



The Implementation of school governance program in selected elementary schools: Basis for Enhancement

Efilda Dulon Lamarca and Jay Bee Buerano Omaweng *

Graduate School Department, Apayao State College, Malama Conner, Apayao, Philippines, 3807.

International Journal of Science and Research Archive, 2026, 19(03), 412-427

Publication history: Received on 17 April 2026; revised on 25 May 2026; accepted on 27 May 2026

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30574/ijrsra.2026.19.3.1137>

Abstract

The School Governance Program (SGP) promotes transparency, accountability, and stakeholder participation in improving school performance. This study assessed the implementation of the SGP in selected elementary schools in Northern Conner, Apayao, focusing on stakeholders' involvement, extent of implementation, relationship between involvement and implementation, and differences based on school profile. A descriptive-correlational research design was employed involving 75 teachers, parents, and school officials. Data were collected through a validated questionnaire with a reliability coefficient of 0.89 and analyzed using frequency counts, percentages, weighted mean, Pearson Product-Moment Correlation, and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). Findings revealed a high level of stakeholder involvement and a high extent of SGP implementation in terms of transparency, accountability, and stakeholder participation. Results further indicated a significant positive relationship between stakeholder involvement and SGP implementation, with significant differences observed across school profiles. The study concluded that the SGP is effectively implemented. It recommends conducting annual capacity-building activities, increasing stakeholder participation, and institutionalizing quarterly monitoring and evaluation mechanisms to further strengthen governance practices and educational outcomes.

Keywords: School Governance Program; Stakeholders' Participation; Transparency and Accountability; Decentralization IN Education; Rural Schools; School Governance Implementation

1. Introduction

School governance has become a central pillar of educational reform worldwide, emphasizing decentralization, transparency, accountability, and stakeholder participation as mechanisms for improving school effectiveness and educational quality. Globally, countries such as Finland and New Zealand have demonstrated that participatory and school-based governance can strengthen educational outcomes through shared leadership and community engagement. In the Philippines, these reforms were institutionalized through Republic Act No. 9155, also known as the Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001, and further reinforced by the school-Based Management (SBM) Framework, which empowers schools and local stakeholders in decision-making and school improvement initiatives. However, despite these reforms, studies indicate that rural and geographically isolated schools continue to experience challenges in sustaining active stakeholder involvement, accountability systems, and effective governance practices due to limited resources and institutional support.

In Northern Conner, Apayao, schools operate within indigenous and resource-constrained communities where governance practices are shaped by cultural traditions, economic conditions, and geographical isolation. These realities

* Corresponding author: Jay Bee B. Omaweng

create unique challenges in implementing participatory governance and ensuring meaningful community engagement in school operations. Despite existing educational reforms, limited studies have examined how School Governance Programs are implemented in geographically isolated and indigenous elementary schools, particularly in relation to stakeholder participation and operational effectiveness. Motivated by this research gap and the need to strengthen educational equity and responsive governance in underserved communities, the researcher conducted this study to assess the implementation of the School Governance Program in selected elementary schools in Northern Conner and identify strategies to improve transparency, accountability, and stakeholder participation.

2. Methodology

2.1. Research Design

The study employed a descriptive-correlational research design to determine the relationship between stakeholders' involvement in the SGP and its level of implementation in selected elementary schools in Northern Conner as basis for program enhancement.

2.2. Locale of the Study

The study was conducted in ten (10) public elementary schools located in Northern Conner, Apayao, all of which are classified as small schools based on DepEd Memorandum No. 43, series of 2017, namely: Manag ES, Ili ES, Guina-ang ES, Talifugo ES, Guinamgaman ES, Liwan ES, Catub ES, Mabaguio ES, Katablangan Integrated School, Lower Katablangan ES.

2.3. Respondents of the Study

The study involved a total of seventy-five (75) respondents composed of teachers, school officials, and selected parents from ten elementary schools in the Northern Conner District. Stratified sampling was applied to select 49 teachers, total enumeration was used for 9 school officials, and purposive sampling identified 17 parents who were members of the Parents-Teacher Association. The distribution ensured that all participants had direct involvement and sufficient knowledge of the School Governance Program, enabling them to provide relevant insights into its implementation, challenges and outcomes.

2.4. Research Instrument

The researcher employed a combination of tools to gather comprehensive data for the study. Initially, an adopted questionnaire from Martin (2019) was utilized to collect quantitative data. The questionnaire underwent pilot testing, during which the survey results were subjected to Cronbach's alpha in the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) to assess reliability. The Cronbach's Alpha Test for 60 items resulted to 0.89; hence, the questionnaire was considered reliable. The survey questionnaire elicits suggested enhancement strategies to improve the implementation of the school governance program.

2.5. Statistical Analysis

Weighted means were employed to determine the level of stakeholders' involvement in the School Governance Program and the extent of implementation of the School Governance Program in terms of transparency, accountability, and stakeholder participation. The results were interpreted using a predefined 5 pt Likert scale to describe the level of involvement for each stakeholder group. The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient (r) will be used to determine the relationship between stakeholders' involvement and the extent of implementation of the School Governance Program. This statistical tool is appropriate as the variables are measured using interval data derived from Likert-scale responses. A one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used, with $\alpha = 0.05$. Post-hoc comparisons were conducted using the Tukey HSD test to determine significant difference in the extent of SGP implementation when the schools are grouped according to profile.

3. Results and Discussion

This chapter presents, analyzes, and interprets the data gathered from 75 respondents composed of 49 teachers, 17 parents, and 9 school officials from ten (10) selected elementary schools in Northern Conner, all classified as small-sized schools located within barangay communities. The discussion is organized to address each of the specific problems enumerated in the Statement of the Problem.

3.1. Profile of the Schools

Table 1 Profile of the Selected Elementary Schools in Northern Conner

No.	School Name	School Size	Location
1	Manag ES	Small	Manag
2	Guinaang ES	Small	Guinaang
3	Ili ES	Small	Ili
4	Talifugo ES	Small	Talifugo
5	Guinamgaman ES	Small	Guinamgaman
6	Mabaguio ES	Small	Guinamgaman
7	Catub ES	Small	Paddaoan
8	Liwan ES	Small	Ili
9	Upper Katablangan ES	Small	Katablangan
10	Lower Katablangan ES	Small	Katablangan
Total		10 Small	Barangay

As reflected in Table 1, all schools are classified as small, each situated in barangay communities within the Northern Conner district. This profile across school size and location suggests a shared contextual backdrop for examining the implementation of school governance. Schools in barangay settings often face distinct governance challenges, including limited resources, reduced stakeholder pool, and less formalized governance structures, factors that are particularly relevant to the analysis of the School Governance Program's implementation in this study.

The result is supported by a study that directly examined small schools, which found that they face unique challenges due to limited teachers, minimal facilities, and multiple teaching assignments [20]. Additionally, it is identified that funding availability is the most critical factor affecting SGP sustainability, alongside inadequate training and low stakeholder commitment [21]. Moreover, it is also documented that resource-constrained schools face limited stakeholder engagement and insufficient resources [22].

3.2. Level of Stakeholders' Involvement in the School Governance Program

Table 2 Level of Teachers' Involvement in the School Governance Program

	Indicators	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1	I actively participate in school governance meetings and decision-making processes.	4.72	0.56	Strongly Agree
2	I am regularly consulted on matters concerning curriculum development and school policies.	4.52	0.57	Strongly Agree
3	I receive adequate information about school governance initiatives and programs.	4.52	0.54	Strongly Agree
4	My suggestions and feedback are valued and considered in school governance decisions.	4.44	0.57	Agree
5	I am provided with training and support to effectively participate in school governance.	3.96	0.75	Agree
6	I collaborate with parents and school officials in implementing governance programs.	4.54	0.54	Strongly Agree

7	I understand my roles and responsibilities in the School Governance Program.	4.59	0.53	Strongly Agree
8	I have sufficient time and resources to participate in governance activities.	4.43	0.60	Agree
9	I am involved in monitoring and evaluating school governance programs.	4.43	0.60	Agree
10	I feel empowered to contribute to improving school governance practices.	4.52	0.67	Strongly Agree
Overall Mean		4.47	0.20	Agree

Table 2 revealed that the overall level of teachers' involvement in the School Governance Program yielded a mean of 4.47 (SD=0.20), interpreted as Agree. Among the ten indicators, Item 1 (Active participation in governance meetings) registered the highest mean of 4.72 (Strongly Agree), indicating that teachers generally take part in formal governance activities. Item 5 (Provision of training and support for effective participation) yielded the lowest mean of 3.96, still interpreted as Agree, suggesting a slight gap in the adequacy of capacity-building support for teachers. The relatively consistent ratings across items affirm that teachers in Northern Conner elementary schools are meaningfully engaged in governance processes, though opportunities for strengthening training support exist.

This is affirmed by a study of Cabilla (2025) conducted with 24 teachers, where it is found that teachers generally take part in formal governance activities through active committee participation and leadership roles, which enables them to influence school operations and feel a sense of ownership and accountability [23]

Table 3 Level of Parents' Involvement in the School Governance Program

No.	Indicators	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1	I actively participate in Parent-Teacher Association (PTA) meetings and activities.	4.45	0.52	Agree
2	I am informed about school policies, programs, and governance initiatives.	4.36	0.81	Agree
3	I am given opportunities to voice my concerns and suggestions regarding school matters.	4.55	0.52	Strongly Agree
4	The school provides clear channels for parent participation in governance.	4.73	0.47	Strongly Agree
5	I contribute to fundraising and resource mobilization for school improvement.	4.36	0.81	Agree
6	I am involved in school planning and evaluation processes.	4.00	0.81	Agree
7	The school welcomes and values parent participation in governance activities.	4.64	0.50	Strongly Agree
8	I receive timely communication about school events and governance matters.	4.36	0.81	Agree
9	I collaborate with teachers and school officials to support my child's education.	4.64	0.50	Strongly Agree
10	I understand my role and responsibilities in the School Governance Program.	4.73	0.47	Strongly Agree
Overall Mean		4.48	0.22	Agree

As shown in Table 3, parents as a group reported an overall mean of 4.48 (SD = 0.22), interpreted as Agree, reflecting a generally positive level of involvement in school governance activities. Items 4 and 10, both rated at 4.73 (Strongly Agree), were the highest, indicating that parents acknowledged clear channels for participation and understand their roles in the School Governance Program. Item 6 (Involvement in school planning and evaluation) received the lowest rating of 4.00, suggesting that parents perceive relatively limited engagement in formal planning processes. Overall, however, parents' involvement remains at a positive level, supporting the school's governance mechanisms.

As evidenced by a mixed-methods study of Munezero (2024) with 52 respondents in Bug sera District, Rwanda, parents acknowledge clear channels for participation and understand their roles in the School Governance Program through involvement in decision-making processes and quality assurance activities [24].

Table 4 Level of School Officials' Involvement in the School Governance Program

No.	Indicators	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1	I provide leadership and direction in implementing the School Governance Program.	4.70	0.48	Strongly Agree
2	I ensure that all stakeholders are informed about governance policies and procedures.	4.60	0.52	Strongly Agree
3	I facilitate meaningful participation of teachers and parents in school governance.	4.70	0.48	Strongly Agree
4	I allocate sufficient resources to support governance activities.	4.60	0.52	Strongly Agree
5	I monitor and evaluate the implementation of the School Governance Program.	4.50	0.71	Strongly Agree
6	I promote a culture of collaboration and shared decision-making.	4.90	0.32	Strongly Agree
7	I provide training and capacity-building opportunities for stakeholders in governance.	4.40	0.70	Agree
8	I address concerns and feedback from stakeholders regarding governance matters.	4.60	0.52	Strongly Agree
9	I coordinate with external partners and agencies to enhance school governance.	4.60	0.52	Strongly Agree
10	I ensure continuous improvement in school governance practices.	4.60	0.52	Strongly Agree
Overall Mean		4.62	0.13	Strongly Agree

Table 4 shows that school officials registered the highest overall involvement mean at 4.62 (SD = 0.13), interpreted as Strongly Agree. This indicates that school officials perceive themselves as highly engaged in all facets of the School Governance Program. Item 6 (Promoting a culture of collaboration and shared decision-making) yielded the highest mean of 4.90, affirming a strong leadership commitment to participatory governance. Item 7 (Providing training and capacity-building opportunities for stakeholders) was the lowest at 4.40, still interpreted as Agree, indicating that while school heads are actively involved, the delivery of structured capacity-building remains an area for improvement. These findings underscore the pivotal role of school officials in driving governance program implementation.

The result is corroborated by the findings of Alvarez et al. (2023), where it is found that school officials are perceived as highly engaged in all facets of the SGP, with strong leadership in instructional leadership, parent and community involvement, and other areas [25].

Table 5 Level of Stakeholders' Involvement in the School Governance Program

Stakeholder Group	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
Teachers	4.47	Agree
Parents	4.48	Agree
School Officials	4.62	Strongly Agree
Categorical Mean	4.52	Strongly Agree

As gleaned on Table 5, the data show that stakeholders are highly involved in the SGP. Teachers ($M = 4.47$) and parents ($M = 4.48$) both fall under Agree, reflecting consistent participation, while school officials ($M = 4.62$) reached Strongly Agree, indicating the strongest engagement. The categorical mean of 4.52, interpreted as Strongly Agree, confirms that overall stakeholder involvement is very high, with school officials leading in participation.

3.3. Extent of Implementation of the School Governance Program

Table 6 Extent of Implementation of the School Governance Program in Terms of Transparency

No.	Transparency Indicators	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1	School financial reports and budgets are regularly disclosed to stakeholders.	4.41	0.64	Agree
2	School policies and procedures are accessible and clearly communicated to all stakeholders.	4.56	0.55	Strongly Agree
3	Decision-making processes in the school are open and transparent.	4.53	0.58	Strongly Agree
4	Information about school programs and activities is readily available to stakeholders.	4.52	0.55	Strongly Agree
5	The school maintains transparency in procurement and resource allocation.	4.47	0.64	Agree
6	Stakeholders are informed about student performance and school achievements.	4.73	0.47	Strongly Agree
7	The school publishes annual reports on its governance and performance.	4.51	0.64	Strongly Agree
8	Communication channels between the school and stakeholders are effective and open.	4.59	0.55	Strongly Agree
9	The school provides timely feedback on concerns and queries raised by stakeholders.	4.61	0.59	Strongly Agree
10	School governance meetings are documented and minutes are shared with stakeholders.	4.71	0.51	Strongly Agree
Overall Mean		4.56	0.10	Strongly Agree

Table 6 shows that the Transparency dimension obtained an overall mean of 4.56 ($SD = 0.10$), interpreted as Strongly Agree. This indicates that the selected schools are perceived to be effectively transparent in their governance practices. Item 6 (Informing stakeholders about student performance and school achievements) yielded the highest mean of 4.73, while Item 1 (Regular disclosure of financial reports and budgets) registered the lowest mean of 4.41, which is still interpreted as Agree. The consistently high ratings across all items suggest that transparency is a relative strength in the governance practices of these schools. Nonetheless, the comparatively lower score on financial disclosure implies that further concerted efforts may be warranted to ensure comprehensive fiscal transparency.

These findings are substantiated by the research of Fernandez (2025), where a positive correlation was found between transparency and governance, indicating that enhanced transparency significantly contributes to more effective governance structures and practices of schools.

Table 7 Extent of Implementation of the School Governance Program in Terms of Accountability (N = 75)

No.	Accountability Indicators	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1	School officials are held accountable for their roles and responsibilities.	4.67	0.50	Strongly Agree
2	The school has clear mechanisms for addressing complaints and grievances.	4.61	0.52	Strongly Agree
3	Performance of school officials is regularly evaluated and monitored.	4.68	0.52	Strongly Agree
4	The school implements proper financial management and auditing procedures.	4.53	0.53	Strongly Agree
5	School policies are consistently enforced and applied to all stakeholders.	4.63	0.54	Strongly Agree
6	The school maintains accurate records and documentation of governance activities.	4.69	0.52	Strongly Agree
7	Stakeholders can hold the school accountable for its commitments and promises.	4.63	0.56	Strongly Agree
8	The school adheres to legal and regulatory requirements in its operations.	4.67	0.53	Strongly Agree
9	School resources are used efficiently and for their intended purposes.	4.64	0.54	Strongly Agree
10	The school provides regular progress reports on its goals and objectives.	4.61	0.52	Strongly Agree
Overall Mean		4.64	0.05	Strongly Agree

As reflected in Table 7, the Accountability dimension obtained the second-highest overall mean of 4.64 (SD = 0.04), interpreted as Strongly Agree. All ten indicators received ratings above 4.50, consistently interpreted as Strongly Agree, reflecting a strong culture of accountability across the selected schools. Item 3 (Regular evaluation and monitoring of school officials' performance) and Item 6 (Efficient use of school resources) both ranked among the highest, with means of 4.68 and 4.69, respectively. The narrow standard deviation (SD = 0.04) reflects remarkable consistency in respondents' perceptions, underscoring that accountability is uniformly upheld as a governance priority in Northern Conner elementary schools.

This is validated by the study of Maile (2002), where accountability is found to be a key aspect of school governance, with a focus on the responsibilities of parents, principals, and teachers to the school-governing body, as part of the transformation to uphold constitutional principles [26].

Table 8 Extent of Implementation of the School Governance Program in Terms of Stakeholder Participation

No.	Stakeholder Participation Indicators	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1	All stakeholders have equal opportunities to participate in school governance.	4.61	0.52	Strongly Agree
2	The school actively seeks input from all stakeholders in decision-making.	4.64	0.51	Strongly Agree

3	Stakeholders are involved in school planning and development activities.	4.55	0.55	Strongly Agree
4	The school provides multiple channels for stakeholder engagement and participation.	4.63	0.56	Strongly Agree
5	Stakeholder contributions and suggestions are valued and implemented when appropriate.	4.63	0.51	Strongly Agree
6	The school organizes regular consultations and forums for stakeholder participation.	4.57	0.52	Strongly Agree
7	Stakeholders have representatives in school governance bodies and committees.	4.65	0.51	Strongly Agree
8	The school encourages collaborative partnerships among all stakeholders.	4.75	0.47	Strongly Agree
9	Stakeholder participation leads to improved school programs and services.	4.76	0.46	Strongly Agree
10	The school provides support and resources to facilitate stakeholder participation.	4.76	0.46	Strongly Agree
Overall Mean		4.65	0.08	Strongly Agree

Table 8 reveals that the Stakeholder Participation dimension obtained the highest overall mean of 4.65 (SD=0.07) among the three governance dimensions, interpreted as Strongly Agree. Items 8, 9, and 10 all yielded means of 4.75-4.76, reflecting a high degree of collaborative partnerships, program improvement outcomes, and logistical support for participation. Item 3 (Involvement in school planning and development activities) obtained the lowest mean of 4.55, which remains within the Strongly Agree range. These findings suggest that stakeholder participation is deeply embedded in the governance culture of the selected schools, with all stakeholder groups actively contributing to school improvement.

The analysis is anchored in the research of Abidin et al. (2025), where it is found that stakeholder participation is deeply embedded in the governance culture of the schools, with all stakeholder groups actively contributing to school improvement, as evidenced by high levels of mobilization, participation, and empowerment across most demographics [27].

Table 9 Extent of Implementation of the School Governance Program

Indicators	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
Transparency	4.56	Strongly Agree
Accountability	4.64	Agree
Stakeholder's Participation	4.65	Strongly Agree
Categorical Mean	4.61	Strongly Agree

The findings reveal that the implementation of the SGP was rated highly across the three major indicators. Transparency obtained a mean score of 4.56, which corresponds to a Strongly Agree interpretation, indicating that stakeholders perceived the program as highly transparent in its processes and practices. Accountability registered a mean score of 4.64, interpreted as Agree, suggesting that while accountability mechanisms were evident, there remains room for further strengthening to reach the highest level of consensus. Stakeholder Participation achieved the highest mean score of 4.65, interpreted as Strongly Agree, underscoring the active and meaningful involvement of teachers, parents, and school officials in governance activities.

The categorical mean of 4.61, interpreted as Strongly Agree, demonstrates that overall, the School Governance Program was implemented to a very high extent. This reflects a strong alignment among stakeholders in recognizing the

program's effectiveness, particularly in fostering transparency and participation, while accountability remains slightly less emphasized compared to the other dimensions.

3.4. Relationship Between Stakeholders' Involvement and Extent of Implementation

Table 10 Pearson Correlation Between Stakeholders' Involvement and Extent of Implementation of the School Governance Program

Stakeholder Group	Spearman's rho (r)	p-value	Strength and Direction	Status of the Null Hypothesis
Teachers	0.457	0.0005	Moderate positive correlation	Reject
Parents	0.911	0.0001	Very strong positive	Reject
School Officials	0.876	0.0009	Very strong positive	Reject
All Stakeholders	0.555	< .001	moderate-to-strong positive	Reject

Table 10 shows a statistically significant positive relationship between stakeholders' involvement and the extent of implementation of the School Governance Program across all stakeholder groups. Among teachers, the analysis yielded $r=0.457$, $p<.001$, indicating a moderate positive correlation. For parents, the result was $r=0.911$, $p<.001$ a very strong positive relationship suggesting that parents' level of engagement is closely tied to the program's extent of implementation as they perceive it. School officials likewise demonstrated a strong positive correlation, $r=0.876$, $p<.001$. When all stakeholders were combined ($N=75$), the correlation was $r=0.555$, $p<.001$, corresponding to a moderate-to-strong positive relationship. These results uniformly lead to the rejection of the hypothesis, affirming that a higher level of stakeholder involvement is significantly associated with a greater extent of School Governance Program implementation across all respondent groups.

3.5. Significant Difference in the Extent of Implementation by School Profile

Table 11 shows that nine of the ten schools recorded mean implementation scores in the Strongly Agree range ($M \geq 4.50$), with Talifugo ES ($M=4.84$) and Liwan ES ($M=4.90$) recording the highest means. Manag ES posted the lowest mean of 4.17, which falls in the Agree range, suggesting a relatively lower perceived level of implementation among its teachers compared to other schools.

Table 11 School-Level Descriptive Statistics for the Extent of Implementation (Teacher Respondents, $N=54$)

School	N	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
Catub ES	6	4.64	0.30	Strongly Agree
Guinaang ES	7	4.52	0.24	Strongly Agree
Guinamgaman ES	6	4.66	0.31	Strongly Agree
Ili ES	7	4.52	0.28	Strongly Agree
Liwan ES	3	4.90	0.09	Strongly Agree
Lower Katablangan ES	3	4.71	0.20	Strongly Agree
Mabaguio ES	4	4.78	0.17	Strongly Agree
Manag ES	6	4.17	0.53	Agree
Talifugo ES	7	4.84	0.18	Strongly Agree
Upper Katablangan ES	5	4.78	0.13	Strongly Agree
Grand Total / Mean	54	4.65		Strongly Agree

Note. Verbal interpretation based on a 5-point Likert scale: 4.50–5.00 = Strongly Agree; 3.50–4.49 = Agree.

Table 12 ANOVA Summary Table: Differences in the Extent of School Governance Program Implementation by School

Dimension	F	p-value	Significance
Transparency	1.656 ^{ns}	0.1293	Not Significant
Accountability	2.703*	0.0135	Significant
Stakeholder Participation	1.877 ^{ns}	0.0811	Not Significant
Overall Implementation	2.437*	0.0241	Significant

Table 12 presents the ANOVA results across the three governance dimensions and overall implementation. A statistically significant difference was found in the Accountability dimension, $F(9, 44) = 2.703$, $p = .014$, and in Overall Implementation, $F(9, 44) = 2.437$, $p = .024$, at the .05 level of significance. Transparency, $F(9, 44) = 1.656$, $p = .129$, and Stakeholder Participation, $F(9, 44) = 1.877$, $p = .081$, did not yield significant differences. The null hypothesis is therefore rejected for Accountability and Overall Implementation but retained for Transparency and Stakeholder Participation.

3.6. Enhancement Strategies Suggested to Improve the Implementation of the School Governance Program

Table 13. Proposed Recommendations to Improve the Implementation of the School Governance Program

3.6.1. Theme 1: Strengthening Communication and Information Flow

A central pillar in implementing the SGP is the deliberate strengthening of communication between the school and its stakeholders. Respondents emphasized providing “adequate and on time information about school programs to stakeholders” (Teacher Respondent 1) and “regularly show school information, policies and decisions with parents and community (School Official Respondent 4) to ensure transparency, trust, and active participation. Schools must “improve communication system” (SR2) and “establish clear communication channels and conduct regular consultations” (SR7) to create structured opportunities for dialogue and collaboration.

Equally important is diversifying strategies. Respondents recommended “strengthen communication channels” (TR5) through “group chats, assemblies, and social media to keep stakeholders updated and engaged” (TR18) and “diverse digital platforms to enhance information dissemination” (TR39). Building “open and honest relationship with the parents, teachers, and school head by communicating respectfully and constructively” (TR24) is vital, reinforced by calls to “strengthen to communicate to the parents” (TR41) and provide “better communication and parents orientation to improve the SGC program” (TR11). Finally, schools may “strengthen communication through regular meetings and updates with stakeholders” (TR36) to ensure governance remains participatory, transparent, and responsive.

Alcala and Quesea (2025) identified poor communication systems as a barrier to stakeholder engagement in school-based management, with a weighted mean of 3.03 [28], while Kahekenye and Mwakalinga (2025) likewise found ineffective communication as a major limitation to participation [29]. Supporting diversification, Zahria (2024) showed that principals’ use of both face-to-face and digital communication increased engagement [30]. Rachman et al. (2024) further noted that structured, transparent communication supported by technology enhances teacher–parent collaboration [31], while Fernández (2025) confirmed a strong positive correlation between transparency and governance effectiveness [32].

Taken together, these recommendations highlight that communication and information flow are not merely supportive mechanisms but strategic foundations of school governance.

3.6.2. Theme 2: Enhancing Stakeholder Engagement and Collaboration

The success of the SGP rests on active stakeholder engagement and genuine collaboration. Respondents emphasized “it is important to strengthen stakeholder engagement through regular meetings and clear communication” (TR3) and the “active involvement of potential stakeholders in the SGC especially in the planning, implementation and decision making of school activities” (TR20). Schools must also “acknowledge active participation of stakeholders” (TR21), while parents should be encouraged to “participate and show them that their involvement in school governance” (Parent Respondent 4) and “motivate parents to participate in forum discussion to address their complaints and suggestions” (PR8). These practices validate contributions, foster inclusivity, and ensure governance remains responsive to community concerns.

Beyond parental involvement, respondents urged schools to “establish strong partnership with local government units and external partnership to address resource gaps” (TR2) and “strengthening partnership and communication to school” (PR3). Internally, schools must “delegate responsibilities effectively and strengthen partnership with parents and community” (SR8) and promote unity through “strengthen 100% team building of stakeholders” (TR8). Collaboration must be anchored in transparency and capacity building, as seen in the call to “promote collaboration, transparency and proper trainings” (TR19). This spirit extends to conflict resolution through “collaboration among teachers, parents and stakeholders in order to address all conflicts” (TR32), reinforced by practical measures such as “conduct regular meetings and forum with parents, community leaders and local partners” (TR12) and ensuring “SPTA officers should cooperate and attend meeting regularly and join activities” (TR33). Ultimately, the vision is one of “full support of both school and stakeholders to the SGC program” (TR14), achieved by “engaging stakeholders by creating inclusive programs” (TR38) that reflect diverse community needs.

Based on the study of Paulete and Roman (2025), effective stakeholder engagement is critical for SGP, particularly within secondary education where diverse internal and external stakeholders influence outcomes [33].

Taken together, these recommendations affirm that stakeholder engagement and collaboration are not peripheral but foundational to school governance.

3.6.3. Theme 3: Capacity Building and Role Clarification

The effective implementation of the SGP requires deliberate investment in capacity building and clear role delineation. Respondents emphasized the need to “provide capacity building and trainings” (TR6) and “organize regular workshops or orientation sessions to train stakeholders on their specific roles and responsibilities” (TR15). Schools must also “offer regular training and workshop on pedagogy, technology, and classroom management” (SR3) and “provide seminars about school governance so that parents will attend” (PR10), thereby fostering competence, parental awareness, and engagement. These initiatives collectively ensure that governance structures operate with clarity and efficiency.

Leadership development is equally vital. Respondents highlighted “leadership training and development support for innovation and regular evaluation and assessment” (TR29) and “capacity building for administration on leadership, management, and communication skills” (SR3). They further recommended “continuous training for school heads, teachers, and governing council members on leadership, management and governance practices” (TR35), alongside “regular orientation on SGC roles and responsibilities” (SR2) and “capacity building for all stakeholders on their governance roles and responsibilities to address concerns and continuously improve the program” (TR30). To sustain these efforts, schools must “strengthen capacity building and awareness and allocate dedicated resources” (TR31), institutionalizing professional development as a cornerstone of effective governance.

This result is supported by the study of Maluleke (2025), where it is found that effective implementation of the SGP requires investment in capacity building and clear role delineation due to training shortfalls and role confusion [34].

3.6.4. Theme 4: Transparency, Accountability, and Monitoring

The sustainability of the SGP depends on consistent transparency, accountability, and monitoring. Respondents stressed the need to “strengthen accountability and transparency” (TR9), including “transparency of the school MOOE funds” (PR9; TR40) and “transparency of procured items, budget and work implemented” (PR1) to safeguard financial integrity and build trust. By openly sharing records and allocations, schools demonstrate fairness and stewardship, reinforcing stakeholder confidence in governance processes.

Equally vital is robust monitoring. Respondents recommended “regular monitoring of school governance program” (TR10) and “establish regular monitoring and evaluation mechanisms to assess program effectiveness” (SR5). They noted that “improving SGC program requires stronger stakeholder engagement, transparency and continuous monitoring and evaluation” (TR13). To institutionalize accountability, schools must “implement clear policies that define the roles and duties of all stakeholders” (TR23) and “strengthen accountability among stakeholders to improve school management” (PR7), ensuring clarity of responsibilities and shared governance. These findings are corroborated by the study of Fernandez (2025) where positive correlation was found between transparency and governance, indicating that enhanced transparency significantly contributes to more effective school governance structures and practices [32].

3.6.5. Theme 5: Resource Mobilization and Support Systems

The effective implementation of the SGP requires mobilization of resources. Respondents emphasized the need to “provide adequate support and resources for program implementation” (TR22) and to “improve the system in order to meet the needs of every public school’s tangible and intangible needs like enough funds to address physical improvements of the school” (TR35), ensuring that facilities and learning environments meet quality standards.

Beyond financial support, resourcefulness and partnerships are vital. Stakeholders urged schools to “be resourceful and creative to help the school using available community resources” (TR34), strengthening community ownership of development. They also stressed the importance of “maintaining good relationship with higher authorities and agencies and invest in continuous learning to improve governance and management skills” (SR6), securing external support while enhancing leadership competence. Such practices connect schools to broader networks of assistance and innovation, fostering resilience in governance.

This is affirmed by the study of Njuki et al. (2025), which found 59.4% effective resource mobilization is essential for successful school governance, with a level of mobilization at 59.4% [35].

3.6.6. Theme 6: Governance Structures and Leadership Development

Effective implementation of the SGP requires clear structures and strong leadership to guide stakeholders toward shared goals. Respondents emphasized the need to “develop a clear and realistic workplan” (TR5) and “set clear objectives and strong engagement of stakeholders” (TR17), ensuring organized governance and active participation. Schools must also “delegate the roles of stakeholders” (TR17) to clarify responsibilities and foster accountability across the framework.

Equally important is prioritization. Respondents highlighted the need to “prioritize school governance program” (TR26), affirming governance as a central pillar of school management. The “school governance program of the school well implemented by the school head and teachers” (TR27) underscores the pivotal role of leadership, with school heads and teachers modeling accountability and guiding stakeholders in fulfilling their roles effectively.

Study of Scott and Caress (2004) proved that effective implementation of SGP requires strong leadership and clear frameworks to engage stakeholders and promote best practices [36].

3.6.7. Theme 7: Strategic Scheduling and Contingency Planning

The effective implementation of the SGP requires foresight in planning and flexibility in execution. Respondents emphasized “strategic scheduling and establishing contingency plan and flexible timelines” (SR1) to keep governance adaptable to unforeseen circumstances while sustaining continuity. Strategic scheduling thus safeguards program sustainability, ensuring initiatives are not derailed by unexpected events.

Equally important is the need to “simplify schedules to accommodate parent and teacher participation” (PR2). By designing realistic timelines considerate of stakeholders’ availability, schools’ foster inclusivity and maximize engagement. Simplified and flexible scheduling ensures parents and teachers, vital contributors to governance, can participate without conflicting responsibilities, strengthening structures that are resilient, participatory, and responsive to community needs.

In a study conducted by Pabriaga (2025), alignment and adaptability of programs to the school’s context are key to successful implementation, while time constraints and scheduling conflicts hinder it [37].

3.6.8. Theme 8: Parent Motivation and Voluntarism

The strength of the SGP lies not only in structured leadership but also in the willingness of parents to contribute their time, effort, and initiative. Respondents emphasized the importance of “volunteer for committees or tasks and take initiative to help implement school projects” (PR8), recognizing that active parent involvement enhances the school’s capacity to deliver programs effectively. This spirit of voluntarism extends beyond specific committees, as stakeholders highlighted the need to “provide voluntarism in all work in school to make progress” (TR8), underscoring that collective effort is essential in driving school development forward.

Moreover, voluntarism must be embedded as a consistent practice, with respondents affirming the call to “provide voluntarism especially in school work” (TR28). Such contributions not only alleviate resource constraints but also foster a sense of ownership and partnership between parents and the school. When parents are motivated to volunteer, they

become co-creators of educational success, strengthening the governance framework by ensuring that initiatives are supported by genuine community participation.

This result is substantiated by the findings of Shatkin and Gershberg (2007), where parent and community participation in school governance can have positive impacts on community development by fostering improvements in school performance and school—community relations and by acting as a catalyst for collective action around community-development issues [38].

Thus, the effective implementation of the SGP relies on communication, stakeholder engagement, capacity building, transparency, resource mobilization, strong leadership, strategic scheduling, and parent voluntarism working together to create a participatory, accountable, and resilient governance framework.

4. Conclusion

Based on the study, the implementation of the SGP in selected elementary schools of Northern Conner, Apayao has been generally effective, with transparency, accountability, and stakeholder participation rated highly across respondents; however, gaps in teacher training and parent involvement in planning highlight the need for enhancement strategies to strengthen participatory leadership, resource mobilization, and inclusive collaboration, thereby ensuring that the SGP continues to serve as a vital mechanism for improving school operations and advancing educational equity in geographically isolated communities.

Compliance with ethical standards

Acknowledgments

I acknowledge that I have not used ChatGPT or Copilot for refining some of the sections in the document.

Disclosure of conflict of interest

Authors have declared that they have no known competing financial interests OR non- financial interests OR personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Statement of ethical approval

The study was conducted with approval and in accordance with the standards of the college No ethical approval was required, as the research followed all applicable ethical guidelines. ensuring respect for the respondents' privacy and confidentiality.

Statement of informed consent

Informed consent was obtained from all individual participants included in the study.

CONSENT

I affirm that the respondents voluntarily agreed to participate after being fully informed about the purpose, nature, and potential implications of the study. Their responses have been collected with utmost respect for their privacy and confidentiality, in accordance with ethical research guidelines

References

- [1] Hargreaves A, Halász G, Pont B. School leadership for systemic improvement in Finland. Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. 2007 Dec:1-44. https://www.academia.edu/download/51169619/School_leadership_for_systemic_improveme20170103-30772-n9w2jv.pdf
- [2] Simola H. The Finnish miracle of PISA: Historical and sociological remarks on teaching and teacher education. Comparative education. 2005 Nov 1;41(4):455-70. <https://www.mv.helsinki.fi/home/hsimola/CCED131764.pdf>

- [3] Arndt S, Gibbons A, Fitzsimons P. Thriving and surviving? The incredible problem of constructions of normality and Otherness in early childhood settings. *Global Studies of Childhood*. 2015 Sep;5(3):279-90. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/2043610615597144>
- [4] Hallinger P, Bryant D. Mapping the terrain of educational leadership and management in East Asia. *Journal of educational administration*. 2013 Aug 9;51(5):618-37. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Philip-Hallinger/publication/262957155_Mapping_the_terrain_of_educational_leadership_and_management_in_East_Asia/links/55bec86b08aec0e5f445e426/Mapping-the-terrain-of-educational-leadership-and-management-in-East-Asia.pdf
- [5] Bush T. Leadership and management development in education. <https://www.torrossa.com/gs/resourceProxy?an=4912521andpublishe r=FZ7200>
- [6] Ghosh J. Right to education act 2009: Issues and challenges. Available at SSRN 2231197. 2013 Mar 10. <https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/Delivery.cfm?abstractid=2231197>
- [7] Echaune M. Learner Characteristics and Educational Attainment among High School Students in Kenya. <https://www.academia.edu/download/57892617/IJCASS.2018.007.63.pdf>
- [8] Kruger J, Beckmann J, Du Plessis A. The management and governance conundrum in South African public schools: Principals' perspectives. *Perspectives in Education*. 2022 Dec 1;40(4):312-24. <https://repository.up.ac.za/bitstreams/6e34baf6-ef0d-49b4-a9aa-e60ead842f36/download>
- [9] Bizzo E, Michener G. Compensatory collaborative governance: filling pandemic transparency gaps in Brazil and the United States. *Public Management Review*. 2025 Jan 2;27(1):109-34. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14719037.2023.2230231>
- [10] Ecija JD. Maintenance and other Operating Expenses (MOOE) and School Based Management (SBM) Performance of Secondary Schools in Samar Island. *LC International Journal of STEM* (ISSN: 2708-7123). 2020;1(4):1-4. <https://www.lcjstem.com/index.php/jstem/article/download/45/156>
- [11] Abulencia AS. School-based management: A structural reform intervention. *The Normal Lights*. 2012 Nov 9;6(1). <https://po.pnuresearchportal.org/ejournal/index.php/normallights/article/download/70/60>
- [12] Capuno JJ. Leadership and innovation under decentralization: A case study of selected local governments in the Philippines. *UPSE Discussion Paper*; 2010. <https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/46620/1/638477085.pdf>
- [13] Valenzuela ES, Buenvenida LP. Managing school operations and resources in the new normal and performance of public schools in one school division in the Philippines. *International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*. doi. 2021 Jun;10. https://www.academia.edu/download/68314413/Managing_School_Operations_and_Resources_in_the_New_Normal_and_Performance_of_Public_Schools.pdf
- [14] Abulencia AA. The social purposes of learning Assessment. *The Normal Lights*. 2010 Nov 8;5(1). <http://po.pnuresearchportal.org/ejournal/index.php/normallights/article/download/62/53>
- [15] Fischer F. Participatory governance: From theory to practice. https://academic.oup.com/edited-volume/34384/chapter-abstract/291595271?redirectedFrom=fulltextandlogin=trueandutm_source=TrendMDandutm_medium=cpcandutm_campaign=Oxford_Academic_Books_TrendMD_0
- [16] Whitchurch GG, Constantine LL. Systems theory. In *Sourcebook of family theories and methods: A contextual approach* 1993 Mar 31 (pp. 325-355). Boston, MA: Springer US. https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-0-387-85764-0_14
- [17] Rondinelli DA. Government decentralization in comparative perspective: theory and practice in developing countries. *International review of administrative sciences*. 1981 Jun;47(2):133-45. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/002085238004700205>
- [18] Kreuter MW, Lezin N. Social capital theory. *Emerging theories in health promotion practice and research: Strategies for improving public health*. 2002 Oct 15;15(1):228. <https://sdh.gmu.ac.ir/Dorsapax/userfiles/file/Eemergingtheoriesinhealthpromotionpracticeandresearch.pdf#page=248>
- [19] Martin, M. (2019). The implementation of school-based management in public elementary schools. *Asian Journal of Assessment in Teaching and Learning*, 9(1),

- [20] Nurhidayah, and Munandar, A. (2025). Dinamika Pengelolaan Kurikulum di Sekolah Kecil: Sebuah Kajian Literatur Komprehensif. *Jurnal Biogenerasi*.
- [21] Nabus, R. V., and Homillano, M. L. M. (2025b). Implementing School Governing Councils in Philippine Basic Education: An Analysis of Challenges and Outcomes in DePED Camarines Sur. *Journal of Scientific Research and Reports*, 31(12), 535–554.
- [22] Sanchez, M., Bermudo, P. J., and Cordial, J. (2026b). Leadership Strategies, Challenges, and level of effectiveness in implementing school based management among elementary schools in Viga East and West Districts. *Pedagogy Review*, 7(1), 85–99. <https://doi.org/10.62718/vmca.pr-ijetas.7.1.sc-1225-005>
- [23] Cabilla, M. S. (2025). Teachers' Involvement in School Decision-Making: Musings of teachers in the secondary school. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 169–172. <https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25sep169>
- [24] Munezero, P. (2024). Implications of school governance on parental participation in school activities in selected secondary schools in Bugesera District, Rwanda. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, VIII(IIS), 263–290. <https://doi.org/10.47772/ijriss.2024.803019s>
- [25] Alvarez, J. M. P., Mempin, R. C., Morales, R. J. G., and Ocampo, A. A. (2023). School management system and governance of elementary school heads as perceived by the school community. *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences*, 8(3), 112–120. <https://doi.org/10.22161/ijels.83.18>
- [26] 26. Maile, S. (2002). Accountability: an essential aspect of school governance. *South African Journal of Education*, 22, 326–331.
- [27] Abidin, J., Tihami, M. A., and Jumhana, N. (2025). Innovative Educational Governance: Exploring the role of stakeholder participation and principal leadership in enhancing service quality. *International Journal of Educational Contemporary Explorations*, 3160–3169. <https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25jul1873>
- [28] Alcala, A., and Quesea, J. (2025a). Barriers and recommendations of stakeholders' engagement in the School-Based Management Programs. *Psychology and Education a Multidisciplinary Journal*, 50(10), 1191–1202. <https://doi.org/10.70838/pemj.501008>
- [29] Kahekenye, Z. I., and Mwakalinga, S. (2025). ENHANCING SCHOOL GOVERNANCE THROUGH PARTICIPATORY DECISIONMAKING: INSIGHTS FROM PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN MOROGORO MUNICIPALITY. *International Journal of Education Humanities and Social Science*, 08(06), 180–199. <https://doi.org/10.54922/ijehss.2025.1130>
- [30] Zahria, I. (2024). Komunikasi Partisipatif Kepala Sekolah dalam Mengembangkan Kolaborasi dengan Komunitas dan Stakeholder. *Communicator*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.59373/comm.v1i1.71>
- [31] Rachman, M., Muslim, S., Suparman, D., and Norman, E. (2024). Effective Communication Strategies between Teachers and Parents through a Collaborative Approach to Improve Student Achievement in Primary Schools. *Jurnal Dirosah Islamiyah*, 6(3). <https://doi.org/10.47467/jdi.v6i3.5329>
- [32] Fernandez, E. (2025). Transparency and governance in self- implementing secondary schools. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 3(9), 324–331. <https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2025.516>
- [33] Paulete, E., and Roman, A. (2025b). Stakeholders' engagement in the strategic, operational and tactical planning and implementation cycles of programs and projects of public secondary schools in the division of Rizal. *Psychology and Education a Multidisciplinary Journal*, 46(5), 61–629. <https://doi.org/10.70838/pemj.460507>
- [34] Maluleke, M. R. (2025b). Principals working as administrators and de facto governors particularly in our remote rural and township schools. *International Journal of Applied Science and Research*, 08(06), 119–129. <https://doi.org/10.56293/ijasr.2025.6813>
- [35] Njuki, J. M., Murage, L. M., and Motanya, J. (2025). Assessment of Board of Management's resource Mobilisation Practices on effective governance of public primary Schools in Nyeri County, Kenya. *Eastern African Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 4(1), 254–265. <https://doi.org/10.58721/eajhss.v4i1.1108>
- [36] Scott, L., and Caress, A. (2004). Shared governance and shared leadership: meeting the challenges of implementation. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 13(1), 4–12. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2834.2004.00455.x>

- [37] Pabriaga, L. R. (2025). Critical factors on the implementation of school programs. World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, 26(1), 1838–1856. <https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2025.26.1.1207>
- Shatkin, G., and Gershberg, A. I. (2007). Empowering parents and building communities. Urban Education, 42(6), 582–615. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085907305044>