strong foundation for achieving high-quality and effective curriculum implementation.

Table 6 presents the regression analysis examining the influence of professional development, data-driven decision making, and resource allocation management on the curriculum implementation practices of school administrators. The overall model reveals an R-value of 0.898, indicating a very strong relationship between the predictors and the dependent variable, while the R^2 value of 0.807 suggests that 80.7% of the variance in curriculum implementation practices is explained by professional development, data-driven decision making,

and resource allocation management. The remaining 19.3% of the variance may be attributed to other factors not measured in this study. The model is highly significant (F = 370.303, p = 0.000), confirming that these factors collectively predict curriculum implementation effectively.

Table 6. Regression analysis between the independent and dependent variables

Model	UNSTANDARDIZED COEFFICIENTS		STANDARDIZED COEFFICIENTS	T	SIG.
	B	STD. ERROR	BETA		
(Constant)	.332	.091		3.628	.000
Professional Development					
Instructional Management	.238	.026	.262	9.162	.000
Disciplinary Skill	.200	.028	.232	7.125	.000
Communication Skill	.176	.028	.191	6.198	.000
ICT Development	.093	.023	.115	3.994	.000
Data-Driven Decision Making					
Data Usage Purpose	.124	.021	.158	6.002	.000
Resource Allocation Management					
Financial & Budgeting Practices	.106	.023	.128	4.586	.000
$R = .898^f$ $R^2 = .807$	F = 370.303		P = 0.000		

Among the professional development components, instructional management emerges as the strongest predictor (Beta = 0.262, p = 0.000), highlighting the importance of administrators' ability to plan, coordinate, and guide teaching practices for effective curriculum delivery. Disciplinary skill (Beta = 0.232, p = 0.000) also significantly predicts curriculum implementation, indicating that administrators who effectively manage student behavior and maintain classroom order contribute to high-quality learning environments. Communication skill (Beta = 0.191, p = 0.000) further underscores that clear and effective interactions with teachers and staff are vital in aligning instructional practices with curriculum goals. ICT development, though slightly lower (Beta = 0.115, p = 0.000), demonstrates the role of technological integration in supporting instructional efficiency and curriculum fidelity.

Data-driven decision making, specifically data usage purpose (Beta = 0.158, p = 0.000), significantly predicts curriculum implementation, reinforcing that administrator who apply evaluation results, monitor performance, and make evidence-based adjustments enhance instructional quality and adherence to curriculum standards. Resource allocation management, represented by financial and budgeting practices (Beta = 0.128, p = 0.000), further contributes to curriculum implementation, highlighting that effective management of school resources ensures the availability of instructional materials, facilities, and support systems necessary for delivering the curriculum effectively.

The regression equation derived from these findings can be expressed as:

$$Y = 0.332 + 0.238X1 + 0.200X2 + 0.176X3 + 0.093X4 + 0.124X5 + 0.106X6$$

Where:

Y = Curriculum Implementation Practices

X1 = Instructional Management

X2 = Disciplinary Skill

X3 = Communication Skill

X4 = ICT Development

X5 = Data Usage Purpose

X6 = Financial & Budgeting Practices

This equation suggests that for every unit increase in instructional management (X1), curriculum implementation practices improve by 0.238 unit. Similarly, a one-unit increase in disciplinary skill (X2) leads to a 0.200 unit rise in curriculum implementation. Communication skill (X3) contributes 0.176 unit of increase for every unit improvement, while ICT development (X4) enhances curriculum practices by 0.093 unit per unit increase. Data usage purpose (X5) adds 0.124 unit, and financial and budgeting practices (X6) contribute 0.106 unit to curriculum implementation for every unit increase. These results indicate that strengthening administrators' professional development, data-driven decision making, and resource management capabilities directly improves the effectiveness and fidelity of curriculum implementation in schools.

Given the significance of the overall model ($F = 370.303$, $p = .000$), the null hypothesis stating that professional development, data-driven decision-making, and resource allocation management do not significantly predict curriculum implementation practices of school administrators is rejected. This finding indicates that these variables collectively exert a significant influence on how administrators implement the curriculum. The strong predictive power of the model underscores the critical role of enhancing administrators' professional competencies, decision-making skills, and effective management of resources in ensuring high-quality curriculum delivery.

These findings are supported by Lundberg (2022), who found that curriculum implementation directly influences learning quality, a result further reinforced by Falloon (2024), who emphasizes that systematic monitoring ensures instructional fidelity and promotes better academic outcomes. Similarly, Taylor et al. (2023) and Kurent and Avsec (2023) highlight that principals' active involvement in tracking teaching and learning processes significantly enhances students' academic competencies. In contrast, Keung and Cheung (2023) suggest that monitoring alone may not suffice, pointing to other factors such as teacher preparedness and resource availability as critical to improving learning outcomes.

Weng et al. (2022) further emphasize that principals play a central role in tracking instructional processes, observing teaching practices, and ensuring that curriculum goals are met. Through systematic monitoring, school leaders can identify gaps in instructional delivery, assess the effectiveness of teaching strategies, and make informed decisions to improve overall school performance. Regular evaluation enables principals to provide guidance to teachers, ensuring that instructional methods align with the intended curriculum and meet the evolving needs of learners (Landa et al., 2021; Tso et al., 2022).

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions were drawn:

School administrators demonstrate a highly data-driven approach in their decision-making practices, as evidenced by the consistent and effective utilization of data in guiding school operations. Their strong understanding of the purpose of data use, supported by adequate data literacy and a positive data culture, enables them to make informed and strategic decisions. However, while technological infrastructure is generally sufficient, further enhancement is still needed to fully optimize data systems and strengthen evidence-based practices in schools.

School administrators demonstrate a highly managed in resource allocation management, particularly in financial planning and budgeting. Their ability to provide instructional materials and support student-related activities reflects a strong commitment to improving teaching and learning conditions. There remains a need to further improve infrastructure development to ensure that school facilities are fully responsive to instructional demands.

Professional development, the findings reveal that school administrators are very highly professionally developed, which significantly contributes to effective school leadership. Their strengths in communication, disciplinary skills, and instructional management enable them to efficiently lead and manage educational processes. However, continuous enhancement in ICT development is still necessary to keep pace with emerging technologies and further strengthen digital leadership in education.

Curriculum implementation practices among school administrators are very highly practiced and consistently carried out, as reflected in their high overall mean. The strong emphasis on capacity building and adaptive practices highlights their active role in ensuring quality instruction and responsiveness to educational changes. While monitoring practices are well established, further strengthening of monitoring mechanisms may enhance the consistency, effectiveness, and sustainability of curriculum implementation.

Professional development, resource allocation management, and data-driven decision-making are all significantly related to curriculum implementation practices. Among these, professional development shows the strongest relationship, indicating that administrators' competencies play a crucial role in influencing effective curriculum delivery. Strengthening these domains collectively can lead to improved educational outcomes.

The regression analysis confirms that the identified variables significantly predict curriculum implementation practices, with professional development emerging as the most influential predictor. Instructional management, disciplinary skills, and communication skills are critical determinants of successful curriculum execution. Data usage purpose and financial management also contribute significantly, highlighting the importance of both leadership competencies and strategic management practices.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the conclusions drawn from the study, the following recommendations are proposed:

The Department of Education (DepEd) is encouraged to support and strengthen school-level data-driven decision-making by providing improved technological infrastructure, including reliable hardware, software systems, and stable connectivity. This will ensure more efficient data management and promote evidence-based decision-making across schools. DepEd may also intensify capacity-building programs focused on data literacy, data analysis, and data utilization to further strengthen a culture of data use among school leaders and teachers.

Furthermore, DepEd and partner agencies are encouraged to adopt a more integrated approach that aligns data-driven decision-making, resource allocation management, and professional development programs. This holistic strategy will promote coherence in school leadership practices and enhance curriculum implementation effectiveness.

Teacher education institutions and training providers are encouraged to continuously enhance professional development programs for school leaders and aspiring administrators, with special emphasis on ICT integration, digital leadership, and innovative instructional management. These institutions play a vital role in preparing education leaders who are responsive to technological advancements and emerging educational demands, since professional development emerged as the strongest predictor of curriculum implementation.

School administrators are encouraged to further strengthen data-driven decision-making practices by enhancing technological infrastructure and hardware to support more efficient data management systems. Continuous training on data analysis, interpretation, and utilization should be sustained to further improve data literacy and reinforce a strong data usage culture. Emphasis should also be placed on maximizing the purposeful use of data in planning, monitoring, and evaluating school programs to ensure more informed and strategic decisions.

School administrators are also advised to improve resource allocation management, particularly in the area of infrastructure development. While financial and budgeting practices are already strong, efforts should be directed toward upgrading school facilities to better support instructional delivery. Ensuring the availability and equitable distribution of instructional materials and strengthening student-support services should remain a priority to enhance the overall learning environment.

In terms of curriculum implementation practices, school administrators should strengthen monitoring mechanisms to ensure more consistent and systematic tracking of instructional processes. The use of structured

monitoring tools, regular feedback systems, and data-informed evaluation strategies may further improve the sustainability and effectiveness of curriculum implementation.

Given the significant relationships among professional development, resource allocation management, and data-driven decision-making with curriculum implementation, it is recommended that these domains be integrated into a unified school management approach. Administrators should align leadership practices, resource utilization, and data use to ensure a more coherent and effective implementation of the curriculum.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The researcher would like to extend her heartfelt gratitude to the following individuals whose invaluable support and guidance contributed significantly to the successful completion of this paper: Ma'am Andrelyn B. Nacario, Ma'am Rollyn P. Gillang, Ma'am Wenna M. Cellar, Ma'am Mirasol N. Cueva, Ma'am Eilane G. Jagunal, Ma'am Jomarie, Ma'am Geneveve, Sir Dexter, Princely, and Ma'am Windy Dioquino.

Special thanks are also extended to Dr. Gladys S. Escarlos, Dr. Raul C. Orongan, Dr. Aprell L. Abellana, and Dr. James L. Paglinawan for their invaluable guidance, scholarly expertise, and insightful feedback throughout the research process, which significantly contributed to the refinement and completion of this study.

The researcher is deeply grateful to Regional Director Dr. Arturo B. Bayocot, CESO III, and to Schools Division Superintendent Dr. Victoria V. Gazo, CESO V, as well as all Schools Division Superintendents of Region X–Northern Mindanao, for their generous permission, invaluable support, and continuous assistance in facilitating the conduct of this study.

Heartfelt appreciation is extended to my family, especially my husband, Gilbert R. Sumbilon, and my children, Sheikinah, Gwyneth, Zane, and Ashianna Zenith, for their unwavering love, understanding, encouragement, and steadfast support throughout the entire journey of completing this study.

Above all, to Almighty God, for His divine guidance, wisdom, strength, and abundant blessings that made this endeavor possible and meaningful.

REFERENCES

1. Acosta, I., & Acosta, A. (2016). Teachers' perceptions of senior high school readiness of higher education institutions in the Philippines. Universal Journal of Educational Research, 4(10), 2435–2450. https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2016.041024
2. Alegado, E. P. J. (2018). Breaking the barriers: teacher leadership in the heart of educational reform in the Philippines. Bulgarian Journal of Science and Education Policy, 12(1), 15–30.
3. Aliyu, B. B. (2018). Assessment of financial management practices among secondary school principals in Kaduna State. International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Management, 2(2). https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijhtm.20180202.11
4. Betingo, V. L. (2025). Resource allocation, operational efficiency, and stakeholders' satisfaction (Doctoral dissertation, Guimaras State University, Buenavista, Guimaras, Philippines). International Journal of Science and Management Studies (IJSMS), 8(5). https://doi.org/10.51386/25815946/ijsms-v8i5p115
5. Bhasin, H., (2018). 5 Reasons Employee development is important to your company. www.marketing91.com
6. Bickmore, D. L., Roberts, M. M., & Gonzales, M. M. (2020). How aspiring principals applied coursebased learning to develop school improvement plans. Journal of Educational Administration, 59(2), 199–214. https://doi.org/10.1108/jea-06-2020-0139
7. Boren, D. M., Hallam, P. R., Ray, N. C., Gill, C. L., & Li, K. (2017). Examining effective principal professional development through a university-district sponsored principals academy. Educational Practice and Theory, 39(2), 87–106. https://doi.org/10.7459/ept/39.2.06

8. Boren, D. M., Hallam, P. R., Ray, N. C., Gill, C. L., & Li, K. (2017). Examining effective principal professional development through a university-district sponsored principals academy. Educational Practice and Theory, 39(2), 87–106. https://doi.org/10.7459/ept/39.2.06
9. Creswell, J.W. and Creswell, J.D. (2018) Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches. Sage, Los Angeles.
10. Cristina, S. T., Popescu, D. M., Stoica, E., & Erculescu, L. M. (2018). Managing the Influence of Resources on Educational Performance. International Journal of Sustainable Economies Management, 7(4), 37-44. https://doi.org/10.4018/IJSEM.2018100104
11. Datnow, A., & Park, V. (2022). Professional collaboration with purpose: Teacher learning for equitable and excellent schools. Teachers College Record, 124(3), 1–28
12. Doğan, E., & Demirbolat, A. O. (2021). Data-driven decision-making in schools scale: A study of validity and reliability. International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction, 13(1).
13. Ednave, R.,.Gatchalian, V..Mamisao, J.Canuto, X.Caugiran, M.Ekid, J.Ilao, M. J. C. (2018). Problems and challenges encountered in the implementation of the K to 12 Curriculum: A synthesis| Ronald Ednave - Academia.edu.
14. Falloon, G. (2024a). Advancing young students' computational thinking: An investigation of structured curriculum in early years primary schooling. Computers & Education,105045. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2024.105045
15. Farley-Ripple, E. N., & Grajeda, S. (2019). Avenues of influence: An exploration of school-based practitioners as knowledge brokers and mobilizers. In J. Malin & C. Brown (Eds.). The role of knowledge brokers in education: Connecting the dots between research and practice (pp. 65–90). Routledge.
16. Farley-Ripple, E. N., & Grajeda, S. (2019). Avenues of influence: An exploration of school-based practitioners as knowledge brokers and mobilizers. In J. Malin & C. Brown (Eds.). The role of knowledge brokers in education: Connecting the dots between research and practice (pp. 65–90). Routledge.
17. Guerrero, S. E. (2019). Hindering factors that prevent college English students from participating in class discussions: a case at Jiangsu University, China. Journal of Curriculum and Teaching, 8(2), 62-70.
18. Gurnov, A. (2019). What Is Resource Allocation in Project Management? Wrike.com. https://www.wrike.com/project-management-guide/faq/what-is-resource-allocation-in-project-management/
19. Keung, P. C. C., & Cheung, A. (2023). A family-school-community partnership supporting play-based learning: A social capital perspective. Teaching and Teacher Education, 135, 104314. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.104314
20. Hamilton, L., Halverson, R., Jackson, S., Mandinach, E., Supovitz, J., & Wayman, J. (2009). Using student achievement data to support instructional decision making (NCEE 2009-4067). Education http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications/practiceguides.
21. Jacob-Dedumo, L. S., Chua, L. L., Niňal, M. M., & Ederio, N. T. (2024). Financial management and resource allocation practices in the Schools Division of Surigao Del Norte, Philippines. International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research (IJFMR), 6(4). https://www.ijfmr.com/papers/2024/4/25687.pdf
22. Karakuş, G. (2021). A literary review on curriculum implementation problems. Shanlax International Journal of Education, 9(3), 201-220. https://doi.org/10.34293/education.v9i3.3983
23. Kimosop, H. (2018). Administrative support provided to teachers during implementation of early childhood development, European Journal of Education Studies, 4(8), 244 - 252, https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1287724
24. Kurent, B., & Avsec, S. (2023). Examining pre-service teachers' regulation in distance and traditional preschool design and technology education. Heliyon, 9(2), e13738. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e13738
25. Landa, E., Zhu, C., & Sesabo, J. (2021). Readiness for integration of innovative teaching and learning technologies : An analysis of meso - micro variables in Tanzanian higher. International Journal of Educational Research Open, 2, 100098. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2021.100098
26. Lazenby, S., Mcculla, N. & Marks, W., (2020) The further professional development of experienced principals. International Journal of Leadership in Education. DOI: 10.1080/13603124.2020.1716999.

27. Li, M., & Jones, B. D. (2019). Transforming traditional teaching: a professional development program for the college EFL teachers. Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 9(12), 1494–1500. https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0912.05
28. Lundberg, A. (2022). Academics' perspectives on good teaching practice in Switzerland' s higher education landscape. International Journal of Educational Research, 3(9), 100202. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2022.100202
29. Mandinach, B., & Gummer, E. S. (2016). What does it mean for teachers to be data literate: Laying out the skills, knowledge, and dispositions. Teaching and Teacher Education, 60, 366–376.
30. Matowo, F., & Tenha, J. (2023). School leadership and curriculum implementation: Challenges and constraints in the Zimbabwean education system. International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science (IJRISS), 7(5), 209. https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2023.70519
31. Nawaz, H., & Akbar, R. A. (2019). Exploration of gaps between intended and enacted physics curriculum: teachers' professional development perspective. Bulletin of Education and Research, 41(2), 1-10.
32. Nevenglosky, E. 2018. Barriers to Effective Curriculum Implementation, Doctoral Dissertation Submitted to the Walden University.
33. Ngigi, S. K., & Tanui, P. J. (2019). Principals' Financial Management Practices, Educational Administration and Performance in Selected Secondary Schools in Kenya. 3(1). https://doi.org/10.58256/njhs.v3i1.802
34. Nurzen, M. (2022). Data-based decision making for education planning: Strategies for principal success. Jurnal Konseling dan Pendidikan, 10(4), 589–596. https://doi.org/10.29210/189500
35. Ojuok, J. O.1., Gogo, J. O. and Olel, M. A. 2020. Influence of physical facilities on academic performance in constituency development fund (CDF) built secondary schools in Rachuonyo South subCounty, Kenya. African Educational Research Journal. 8(3), 462-471.
36. Osuji, C., & Etuketu, E. L. (2019). School administrators' quality assurance strategies for the implementation of curriculum in junior secondary school in Owerri Municipal, Imo State. International Journal of Innovative Education Research, 7(3), 101–119.
37. Peretomode, V. F., & Dinzei, M. M. (2019). Professional development needs of public and private secondary school principals in Delta State, Nigeria. International Journal of Educational Administration, 11(1), 7–21.
38. Rahman, M. M., Pandian, A., and Kaur, M. 2018. Factors affecting teachers' implementation of communicative language teaching curriculum in secondary schools in Bangladesh. The Qualitative Report, 23(5), 1104-1126.
39. Roadmunk. (2024). Resource Allocation: Definition, Examples, and Best Practices. Roadmunk. https://roadmunk.com/glossary/resource-allocation/
40. Rohmad, A., Muawanah, E., Ju'subaidi, J., Hidayah, N., & Ikhwan, A. (2024). The role of curriculum implementation and principal leadership to enhance academic performance in Islamic boarding schools. Journal of Social Studies Education Research, 15(4), 338–373.
41. Roman, A. G. (2019). Curriculum implementation and performance of mathematics education students in one state university in the Philippines. Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies, 2(2), 65-72.
42. Sarmiento, D. H., & Orale, R. L. (2016). Senior high school curriculum in the Philippines, USA, and Japan. Journal of Academic Research, 1(3), 12–23.
43. Tarusan, M. C. E., & Nabos, J. Q. (2024). School operations in the implementation of K–12 curriculum and performance of school heads in CALABARZON: Basis for curriculum management framework. Psych Educ, 17(2), 125–132. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.11079565
44. Taylor, M., Alamos, P., Turnbull, K. L. P., & Locasale-crouch, J. (2023). Examining individual children' s peer engagement in pre-kindergarten classrooms: Relations with classroom-level teacher-child interaction. Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 331–344. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2023.04.007
45. Tso, W. W. Y., Reichert, F., Law, N., Fu, W., Torre, D., Rao, N., & Leung, K. (2022). Digital competence as a protective factor against gaming addiction in children and adolescents: A cross-sectional study in Hong Kong. The Lancet Regional Health - Western Pacific, 20, 100382. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lanwpc.2022.100382

46. Weng, X., Chiu, T. K. F., & Chun, C. (2022). Promoting student creativity and entrepreneurship through real-world problem-based maker education. Thinking Skills and Creativity, 101046. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2022.101046
47. World Bank. 2017. Education in Sub Saharan Africa. Policies for Adjustments Revitalisational Expansion. Washington, DC: World Bank.
48. Young, M.D., & Crow, G.M., (2017). Handbook of Research on the Education of School Leaders. New York, NY: Routledge.