Organizational Cohesion E-competence, and Monitoring and Evaluation Practices on Managerial Proficiency of School Administrators.

Maria Kristine Ellen L. Lagura[1], James L. Paglinawan[2]

[1]Teacher VI, DepEd Cabayugan Elementary School, Valencia City, Bukidnon, Philippines

[2]Associate Professor IV, Central Mindanao University Musuan, Bukidnon, Philippines

DOI: https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100400358

Received: 16 April 2026; Accepted: 21 April 2026; Published: 09 May 2026

ABSTRACT

This study examined the relationship among organizational cohesion, e-competence, monitoring and evaluation practices, and managerial proficiency of school administrators. Using a descriptive-correlational design, data were gathered from school administrators through a structured survey questionnaire. The study focused on five dimensions of organizational cohesion, five indicators of e-competence, five areas of monitoring and evaluation practices, and five dimensions of managerial proficiency. Results showed that school administrators generally demonstrated high to very high levels across all variables. Organizational cohesion was strong, particularly in shared vision and trust building. E-competence was also highly evident, with information literacy and cyber leadership obtaining the highest ratings. Monitoring and evaluation practices were very highly practiced, especially in outcome tracking, resource audit, and data adjustment. Managerial proficiency was likewise rated highly, with strategic planning and performance control emerging as strengths. Correlation analysis revealed significant positive relationships among organizational cohesion, e-competence, monitoring and evaluation practices, and managerial proficiency. Regression analysis further showed that resource audit under monitoring and evaluation practices was the best predictor of managerial proficiency. These findings suggest that administrators who foster cohesion, strengthen digital competence, and apply systematic monitoring and evaluation are more likely to demonstrate stronger managerial proficiency. The study concludes that effective school leadership requires not only technical and administrative competence but also collaborative, data-driven, and digitally responsive practices.

Keywords: organizational cohesion, e-competence, monitoring and evaluation practices, managerial proficiency, school administrators, resource audit, educational leadership

INRODUCTION

School administrators play a crucial role in ensuring that school's function effectively and achieve their educational goals. In today's rapidly changing educational environment, administrators are expected not only to manage day-to-day operations but also to demonstrate strong managerial proficiency in areas such as strategic planning, resource allocation, decision making, staff development, and performance control. They are also expected to maintain organizational cohesion, apply e-competence in managing digital demands, and implement monitoring and evaluation practices that support continuous school improvement. As schools become more complex and technology-driven, the quality of administrative leadership becomes increasingly important in shaping instructional quality, organizational effectiveness, and learner outcomes.

Monitoring and evaluation are especially significant because they provide administrators with evidence for planning, decision making, and improvement. Through outcome tracking, instructional oversight, resource auditing, data adjustment, and stakeholder review, school leaders can identify strengths, address weaknesses, and sustain quality performance. Likewise, organizational cohesion strengthens school leadership by promoting shared vision, trust, communication, and collaboration among school members. In addition, e-competence has become essential in school administration because leaders are now expected to manage digital information,

communicate online, integrate technology, and ensure online safety in educational settings. These dimensions are all interconnected and contribute to the overall managerial proficiency of school administrators.

The reason for conducting this study is to determine how organizational cohesion, e-competence, and monitoring and evaluation practices relate to the managerial proficiency of school administrators. Specifically, the study seeks to identify which among these variables best predict managerial proficiency and curriculum implementation quality. The findings of this study may help school leaders, education supervisors, and policy makers strengthen administrative practices and design interventions that improve school management and instructional effectiveness. Ultimately, this study is important because effective school leadership depends on the ability of administrators to lead collaboratively, use technology wisely, monitor outcomes systematically, and manage school resources and people efficiently.

METHODOLOGY

This study utilized a quantitative descriptive-correlational design method. A quantitative descriptive-correlational design method combines elements of both descriptive research and correlational research. This research approach aims to describe and examine the relationship between variables in a quantitative manner. Additionally, linear regression analysis was employed to determine which independent variables best predict managerial proficiency. The study used an adapted survey questionnaire.

The first part of the instrument on organizational cohesion of school administrators was adapted from Bacolod, M. J., et al. (2025), it consists of items representing the following dimensions: shared vision, effective communication, trust building, sense of unity, and collaborative culture. While these instruments are grounded in established standards, the consistently high results suggest a need for future refinement to include more nuanced indicators that can better capture fine-grained variability in administrator cohesion and reduce potential response bias. The second part of the instrument on e-competence was adapted from Olamire, O. J. (2025). It includes the following variables: information literacy, cyber leadership, online communication and collaboration, technology integration, and online safety. The third part of the instrument on monitoring and evaluation practices was adapted from Silva, J. R. (2025). It includes the following variables: outcome tracking, instructional oversight, resource audit, data adjustment, and stakeholder review.

Finally, the fourth part of the questionnaire assessed managerial proficiency adapted from Mariñas, B. O., & Ditapat, P. (2022). These includes the following variables: strategic planning, resource allocation, decision making, staff development, and performance control. It was administered to school administrators to determine their organizational cohesion, e-competence, monitoring and evaluation practices, and managerial proficiency. The researcher oriented the respondents and explained the purpose of the study, and were given informed consent.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Organization Cohesion

Table 1 presents the level of organizational cohesion of school administrators in terms of shared vision. The findings show a High-Level Cohesion overall, with a sub-mean of 4.48, indicating that school administrators and staff generally agree that the school's vision is shared, understood, and used to guide action. This is important because a shared vision helps align people's work, reduce confusion, and strengthen commitment to school goals.

Table 1: Level of organizational cohesion of school administrators in terms of shared vision

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
Alignment reduces role confusion.	4.59	Strongly	Very High-Level Cohesion

		Agree	
Goals are revisited in team meetings.	4.56	Strongly Agree	Very High-Level Cohesion
Staff understand long-term objectives.	4.51	Strongly Agree	Very High-Level Cohesion
Vision inspires collective commitment.	4.50	Strongly Agree	Very High-Level Cohesion
Common mission guides daily operations.	4.48	Agree	High Level Cohesion
Vision is clearly communicated to everyone.	4.46	Agree	High Level Cohesion
Vision supports innovation initiatives.	4.42	Agree	High Level Cohesion
School goals align with all staff efforts.	4.35	Agree	High Level Cohesion
SUB-MEAN	4.48	Agree	High Level Cohesion

Legend:

Rating	Range	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
5	4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree	Very High-Level Cohesion
4	3.51-4.50	Agree	High Level Cohesion
3	2.51-3.50	Moderately Agree	Moderate Level Cohesion
2	1.51-2.50	Disagree	Low Level Cohesion
1	1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree	Very Low Cohesion

The highest-rated indicator is “Alignment reduces role confusion” with a mean of 4.59, followed by “Goals are revisited in team meetings” at 4.56 and “Staff understand long-term objectives” at 4.51. These results suggest that the school’s shared vision is not only written or stated, but also actively reinforced through meetings and daily practice. The lowest mean is 4.35 for “School goals align with all staff efforts,” but this is still within the Agree range, showing that cohesion remains positive across all indicators. Overall, the data indicate that the school has a strong sense of direction and collective purpose

A shared vision aligns stakeholders’ efforts, promotes collective responsibility, and supports school improvement by giving direction to daily actions. Moraal, Suhre, and Van Veen (2023) found that an explicit and shared school vision is positively related to teachers’ commitment, suggesting that vision helps strengthen organizational unity and dedication. Literature also suggests that when school leaders involve staff in vision-building and repeatedly communicate goals, commitment increases and instructional change becomes more sustainable. In addition, shared vision helps create a culture of trust, ownership, and coordinated action, which are essential features of strong school organizations (Moraal et al., 2023; McInerney et al., 2015; Bryk et al., 2015).

Table 2 presents the level of organization cohesion of school administrators in terms of effective communication. The findings show a Very High-Level Cohesion overall, with a sub-mean of 4.61, indicating that communication practices in the school are consistently strong, open, and responsive. This is important

because effective communication helps school leaders and staff maintain mutual understanding, reduce conflict, and support coordinated action toward shared goals.

Table 2: Level of organizational cohesion of school administrators in terms of effective communication

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
Misunderstandings are addressed promptly.	4.77	Strongly Agree	Very High-Level Cohesion
Communication builds mutual understanding.	4.76	Strongly Agree	Very High-Level Cohesion
Updates keep everyone informed.	4.67	Strongly Agree	Very High-Level Cohesion
Open channels exist for feedback.	4.60	Strongly Agree	Very High-Level Cohesion
Digital tools aid clear messaging.	4.60	Strongly Agree	Very High-Level Cohesion
Leaders listen actively to concerns.	4.52	Strongly Agree	Very High-Level Cohesion
Meetings facilitate idea sharing.	4.49	Agree	High Level Cohesion
Information flows timely across levels.	4.45	Agree	High Level Cohesion
SUB-MEAN	4.61	Strongly Agree	Very High-Level Cohesion

Legend:

Rating	Range	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
5	4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree	Very High-Level Cohesion
4	3.51-4.50	Agree	High Level Cohesion
3	2.51-3.50	Moderately Agree	Moderate Level Cohesion
2	1.51-2.50	Disagree	Low Level Cohesion
1	1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree	Very Low Cohesion

The highest-rated indicator is “Misunderstandings are addressed promptly” with a mean of 4.77, followed by “Communication builds mutual understanding” at 4.76 and “Updates keep everyone informed” at 4.67. These results suggest that communication in the school is not only frequent but also purposeful and solution-oriented. The lowest mean is 4.45 for “Information flows timely across levels,” but this still falls within the Agree range, showing that communication remains positive across all indicators. Overall, the data indicate that the school has a strong communication culture that supports teamwork and organizational cohesion.

Effective communication is widely recognized as a core feature of strong school leadership because it helps leaders coordinate people, clarify expectations, and sustain trust among staff. Leithwood, Harris, and Hopkins (2020) explained that successful school leadership depends on building relational trust and maintaining clear communication so that teachers and staff can work toward shared goals. This supports your result because your table shows that administrators and staff strongly agree that feedback channels are open, concerns are listened to, misunderstandings are addressed promptly, and updates keep everyone informed. These communication practices reflect a cohesive school environment where information flows well and collaboration is strengthened.

Table 3 presents the level of organizational cohesion of school administrators in terms of trust building. The findings show a High-Level Cohesion overall, with a sub-mean of 4.41, indicating that trust is generally strong among school administrators and staff, though still slightly lower than the levels shown in shared vision and effective communication. This suggests that the school has a positive trust climate, but there is still room to strengthen some areas such as confidentiality, fairness, and support for vulnerability.

Table 3: Level of organizational cohesion of school administrators in terms of trust building

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
Staff trust each other's competence.	4.66	Strongly Agree	Very High-Level Cohesion
Mutual respect underpins relations.	4.59	Strongly Agree	Very High-Level Cohesion
Reliability fosters dependability.	4.56	Strongly Agree	Very High-Level Cohesion
Vulnerability is handled supportively.	4.37	Agree	High Level Cohesion
Trust enables risk-taking.	4.35	Agree	High Level Cohesion
Fairness guides interactions.	4.31	Agree	High Level Cohesion
Confidentiality is maintained.	4.27	Agree	High Level Cohesion
Past commitments build confidence.	4.22	Agree	High Level Cohesion
SUB-MEAN	4.41	Agree	High Level Cohesion

Legend:

Rating	Range	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
5	4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree	Very High-Level Cohesion
4	3.51-4.50	Agree	High Level Cohesion
3	2.51-3.50	Moderately Agree	Moderate Level Cohesion
2	1.51-2.50	Disagree	Low Level Cohesion
1	1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree	Very Low Cohesion

The highest-rated indicators are "Staff trust each other's competence" ($M = 4.66$) and "Mutual respect underpins relations" ($M = 4.59$), both of which fall under Very High-Level Cohesion. These results suggest that respondents strongly believe colleagues are capable and respectful, which are important foundations of trust in any organization. "Reliability fosters dependability" also received a strong rating ($M = 4.56$), showing that consistency in behavior and follow-through contributes to confidence among staff. The lowest mean is "Past commitments build confidence" ($M = 4.22$), but this still falls within the Agree range, meaning the overall trust environment remains positive.

This supports your finding that staff trust each other's competence and that mutual respect underpins relations, because trust makes collaboration easier and strengthens organizational effectiveness. In addition, Avolio, Kahai, and Dodge (2021) explained that trust encourages people to be more open, dependable, and willing to work toward shared goals, which aligns with your results showing that reliability and respect contribute to cohesion.

Table 4 presents the level of organizational cohesion of school administrators in terms of sense of unity. The findings show a High-Level Cohesion overall, with a sub-mean of 4.27, indicating that respondents generally agree that the school has a shared feeling of belonging, solidarity, and collective identity. This is important because a sense of unity helps members stay connected, support one another, and continue working toward common goals even when challenges arise.

Table 4: Level of organizational cohesion of school administrators in terms of sense of unity.

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
Shared identity motivates.	4.46	Agree	High Level Cohesion
Collective success is celebrated.	4.33	Agree	High Level Cohesion
Strong "we" feeling exists.	4.32	Agree	High Level Cohesion
Group solidarity prevails.	4.29	Agree	High Level Cohesion
Social bonds strengthen cohesion.	4.23	Agree	High Level Cohesion
Unity integrates new members.	4.22	Agree	High Level Cohesion
Unity withstands challenges.	4.21	Agree	High Level Cohesion
Strong "we" feeling exists.	4.13	Agree	High Level Cohesion
SUB-MEAN	4.27	Agree	High Level Cohesion

Legend:

Rating	Range	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
5	4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree	Very High-Level Cohesion
4	3.51-4.50	Agree	High Level Cohesion
3	2.51-3.50	Moderately Agree	Moderate Level Cohesion
2	1.51-2.50	Disagree	Low Level Cohesion
1	1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree	Very Low Cohesion

The highest-rated indicator is "Shared identity motivates" with a mean of 4.46, followed by "Collective success is celebrated" at 4.33 and "Strong 'we' feeling exists" at 4.32. These results suggest that school administrators and staff experience a reasonably strong sense of togetherness. The lowest mean is 4.13 for one of the unity indicators, but it still falls within the Agree range, showing that the overall perception of unity remains positive across all items.

Table 5 presents the level of organizational cohesion of school administrators in terms of collaborative culture. The findings show a High-Level Cohesion overall, with a sub-mean of 4.27, indicating that collaboration is present and generally practiced in the school. This suggests that school administrators and staff are able to work together, share resources, and engage in joint problem-solving, although there is still room to further strengthen teamwork and inclusivity.

Table 5: Level of organizational cohesion of school administrators in terms of collaborative culture.

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
Staff share resources willingly.	4.42	Agree	High Level Cohesion
Culture supports peer mentoring.	4.42	Agree	High Level Cohesion
Joint problem-solving is common.	4.37	Agree	High Level Cohesion
Teams work interdependently.	4.31	Agree	High Level Cohesion
Recognition values team efforts.	4.30	Agree	High Level Cohesion
Cross-role collaborations thrive.	4.22	Agree	High Level Cohesion
Inclusivity defines team dynamics.	4.10	Agree	High Level Cohesion
Collaboration enhances performance.	4.03	Agree	High Level Cohesion
SUB-MEAN	4.27	Agree	High Level Cohesion

Legend:

Rating	Range	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
5	4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree	Very High-Level Cohesion
4	3.51-4.50	Agree	High Level Cohesion
3	2.51-3.50	Moderately Agree	Moderate Level Cohesion
2	1.51-2.50	Disagree	Low Level Cohesion
1	1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree	Very Low Cohesion

The highest-rated indicators are "Staff share resources willingly" and "Culture supports peer mentoring", both with a mean of 4.42. These results show that cooperation is one of the school's strengths because staff are willing to help one another and support professional learning. The lowest mean is 4.03 for "Collaboration enhances performance," but this still falls within the Agree range, showing that respondents still see collaboration as beneficial even if it is not yet maximized. Overall, the table reflects a school culture where collaboration is positive but slightly less strong than the earlier dimensions of communication and trust.

Surmae and Sarabia (2024) reported that school administrators play a crucial role in promoting collaboration by setting clear expectations for teamwork, supporting professional learning communities, and encouraging open communication, which aligns with your indicators on interdependent teams and resource sharing.

Table 6 presents the summary of the level of organizational cohesion of school administrators. The results show an overall mean of 4.40, which is interpreted as Agree and indicates a High Level Cohesion.

Table 6: Level of summary of the level of organizational cohesion of school administrators.

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
Shared Vision	4.48	Agree	High Level Cohesion
Effective Communication	4.61	Strongly Agree	Very High-Level Cohesion
Trust Building	4.41	Agree	High Level Cohesion
Sense of Unity	4.27	Agree	High Level Cohesion
Collaborative Culture	4.27	Agree	High Level Cohesion
OVERALL MEAN	4.40	Agree	High Level Cohesion

Legend:

Rating	Range	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
5	4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree	Very High-Level Cohesion
4	3.51-4.50	Agree	High Level Cohesion
3	2.51-3.50	Moderately Agree	Moderate Level Cohesion
2	1.51-2.50	Disagree	Low Level Cohesion
1	1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree	Very Low Cohesion

Among the five dimensions, Effective Communication obtained the highest mean of 4.61, described as Strongly Agree and interpreted as Very High-Level Cohesion, while Shared Vision registered the next highest mean of 4.48. The remaining dimensions—Trust Building ($M = 4.41$), Sense of Unity ($M = 4.27$), and Collaborative Culture ($M = 4.27$)—all fell under High Level Cohesion.

Tracey et al. (2024) argued that effective communication in schools depends on trust, transparency, and active listening, and these features help create stronger stakeholder relationships. This supports your finding that effective communication is the strongest dimension in the table.

E-COMPETENCE

Table 7 presents the level of e-competence of school administrators in terms of information literacy. The findings show a Very Highly Level Competent overall rating, with a sub-mean of 4.77, indicating that the respondents have very strong skills in finding, evaluating, organizing, and using digital information. This suggests that school administrators are highly capable of navigating online resources in ways that support informed decision-making and educational work. Table 7: Level of e-competence of school administrators in terms of information literacy

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
I access and manage data from educational platforms effectively.	4.93	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Competent
I identify fake news or misinformation in online educational content.	4.93	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Competent
I evaluate digital sources for credibility, bias, and relevance before use.	4.82	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Competent
I use digital tools to summarize and cite information accurately.	4.77	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Competent
I organize digital information using tools like bookmarks or databases.	4.75	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Competent
I can search for reliable online information using advanced keywords and filters.	4.73	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Competent
I retrieve archived or specialized educational resources online.	4.69	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Competent
I adapt search strategies for different digital learning contexts.	4.51	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Competent
SUB-MEAN	4.77	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Competent

Legend:

Rating	Range	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
5	4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Competent
4	3.51-4.50	Agree	Highly Level Competent
3	2.51-3.50	Moderately Agree	Moderately Level Competent
2	1.51-2.50	Disagree	Low Level Competent
1	1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree	Very Low Competent

The highest-rated indicators are “Access and manage data from educational platforms effectively” and “Identify fake news or misinformation in online educational content,” both with a mean of 4.93. These findings show that the respondents are not only able to retrieve information but also apply critical judgment when dealing with digital content. Other highly rated indicators, such as evaluating sources for credibility ($M = 4.82$) and using digital tools to summarize and cite information accurately ($M = 4.77$), further show that the administrators possess strong information handling skills. The lowest mean is 4.51 for “I adapt search strategies for different digital learning contexts,” but this still falls within the Strongly Agree range and remains very high.

Information literacy is an essential component of e-competence because it enables school administrators to locate, evaluate, organize, and use digital information responsibly. Ordu and Nayır (2021) emphasized that school administrators in the digital age must possess the knowledge and skills to use digital technologies

effectively in order to support school culture, decision-making, and educational improvement. This supports your findings because the respondents strongly agreed that they can search for reliable online information, evaluate digital sources, and organize information using digital tools. Likewise, Georgios et al. (2021) noted that digital competence is vital for school leaders because it helps them identify local needs and streamline administrative processes, which aligns with your high scores in accessing and managing data from educational platforms.

Table 8 presents the level of e-competence of school administrators in terms of cyber leadership. The findings shows that the school administrators are very highly competent in cyber leadership, with an overall sub-mean of 4.51 and a descriptive rating of Strongly Agree. This means they generally demonstrate strong leadership in using technology to guide school improvement, support innovation, and respond to digital demands in education.

Table 8: Level of e-competence of school administrators in terms of cyber leadership.

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
I develop a school-wide digital transformation vision.	4.75	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Competent
I champion innovative tech adoption for efficiency.	4.70	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Competent
I evaluate ROI on technology investments annually.	4.58	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Competent
I foster a culture of continuous digital upskilling.	4.57	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Competent
I inspire staff through successful tech initiatives.	4.39	Agree	Highly Level Competent
I collaborate with edtech vendors strategically.	4.39	Agree	Highly Level Competent
I lead crisis response using digital communication.	4.34	Agree	Highly Level Competent
I advocate for equitable tech access in school.	4.33	Agree	Highly Level Competent
SUB-MEAN	4.51	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Competent

Legend:

Rating	Range	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
5	4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Competent
4	3.51-4.50	Agree	Highly Level Competent
3	2.51-3.50	Moderately Agree	Moderately Level Competent
2	1.51-2.50	Disagree	Low Level Competent
1	1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree	Very Low Competent

The highest-rated indicator is "I develop a school-wide digital transformation vision" with a mean of 4.75, followed by "I champion innovative tech adoption for efficiency" at 4.70. These scores suggest that the administrators do not only use technology, but also provide direction for digital change in the school. Another highly rated indicator is "I evaluate ROI on technology investments annually" with a mean of 4.58, showing that they also think strategically about the value and impact of technology. The lower means, such as "I advocate for equitable tech access in school" ($M = 4.33$) and "I lead crisis response using digital communication" ($M = 4.34$), are still within the Highly Level Competent range, which means these areas are positive but may need strengthening.

Aydin, Karip, and Kocyigit (2025) explained that educational leadership for digital transformation requires not only technical competence but also strategic planning, stakeholder engagement, and organizational change management, which supports your findings that school administrators also evaluate technology investments and foster continuous digital upskilling. Similarly, Mendoza and Santos (2025) noted that cyber leadership in education involves creating a resilient digital culture, ensuring equitable access to technology, and leading communication during digital disruptions, which is consistent with the lower but still positive ratings in your table on crisis response and equitable tech access.

Table 9 presents the level of e-competence of school administrators in terms of online communication and collaboration. The findings shows that the school administrators are highly competent in online communication and collaboration, with an overall sub-mean of 4.46 and a descriptive rating of Agree. This means they are generally capable of communicating, cooperating, and managing tasks through digital platforms, although some areas are stronger than others.

Table 9: Level of e-competence of school administrators in terms of online communication and collaboration.

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
I can troubleshoot basic issues that arise during online collaboration (e.g., login problems, file sharing).	4.73	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Competent
I can give and receive constructive feedback through digital channels.	4.70	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Competent
I can adjust my communication style depending on the audience (peers, supervisors, students, parents).	4.50	Agree	Highly Level Competent
I understand and practice appropriate netiquette (online etiquette) in academic or professional settings.	4.49	Agree	Highly Level Competent
I can manage my time and responsibilities when working on online group tasks.	4.45	Agree	Highly Level Competent
I can communicate clearly and professionally in online platforms (e.g., email, learning management systems, chat).	4.29	Agree	Highly Level Competent
I know how to participate effectively in online discussions or forums.	4.26	Agree	Highly Level Competent
I can collaborate with others using digital tools (e.g., shared documents, video conferencing,	4.26	Agree	Highly Level Competent

group chats).			
SUB-MEAN	4.46	Agree	Highly Level Competent

Legend:

Rating	Range	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
5	4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Competent
4	3.51-4.50	Agree	Highly Level Competent
3	2.51-3.50	Moderately Agree	Moderately Level Competent
2	1.51-2.50	Disagree	Low Level Competent
1	1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree	Very Low Competent

In practical terms, the table implies that school administrators are capable of working effectively in online environments and can respond well to common digital challenges. Their ability to provide and receive feedback, adjust communication style, and solve technical issues supports effective teamwork in virtual or hybrid settings. Overall, the findings reflect a solid level of e-competence in online communication and collaboration.

Calderon (2024) found that secondary school administrators' online communication management practices affect teachers' experiences and school operations, highlighting the importance of clarity, responsiveness, and appropriate digital interaction in school leadership.

Table 10 presents the level of e-competence of school administrators in terms of technology integration. The findings shows that school administrators have a Highly Level Competent rating in technology integration, with an overall sub-mean of 4.38. This means they are generally capable of using technology in school operations and instruction, but their competence is stronger in some areas than in others.

Table 10: Level of e-competence of school administrators in terms of technology integration.

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
I oversee tech procurement aligned with school needs.	4.87	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Competent
I incorporate technology into school planning and operations.	4.54	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Competent
I integrate apps for student engagement and tracking.	4.50	Agree	Highly Level Competent
I facilitate virtual meetings and collaborations seamlessly.	4.45	Agree	Highly Level Competent
I promote blended learning models across the curriculum.	4.42	Agree	Highly Level Competent
I support teachers in using edtech for classroom instruction.	4.37	Agree	Highly Level Competent

I lead tech-enhanced professional development sessions.	4.16	Agree	Highly Level Competent
I align technology use with national education standards.	3.76	Agree	Highly Level Competent
SUB-MEAN	4.38	Agree	Highly Level Competent

Legend:

Rating	Range	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
5	4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Competent
4	3.51-4.50	Agree	Highly Level Competent
3	2.51-3.50	Moderately Agree	Moderately Level Competent
2	1.51-2.50	Disagree	Low Level Competent
1	1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree	Very Low Competent

The strongest indicator is "I oversee tech procurement aligned with school needs" ($M = 4.87$), followed by "I incorporate technology into school planning and operations" ($M = 4.54$) and "I integrate apps for student engagement and tracking" ($M = 4.50$). These results suggest that the administrators are especially strong in planning, selecting, and managing technology for school use. They also appear confident in applying digital tools to improve school management and student engagement. In contrast, the lowest mean is "I align technology use with national education standards" ($M = 3.76$), though this still falls within the Agree range. This suggests that while administrators are generally positive about technology integration, linking technology use to formal curriculum or policy standards may still need strengthening.

Calderon (2024) found that school administrators' technology management practices help improve instructional advancement, although challenges such as inadequate equipment and limited technical support may still limit full integration. This is consistent with your result showing that technology integration is already strong, but some areas still need strengthening.

Table 11 presents the level of e-competence of school administrators in terms of online safety. The findings shows that school administrators have a Highly Level Competent level in online safety, with a sub-mean of 3.96. This means they generally practice safe and responsible digital habits, but the overall level is slightly lower than the other e-competence areas you shared.

Table 11: Level of e-competence of school administrators in terms of online safety.

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
I promote ethical digital citizenship among stakeholders.	4.10	Agree	Highly Level Competent
I monitor student data privacy compliance regularly.	4.01	Agree	Highly Level Competent
I train staff on recognizing phishing and cyber threats.	3.98	Agree	Highly Level Competent

I enforce policies for safe internet use in school.	3.96	Agree	Highly Level Competent
I conduct regular audits of school network security.	3.96	Agree	Highly Level Competent
I educate parents on online risks and protections.	3.95	Agree	Highly Level Competent
I implement firewalls and antivirus across school devices.	3.94	Agree	Highly Level Competent
I respond promptly to digital security incidents.	3.84	Agree	Highly Level Competent
SUB-MEAN	3.96	Agree	Highly Level Competent

Legend:

Rating	Range	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
5	4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Competent
4	3.51-4.50	Agree	Highly Level Competent
3	2.51-3.50	Moderately Agree	Moderately Level Competent
2	1.51-2.50	Disagree	Low Level Competent
1	1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree	Very Low Competent

The strongest indicator is "I promote ethical digital citizenship among stakeholders" ($M = 4.10$), followed by "I monitor student data privacy compliance regularly" ($M = 4.01$). These results suggest that administrators are most confident in promoting responsible online behavior and protecting privacy. Other indicators such as enforcing safe internet use policies, training staff on phishing, and conducting security audits are also positive, but they remain just below or around the 4.00 mark. The lowest mean is "I respond promptly to digital security incidents" ($M = 3.84$), which indicates that incident response may be the weakest area in this dimension.

Table 12 presents the summary of the level of e-competence of school administrators. The findings show that the overall mean of 4.42, which is interpreted as Agree and indicates a Highly Level Competent level overall. Table

12: Level of summary of the level of e-competence of school administrators.

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
Information Literacy	4.77	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Competent
Cyber Leadership	4.51	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Competent
Online Communication and Collaboration	4.46	Agree	Highly Level Competent
Technology Integration	4.38	Agree	Highly Level Competent

Online Safety	3.96	Agree	Highly Level Competent
OVERALL MEAN	4.42	Agree	Highly Level Competent

Legend:

Rating	Range	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
5	4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Competent
4	3.51-4.50	Agree	Highly Level Competent
3	2.51-3.50	Moderately Agree	Moderately Level Competent
2	1.51-2.50	Disagree	Low Level Competent
1	1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree	Very Low Competent

This means that the school administrators generally demonstrate strong digital competence, especially in locating, evaluating, and using online information, as well as in leading digital transformation. Their strongest area is information literacy, which suggests that they are highly capable of searching for, assessing, and managing digital resources. Cyber leadership also stands out, showing that they are able to guide technology-related change and support innovation in the school. However, the slightly lower mean in online safety suggests that this area may need further strengthening compared with the other dimensions.

Monitoring and Evaluation Practices

Table 13 presents the level of monitoring and evaluation practices of school administrators in terms of outcome tracking. The findings show a Very Highly Level Practiced overall, with a sub-mean of 4.64, indicating that the administrators consistently engage in results-based monitoring and evaluation.

Table 13: Level monitoring and evaluation practices of school administrators in terms of outcome tracking

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
I evaluate curriculum alignment to standards.	4.77	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Practiced
I use benchmarks for annual improvements.	4.73	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Practiced
I monitor learner progress via assessments.	4.70	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Practiced
I track enrollment and retention rates.	4.67	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Practiced
I report outcomes to division supervisors.	4.66	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Practiced
I regularly assess program effectiveness.	4.63	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Practiced

I set measurable goals for student achievement.	4.56	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Practiced
I link outcomes to school improvement plans.	4.52	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Practiced
SUB-MEAN	4.64	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Practiced

Legend:

Rating	Range	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
5	4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Practiced
4	3.51-4.50	Agree	Highly Level Practiced
3	2.51-3.50	Moderately Agree	Moderately Level Practiced
2	1.51-2.50	Disagree	Low Level Practiced
1	1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree	Very Low Practiced

The highest-rated indicator is "I evaluate curriculum alignment to standards" with a mean of 4.77, followed by "I use benchmarks for annual improvements" ($M = 4.73$) and "I monitor learner progress via assessments" ($M = 4.70$). These results suggest that the administrators are especially strong in linking school outcomes to academic standards and measurable progress. Other highly rated indicators, such as tracking enrollment and retention rates and reporting outcomes to division supervisors, show that they also value accountability and evidence-based reporting. The lowest mean is "I link outcomes to school improvement plans" ($M = 4.52$), but this still falls within the Very Highly Level Practiced range, showing that this area remains strong even if it is slightly less emphasized than the others.

PerformYard (2023) noted that modern performance management in education should include regular feedback, broader indicators of success, and systems that allow educators to make timely adjustments. This supports your finding that school administrators report outcomes to division supervisors and link outcomes to school improvement plans, even though that item received the lowest mean in the table. Overall, the literature suggests that strong outcome tracking helps administrators ensure that programs, curriculum, and student performance are all aligned with school goals and standards.

Table 14 presents the level of monitoring and evaluation practices of school administrators in terms of instructional oversight. The findings shows that the monitoring and evaluation practices of school administrators in terms of instructional oversight are at a Very Highly Level Practiced, with a sub-mean of 4.51. This means that the administrators consistently observe teaching, give feedback, review instructional quality, and support teachers in improving classroom practice.

Table 14: Level monitoring and evaluation practices of school administrators in terms of instructional oversight.

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
I supervise teaching methods alignment.	4.70	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Practiced
I assess professional development impact.	4.56	Strongly	Very Highly Level Practiced

		Agree	
I ensure inclusive teaching practices.	4.56	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Practiced
I provide feedback to teacher's post-visit.	4.52	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Practiced
I review lesson plans for quality.	4.48	Agree	Highly Level Practiced
I organize peer review sessions.	4.46	Agree	Highly Level Practiced
I conduct classroom observations routinely.	4.44	Agree	Highly Level Practiced
I mentor underperforming instructors.	4.42	Agree	Highly Level Practiced
SUB-MEAN	4.51	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Practiced

Legend:

Rating	Range	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
5	4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Practiced
4	3.51-4.50	Agree	Highly Level Practiced
3	2.51-3.50	Moderately Agree	Moderately Level Practiced
2	1.51-2.50	Disagree	Low Level Practiced
1	1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree	Very Low Practiced

The highest-rated indicator is "I supervise teaching methods alignment" with a mean of 4.70, followed by "I assess professional development impact" and "I ensure inclusive teaching practices" both with means of 4.56. These results suggest that the administrators are especially strong in making sure that what happens in the classroom is aligned with expected teaching standards and that teacher development is actually producing improvement. The lowest mean is "I conduct classroom observations routinely" at 4.44, but this still falls within the Highly Level Practiced range, showing that the practice is still positive and well established.

Teaching Times (2025) noted that lesson observation is most effective when it is followed by reflection, feedback, and collaborative improvement rather than used only for inspection. This is relevant to your data because the administrators not only conduct classroom observations but also review lesson plans and assess professional development impact, showing that supervision is being used as a support mechanism.

Table 15 presents the level of monitoring and evaluation practices of school administrators in terms resource audit. The findings shows that the monitoring and evaluation practices of school administrators in terms of resource audit are at a Very Highly Level Practiced, with a sub-mean of 4.62. This means that the administrators consistently monitor school resources, review utilization, and check whether financial and material assets are being used properly.

Table 15: Level monitoring and evaluation practices of school administrators in terms of resource audit.

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
I track instructional materials inventory.	4.84	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Practiced
I audit physical facilities regularly.	4.77	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Practiced
I monitor budget utilization quarterly.	4.73	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Practiced
I optimize resource allocation yearly.	4.73	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Practiced
I review staff deployment efficiency.	4.66	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Practiced
I evaluate procurement compliance.	4.54	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Practiced
I assess tech resource functionality.	4.44	Agree	Highly Level Practiced
I report financial variances timely.	4.31	Agree	Highly Level Practiced
SUB-MEAN	4.62	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Practiced

Legend:

Rating	Range	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
5	4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Practiced
4	3.51-4.50	Agree	Highly Level Practiced
3	2.51-3.50	Moderately Agree	Moderately Level Practiced
2	1.51-2.50	Disagree	Low Level Practiced
1	1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree	Very Low Practiced

The highest-rated indicator is “I track instructional materials inventory” with a mean of 4.84, followed by “I audit physical facilities regularly” at 4.77 and “I monitor budget utilization quarterly” and “I optimize resource allocation yearly” both at 4.73. These results suggest that the administrators are especially strong in keeping track of school assets and ensuring that resources are available and used effectively. The lower means, “I assess tech resource functionality” ($M = 4.44$) and “I report financial variances timely” ($M = 4.31$), still fall within the Highly Level Practiced range, which means these areas are also positive but slightly less emphasized than the others.

Table 16 presents the level of monitoring and evaluation practices of school administrators in terms data adjustments. The findings shows that the monitoring and evaluation practices of school administrators in terms of data adjustments are at a Very Highly Level Practiced, with a sub-mean of 4.57. This means that the

administrators do not just collect and review data, but also use it actively to improve plans, make corrections, and guide future decisions.

Table 16: Level monitoring and evaluation practices of school administrators in terms of data adjustments.

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
I forecast needs from performance data.	4.90	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Practiced
I implement corrective actions promptly.	4.78	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Practiced
I update SIP from evaluation results.	4.68	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Practiced
I validate data accuracy routinely.	4.59	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Practiced
I analyze M&E data for trends.	4.52	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Practiced
I integrate feedback loops continuously.	4.45	Agree	Highly Level Practiced
I adjust plans based on findings.	4.38	Agree	Highly Level Practiced
I share insights for team buy-in.	4.30	Agree	Highly Level Practiced
SUB-MEAN	4.57	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Practiced

Legend:

Rating	Range	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
5	4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Practiced
4	3.51-4.50	Agree	Highly Level Practiced
3	2.51-3.50	Moderately Agree	Moderately Level Practiced
2	1.51-2.50	Disagree	Low Level Practiced
1	1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree	Very Low Practiced

The highest-rated indicator is “I forecast needs from performance data” with a mean of 4.90, followed by “I implement corrective actions promptly” at 4.78 and “I update SIP from evaluation results” at 4.68. These results suggest that the administrators are highly responsive to the findings of monitoring and evaluation. They are using data not only to look at what happened in the past, but also to predict what will be needed in the future and to revise school plans accordingly. The lowest mean is “I share insights for team buy-in” at 4.30, but this still falls within the Agree range, showing that collaboration and communication are still positively practiced.

Table 17 presents the level of monitoring and evaluation practices of school administrators in terms stakeholder review. The findings shows that the monitoring and evaluation practices of school administrators in terms

of stakeholder review are at a Highly Level Practiced, with a sub-mean of 4.49. Table 17: Level monitoring and evaluation practices of school administrators in terms of terms stakeholder review.

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
I address stakeholder concerns swiftly.	4.67	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Practiced
I consult parents on school progress.	4.64	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Practiced
I involve teachers in evaluations.	4.55	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Practiced
I engage community in monitoring.	4.45	Agree	Highly Level Practiced
I gather input via surveys.	4.45	Agree	Highly Level Practiced
I collaborate with supervisors on reviews.	4.44	Agree	Highly Level Practiced
I report to DepEd division regularly.	4.40	Agree	Highly Level Practiced
I celebrate achievements collectively.	4.33	Agree	Highly Level Practiced
SUB-MEAN	4.49	Agree	Highly Level Practiced

Legend:

Rating	Range	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
5	4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Practiced
4	3.51-4.50	Agree	Highly Level Practiced
3	2.51-3.50	Moderately Agree	Moderately Level Practiced
2	1.51-2.50	Disagree	Low Level Practiced
1	1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree	Very Low Practiced

The highest-rated indicator is "I address stakeholder concerns swiftly" with a mean of 4.67, followed by "I consult parents on school progress" at 4.64 and "I involve teachers in evaluations" at 4.55. These results suggest that the administrators value responsiveness, consultation, and inclusion in their monitoring and evaluation practices. The lower means, such as "I report to DepEd division regularly" ($M = 4.40$) and "I celebrate achievements collectively" ($M = 4.33$), still fall within the Agree range, showing that these practices are also present but slightly less emphasized than direct stakeholder consultation and concern resolution.

Table 18 presents the summary of the level of monitoring and evaluation practices of school administrators. The findings shows that the overall monitoring and evaluation practices of school administrators are at a Very Highly Level Practiced, with an overall mean of 4.56. This means that the administrators consistently apply monitoring and evaluation in a systematic, evidence-based, and improvement-oriented way.

Table 18: Level of summary of the level of monitoring and evaluation practices of school administrators.

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
Outcome tracking	4.64	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Practiced
Instructional Oversight	4.51	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Practiced
Resource Audit	4.62	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Practiced
Data Adjustments	4.57	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Practiced
Stakeholder Review	4.49	Agree	Highly Level Practiced
OVERALL MEAN	4.56	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Practiced

Legend:

Rating	Range	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
5	4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree	Very Highly Level Practiced
4	3.51-4.50	Agree	Highly Level Practiced
3	2.51-3.50	Moderately Agree	Moderately Level Practiced
2	1.51-2.50	Disagree	Low Level Practiced
1	1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree	Very Low Practiced

This suggests that school administrators are strongest in practices that involve measuring results, checking resources, and using data for improvement. They appear to be highly focused on academic outcomes, resource accountability, and decision-making based on evidence. Their strong ratings in outcome tracking and resource audit indicate that they are attentive to both instructional results and the proper use of school assets. Instructional oversight and data adjustments also reflect a leadership style that is active and responsive, especially in improving teaching quality and revising plans based on findings.

Managerial Proficiency

Table 19 presents the level of managerial proficiency of school administrators in terms strategic planning. The findings shows that the managerial proficiency of school administrators in terms of strategic planning is at a Very High Proficiency level, with an overall sub-mean of 4.59. This means that the administrators are highly capable of setting direction, planning for improvement, and involving stakeholders in the planning process.

Table 19: Level of managerial proficiency of school administrators in terms of terms strategic planning.

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
Involve stakeholders in planning.	4.72	Strongly Agree	Very High Proficiency
Monitor progress against milestones.	4.69	Strongly Agree	Very High Proficiency

Align plans with community priorities.	4.68	Strongly Agree	Very High Proficiency
Evaluate plan implementation yearly.	4.60	Strongly Agree	Very High Proficiency
Set long-term objectives for improvement.	4.55	Strongly Agree	Very High Proficiency
Adapt strategies to changes.	4.53	Strongly Agree	Very High Proficiency
Forecast needs and risks effectively.	4.49	Agree	High Proficiency
Develop school vision aligned with DepEd goals.	4.47	Agree	High Proficiency
SUB-MEAN	4.59	Strongly Agree	Very High Proficiency

Legend:

Rating	Range	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
5	4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree	Very High Proficiency
4	3.51-4.50	Agree	High Proficiency
3	2.51-3.50	Moderately Agree	Moderate Proficiency
2	1.51-2.50	Disagree	Low Proficiency
1	1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree	Very Low Proficiency

The highest-rated indicator is “Involve stakeholders in planning” with a mean of 4.72, followed by “Monitor progress against milestones” at 4.69 and “Align plans with community priorities” at 4.68. These results suggest that the administrators do not plan alone; instead, they value participation, community alignment, and regular monitoring. The lowest mean is “Develop school vision aligned with DepEd goals” at 4.47, but this still falls within the High Proficiency range, showing that it remains a strong area even if slightly lower than the others.

Table 20 presents the level of managerial proficiency of school administrators in terms resource allocation. The findings shows that the managerial proficiency of school administrators in terms of resource allocation is at a High Proficiency level, with an overall sub-mean of 4.47. This means that the administrators are generally effective in budgeting, managing facilities, distributing resources, and ensuring that school needs are addressed fairly.

Table 20: Level of managerial proficiency of school administrators in terms of terms resource allocation.

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
Allocate budget optimally for needs.	4.64	Strongly Agree	Very High Proficiency
Manage facilities and equipment well.	4.59	Strongly	Very High Proficiency

		Agree	
Report finances transparently.	4.50	Agree	High Proficiency
Distribute human resources fairly.	4.44	Agree	High Proficiency
Optimize for teaching-learning.	4.44	Agree	High Proficiency
Track utilization and wastage.	4.43	Agree	High Proficiency
Ensure equitable access for all.	4.38	Agree	High Proficiency
Prioritize instructional materials.	4.37	Agree	High Proficiency
SUB-MEAN	4.47	Agree	High Proficiency

Legend:

Rating	Range	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
5	4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree	Very High Proficiency
4	3.51-4.50	Agree	High Proficiency
3	2.51-3.50	Moderately Agree	Moderate Proficiency
2	1.51-2.50	Disagree	Low Proficiency
1	1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree	Very Low Proficiency

The highest-rated indicator is "Allocate budget optimally for needs" with a mean of 4.64, followed by "Manage facilities and equipment well" at 4.59. These results suggest that the administrators are strongest in handling financial and material resources in ways that support school operations. The lowest means are "Prioritize instructional materials" ($M = 4.37$) and "Ensure equitable access for all" ($M = 4.38$), but these still fall within the Agree range, showing that they remain positive aspects of resource allocation practice.

Table 21 presents the level of managerial proficiency of school administrators in terms decision making. The findings shows that the **managerial proficiency** of school administrators in terms of **decision-making** is at a **High Proficiency** level, with an overall sub-mean of **4.46**.

Table 21: Level of managerial proficiency of school administrators in terms of terms decision making.

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
Align with ethical standards.	4.58	Strongly Agree	Very High Proficiency
Evaluate decision outcomes.	4.56	Strongly Agree	Very High Proficiency
Innovate solutions to problems.	4.52	Strongly Agree	Very High Proficiency
Balance stakeholder inputs.	4.47	Agree	High Proficiency

Make informed, timely decisions.	4.46	Agree	High Proficiency
Resolve conflicts constructively.	4.43	Agree	High Proficiency
Delegate appropriately.	4.42	Agree	High Proficiency
Use data for evidence-based choices.	4.29	Agree	High Proficiency
SUB-MEAN	4.46	Agree	High Proficiency

Legend:

Rating	Range	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
5	4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree	Very High Proficiency
4	3.51-4.50	Agree	High Proficiency
3	2.51-3.50	Moderately Agree	Moderate Proficiency
2	1.51-2.50	Disagree	Low Proficiency
1	1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree	Very Low Proficiency

Resource allocation is a core component of managerial proficiency because school leaders must ensure that financial, physical, and human resources are used efficiently to support teaching and learning. Recent literature emphasizes that effective school administrators are expected to budget strategically, distribute resources fairly, and align allocations with school improvement priorities. United States Department of Education (2025) noted that strong resource allocation practices require school leaders to connect available funds and materials with student needs, instructional goals, and improvement plans. This supports your results because the highest mean in Table 20 is Allocate budget optimally for needs $(M = 4.64)$, followed by Manage facilities and equipment well $(M = 4.59)$, showing that the respondents are very strong in managing school resources responsibly.

Table 22 presents the level of managerial proficiency of school administrators in terms of staff development. The findings shows that the managerial proficiency of school administrators in terms of staff development is at a High Proficiency level, with an overall sub-mean of 4.49.

Table 22: Level of managerial proficiency of school administrators in terms of terms of staff development.

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
Conduct performance appraisals.	4.70	Strongly Agree	Very High Proficiency
Foster leadership in staff.	4.69	Strongly Agree	Very High Proficiency
Address development needs.	4.67	Strongly Agree	Very High Proficiency
Provide professional training opportunities.	4.53	Strongly Agree	Very High Proficiency

Support work-life balance.	4.37	Agree	High Proficiency
Mentor teachers for growth.	4.33	Agree	High Proficiency
Motivate through recognition.	4.33	Agree	High Proficiency
Build team capacities.	4.30	Agree	High Proficiency
SUB-MEAN	4.49	Agree	High Proficiency

Legend:

Rating	Range	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
5	4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree	Very High Proficiency
4	3.51-4.50	Agree	High Proficiency
3	2.51-3.50	Moderately Agree	Moderate Proficiency
2	1.51-2.50	Disagree	Low Proficiency
1	1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree	Very Low Proficiency

The highest-rated indicator is "Conduct performance appraisals" with a mean of 4.70, followed by "Foster leadership in staff" at 4.69 and "Address development needs" at 4.67. These results suggest that the administrators are particularly strong in evaluating staff performance and encouraging leadership potential among teachers. The lowest means are "Build team capacities" ($M = 4.30$) and "Mentor teachers for growth" ($M = 4.33$), but these still fall within the Agree range, showing that staff development is still positively practiced even if these areas may need further strengthening.

Table 23 presents the level of managerial proficiency of school administrators in terms of performance control. The findings shows that the **managerial proficiency** of school administrators in terms of **performance control** is at a **Very High Proficiency** level, with an overall sub-mean of **4.55**.

Table 23: Level of managerial proficiency of school administrators in terms of terms of performance control.

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
Promote accountability culture.	4.74	Strongly Agree	Very High Proficiency
Monitor operations regularly.	4.70	Strongly Agree	Very High Proficiency
Set clear performance standards.	4.63	Strongly Agree	Very High Proficiency
Use feedback for adjustments.	4.60	Strongly Agree	Very High Proficiency
Sustain continuous improvement.	4.50	Agree	High Proficiency
Ensure compliance with policies.	4.49	Agree	High Proficiency

Implement corrective actions.	4.43	Agree	High Proficiency
Evaluate overall school performance.	4.37	Agree	High Proficiency
SUB-MEAN	4.55	Strongly Agree	Very High Proficiency

Legend:

Rating	Range	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
5	4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree	Very High Proficiency
4	3.51-4.50	Agree	High Proficiency
3	2.51-3.50	Moderately Agree	Moderate Proficiency
2	1.51-2.50	Disagree	Low Proficiency
1	1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree	Very Low Proficiency

The highest-rated indicator is "Promote accountability culture" with a mean of 4.74, followed by "Monitor operations regularly" at 4.70 and "Set clear performance standards" at 4.63. These results suggest that the administrators are especially strong in creating a work environment where performance is monitored and responsibility is emphasized. The lower means are "Evaluate overall school performance" ($M = 4.37$) and "Implement corrective actions" ($M = 4.43$), but these still fall within the High Proficiency range, indicating that these practices are present and positive, though not as strong as the others.

Table 24 presents the summary of the level of managerial proficiency of school administrators. The findings shows that the overall managerial proficiency of school administrators is at a Very High Proficiency level, with an overall mean of 4.51. This means that the administrators are generally strong in planning, allocating resources, making decisions, developing staff, and controlling performance.

Table 24: Level of summary of the level of managerial proficiency of school administrators.

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
Strategic Planning	4.59	Strongly Agree	Very High Proficiency
Resource Allocation	4.47	Agree	High Proficiency
Decision Making	4.46	Agree	High Proficiency
Staff Development	4.49	Agree	High Proficiency
Performance Control	4.55	Strongly Agree	Very High Proficiency
OVERALL MEAN	4.51	Strongly Agree	Very High Proficiency

Legend: 4.51

Rating	Range	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
5	4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree	Very High Proficiency

4	3.51-4.50	Agree	High Proficiency
3	2.51-3.50	Moderately Agree	Moderate Proficiency
2	1.51-2.50	Disagree	Low Proficiency
1	1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree	Very Low Proficiency

Among the five dimensions, Strategic Planning obtained the highest mean of 4.59, followed by Performance Control with 4.55. These results suggest that the administrators are especially strong in setting direction and ensuring that school operations stay aligned with goals and standards. The remaining dimensions—Staff Development ($M = 4.49$), Resource Allocation ($M = 4.47$), and Decision Making ($M = 4.46$)—all fall within the High Proficiency range, showing that these are also solid areas of competence, though slightly lower than the first two.

In practical terms, the findings imply that school administrators are capable of guiding school improvement through organized planning and consistent monitoring. Their strong performance in strategic planning and performance control suggests that they are able to set goals, track progress, and maintain accountability. At the same time, the scores in resource allocation, decision making, and staff development show that they are also managing the human, material, and operational aspects of leadership effectively.

Table 25 presents the relationship of organizational cohesion, e-competence, and monitoring and evaluation practices on managerial proficiency of school administrators. The results indicate that organizational cohesion, e-competence, and monitoring and evaluation practices are all positively related to the managerial proficiency of school administrators. Most of the variables show significant relationships at the .05 level, which means that as these competencies and practices improve, managerial proficiency also tends to improve. This suggests that managerial proficiency is strengthened not by one skill alone, but by a combination of collaborative, digital, and evaluative capabilities.

Table 10: Relationship of relationship of organizational cohesion, e-competence, and monitoring and evaluation practices on managerial proficiency of school administrators

dependent Variables	Pearson Coefficient (r-value)	Probability (P-value)
Organizational Cohesion		
Share Vision	.349**	.000
Effective Communication	.141**	.002
Trust Building	.404**	.000
Sense of Unity	.034	.448
Collaborative Culture	.140**	.002
Competence		
Information Literacy	.159**	.000
Cyber Leadership	.135**	.002
Online Communication and Collaboration	.183	.000
Technology Integration	.671**	.000

Online Safety	.254**	.000
lonitoring and Evaluation Practices		
Outcome Tracking	.324**	.000
Instructional Oversight	.335**	.000
Resource Audit	.284**	.000
Data Adjustment	.174**	.000
Stakeholder Review	.090	.044

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2- tailed)

Among the organizational cohesion variables, trust building shows the strongest relationship with managerial proficiency ($r = .404, p = .000$), followed by shared vision ($r = .349, p = .000$). This means that administrators who help build trust and maintain a shared direction are more likely to show higher managerial proficiency. Effective communication ($r = .141, p = .002$) and collaborative culture ($r = .140, p = .002$) also have significant but weaker relationships, which still indicate that communication and collaboration matter in managerial performance. However, sense of unity ($r = .034, p = .448$) is not significantly related, suggesting that unity alone, as measured here, does not strongly predict managerial proficiency.

For e-competence, technology integration has the strongest relationship with managerial proficiency ($r = .671, p = .000$), which is a very strong positive association. This means that school administrators who are more capable of integrating technology into planning, operations, and instructional support tend to show much higher managerial proficiency. Online safety ($r = .254, p = .000$), online communication and collaboration ($r = .183, p = .000$), information literacy ($r = .159, p = .000$), and cyber leadership ($r = .135, p = .002$) are also significantly related, though at weaker levels. These findings imply that digital competence supports managerial effectiveness, especially when it is applied directly to school systems and operations.

All monitoring and evaluation variables are significantly related to managerial proficiency except that stakeholder review is the weakest relationship. Instructional oversight ($r = .335, p = .000$) and outcome tracking ($r = .324, p = .000$) show relatively stronger relationships, meaning that administrators who closely monitor teaching and student outcomes tend to be more proficient managers. Resource audit ($r = .284, p = .000$) and data adjustment ($r = .174, p = .000$) are also significant, which suggests that using evidence to improve school operations contributes to managerial skill. Stakeholder review ($r = .090, p = .044$) is statistically significant but very weak, indicating that involving stakeholders is helpful but not as strongly linked to managerial proficiency as the internal monitoring functions.

Overall, the table shows that managerial proficiency is most strongly associated with technology integration, trust building, and instructional oversight. This means school administrators are more likely to be proficient when they can lead with trust, use technology strategically, and closely monitor teaching and outcomes. The findings also suggest that managerial proficiency is a multidimensional construct shaped by both organizational relationships and technical management skills. In short, administrators who are collaborative, digitally competent, and data-driven tend to perform better as managers.

Variable that best predicts the Managerial Proficiency of School Administrators

Table 26 presents the variable that best predicts managerial proficiency of school administrators. The findings show that the variable that best predict the managerial proficiency of school administrators is monitoring and evaluation practices in terms of resource audit is the best predictor of Curriculum Implementation Quality

Table 26: Variable that best predicts the Managerial Proficiency of School Administrators

INDICATORS	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	2.281	0.404		5.643	0.000
Monitoring and Evaluation Practices in terms of Resource Audit	0.364	0.022	0.596	16.465	0.000
R= 0.774 R^2= 0582 F= 32.778 p-value=0.000					

The regression result is statistically significant, with $B = 0.364$, $\beta = 0.596$, $t = 16.465$, and $p = 0.000$, which means resource audit has a strong positive effect on managerial proficiency.

The model also indicates a strong overall relationship, with $R = 0.774$ and $R^2 = 0.582$. This means that 58.2% of the variation in managerial proficiency is explained by resource audit practices alone. The F-value of 32.778 with a p-value of 0.000 confirms that the model is significant. In simple terms, school administrators who regularly monitor budgets, audit facilities, track instructional materials, and evaluate procurement are more likely to demonstrate higher managerial proficiency.

This finding suggests that resource audit is not just a financial or administrative activity, but a leadership function that supports effective management. When school administrators carefully track and manage school resources, they are better able to plan, allocate, and control operations. This improves their overall ability to lead the school efficiently and responsibly.

A concise interpretation is that resource audit is the strongest predictor of managerial proficiency among the variables examined. The more systematic and accurate the resource audit practices are, the higher the managerial proficiency of school administrators tends to be. Here is a possible thesis-style paragraph:

The regression analysis revealed that monitoring and evaluation practices in terms of resource audit significantly predict the managerial proficiency of school administrators. The results showed a strong positive relationship ($R = 0.774$), and resource audit explained 58.2% of the variance in managerial proficiency ($R^2 = 0.582$). Moreover, the predictor was statistically significant ($B = 0.364, \beta = 0.596, t = 16.465, p < 0.001$), indicating that administrators who practice stronger resource audit tend to demonstrate higher managerial proficiency. This implies that effective monitoring of budgets, facilities, instructional materials, and procurement contributes substantially to stronger school management.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The findings of the study led to the following conclusions:

The level of organization cohesion of school administrators obtained “High Level Cohesion This implied that they school administrators generally demonstrate a cohesive organizational climate, establish sense of unity and collaborative culture, while still positive, are slightly lower and may need more deliberate strengthening through inclusive practices, team-building activities, and shared decision-making.

The level of e-competence of school administrators obtained “High Level Competent”. Thus, it could be evident that the school administrators generally demonstrate strong digital competence, especially in locating, evaluating, and using online information, as well as in leading digital transformation.

The level of monitoring and evaluation practices of school administrators attained "Very High-Level Practice". Hence the school administrators consistently practiced monitoring and evaluation in managing school operations, particularly in tracking outcomes, auditing resources, and adjusting data for improvement.

A significant relationship existed between mmanagerial proficiency is most strongly associated with technology integration, trust building, and instructional oversight.

Resource audit is the strongest single factor in improving curriculum implementation quality among the variables tested in this model. Schools that carefully monitor and manage their resources tend to have better curriculum delivery because teachers can work with adequate support and fewer operational constraints.

Based on the findings of the study, it leads to the following recommendations

The Department of Education may strengthen policies and capacity-building programs that focus on monitoring and evaluation practices, especially resource audit, to help school administrators improve their managerial proficiency. School administrators may continue to enhance their skills in planning, tracking, and evaluating school resources to ensure transparency, accountability, and efficient school operations.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Author Contributions: "Conceptualization was done using brainstorming with all of the authors. The needs analysis was conceptualized and was gathered by all the authors. Author 1 served as the main author and all the authors shared the crafting of the different parts of the manuscript including the interpolation and the discussion of the different findings. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

REFERENCES

1. Avolio, B. J., Kahai, S. S., & Dodge, G. E. (2021). E-leadership: Implications for theory, research, and practice. The Leadership Quarterly, 31(1), 101–115.
2. Aydin, Karip, & Kocyigit. (2025). Educational leadership for digital transformation.
3. Bryk, A. S., Gomez, L. M., Grunow, A., & LeMahieu, P. G. (2015). Learning to improve: How America's schools can get better at getting better. Harvard Education Press.
4. Calderon, A. B. B. (2024). An investigation of post-lockdown online communications management practices of secondary school heads.
5. Data-driven decision making in educational leadership: Trends and challenges. (2025).
6. Etioglobal. (2025, September 17). Progress monitoring: The under-used tool to ensuring your school's efforts lead to measurable impact. https://blog.etioglobal.org/blog/progress-monitoring-the-under-used-tool-to-ensuring-your-schools-efforts-lead-to-measurable-imp
7. Georgios, A., et al. (2021). Digital competence and school leadership.
8. Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. School Leadership & Management, 40(1), 5–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2019.1577797
9. McInerney, D. M., Ganotice, F. A., King, R. B., Marsh, H. W., & others. (2015). Teacher and school outcomes linked to shared school vision.
10. Mendoza, & Santos. (2025). Cyber leadership in education.
11. Monitoring & Evaluation Framework (2021–2025). (2025). General education sector, Sri Lanka.
12. Moraal, E., Suhre, C., & Van Veen, K. (2023). A shared school vision and teacher commitment. The Journal of Educational Research.
13. Ordu, A., & Nayır, F. (2021). Digital leadership and school administration in the digital age.
14. Panorama Education. (2024, November 25). A comprehensive guide to data-driven decision-making in education. https://www.panoramaed.com/blog/a-comprehensive-guide-to-data-driven-decision-making-in-education
15. Philippine National Privacy Commission. (2022, January 16). Online learning guidelines issued to help protect student privacy and reduce data breaches in schools. https://privacy.gov.ph/online-learning-guidelines-issued-to-help-protect-student-privacy-and-reduce-data-breaches-in-schools/

16. PerformYard. (2023, October 25). Performance management in education: Best practices. https://www.performyard.com/articles/performance-management-in-education
17. School Monitoring Evaluation and Adjustment in Public Secondary Schools: Practices and Performance of Administrators. (2020). Journal of World Englishes and Educational Practices. https://al-kindipublisher.com/index.php/jweep/article/view/1608
18. Surmae, M., & Sarabia, M. (2024). School administrators' strategies in enhancing teachers' teamwork and collaboration.
19. Teaching Times. (2025, February 12). Lesson observation process & guidance for CPD. https://www.teachingtimes.com/knowledge-banks/lesson-observation/
20. The Role of Educational Leaders in the Development of Students' Technology Use and Digital Citizenship. (2021). ERIC record EJ1333621.
21. Tracey, L., et al. (2024). Effective communication in schools.
22. UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning. (2022). IIEP monitoring, evaluation, and learning strategy 2022–2025. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000384786
23. U.S. Department of Education. (2025, January 13). Keeping students safe online. https://www.ed.gov/teaching-and-administration/safe-learning-environments/school-safety-and-security/keeping-students-safe-online
24. U.S. Department of Education. (2025, January 13). Resource allocation review. https://www.ed.gov/teaching-and-administration/lead-and-manage-my-school/state-support-network/cop/resource-allocation-review