



Assessment of School Heads' Development Programs and Leadership Performance in Samar: Basis for a Strategic Improvement Plan.

Melvin J. Gabac, PhD., Principal IV

Bayog Elementary School, Samar Division

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51583/IJLTEMAS.2026.150700116>

Received: 06 August 2026; Accepted: 11 August 2026; Published: 20 August 2026

ABSTRACT

This study examined the effectiveness of development programs for school heads in relation to leadership performance, program implementation, and challenges encountered. Specifically, it described the school heads' demographic profile; assessed the implementation of development program parameters; determined their performance across key leadership domains; examined the relationship between profile and performance; analyzed the relationship between development program parameters and leadership performance; and identified challenges encountered in program implementation. A convergent parallel mixed-methods design was employed, integrating quantitative data from structured questionnaires and qualitative data from semi-structured interviews. Findings revealed that school heads demonstrated a very high level of leadership performance, particularly in instructional leadership, resource management, and stakeholder engagement. Development program parameters were likewise rated very highly, with content relevance and practical applicability identified as the most valued components. Correlation analyses showed that demographic characteristics had minimal to no significant relationship with leadership performance, whereas development program parameters demonstrated a significant positive relationship with school head performance. Qualitative findings corroborated these results, indicating that development programs provided essential support for leadership transition, role clarification, and confidence-building. Participants particularly valued training on instructional supervision, financial management, and policy implementation. However, time constraints, limited resources, and the need for more contextualized training were identified as key challenges. The study concludes that development programs are vital in strengthening school leadership effectiveness. A strategic improvement plan was proposed emphasizing sustained professional development, contextualized training, and strengthened support mechanisms for school heads.

Keywords: School Heads; Development Programs; Leadership Performance; Professional Development; Instructional Leadership; Mixed-Methods Research; School Leadership; Strategic Improvement Plan

INTRODUCTION

The performance of school heads is pivotal to the effective delivery of basic education. As frontline leaders, school heads are tasked not only with administrative and instructional leadership functions, but also with translating the Department of Education's (DepEd) policies into meaningful school practices. DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020, which institutionalized the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH), emphasizes that school leaders must demonstrate competencies in instructional leadership, human resource management, school governance, and community partnerships. These standards align with the broader objectives of the Basic Education Development Plan (BEDP) 2030, highlighting the necessity of systematic and structured leadership capacity-building initiatives.

In recent years, the professional preparation and capacity-building of school heads have gained increasing attention from policymakers, educators, and researchers. Leadership transition is often complex, and without structured programs, newly appointed school heads may struggle to balance instructional leadership with managerial and community responsibilities. Studies by Bernardo (2019) and Flores and Tan (2021) underscore that programs designed to enhance school leaders' competencies contribute to improved teacher performance



and student outcomes. Nevertheless, challenges persist in ensuring that school heads are adequately prepared to meet the multidimensional demands of their roles.

Globally, leadership development is recognized as a cornerstone of educational reform. The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD, 2019) emphasizes that school leaders require continuous, structured, and context-based training to implement reforms effectively and sustain quality education. Darling-Hammond et al. (2017) further note that effective leadership development is not a one-time event but a sustained process involving learning, mentoring, and evaluation. Internationally, school heads participate in programs such as the International Institute for Educational Leadership (IIEL) workshops, UNESCO leadership seminars, and the OECD's School Leadership Framework initiatives, which provide cross-contextual perspectives on instructional innovation, school governance, and community engagement. These insights resonate strongly with the Philippine context, where the realities of resource gaps, diverse school settings, and community needs necessitate adaptive and well-prepared leaders.

Within the Philippines, DepEd has implemented various professional development programs for school heads at national, regional, and division levels. At the national level, school leaders may attend the National Educators Academy of the Philippines (NEAP) leadership transformation programs. Regional initiatives include capacity-building seminars conducted by Regional Offices, such as leadership immersion programs, financial management training, and policy orientation modules. Division-level programs often focus on context-specific skills, including instructional supervision, school governance, and stakeholder engagement, through workshops, mentoring, and peer coaching. In the context of the Second Congressional District of Samar, existing records from the Human Resource Development Office reveal that school heads have participated in a wide array of training programs from 2016 to 2026, predominantly at the division level, with selected opportunities at the district, regional, national, and even international levels.

These include trainings on instructional leadership, curriculum implementation, academic recovery initiatives, financial management, gender-responsive planning, ICT integration, and the School Head Onboarding Program (SHOP). While this indicates active engagement in professional development, the concentration of trainings at the division level and the variability in access to higher-level or specialized programs suggest uneven exposure to advanced leadership development opportunities. Moreover, participation appears to depend on tenure and years of service, implying that not all school heads benefit equally from these initiatives.

School heads in rural and geographically isolated areas, such as those in Samar, encounter unique challenges that require context-based interventions. Research by Dela Cruz and Javier (2020) found that school leaders in far-flung communities often face overlapping administrative duties and limited access to professional training. These conditions restrict their ability to focus on instructional leadership and community engagement, highlighting the urgency of assessing development programs that are responsive to diverse school contexts.

Another critical issue is the quality and structure of existing programs. Recent studies (San Juan, 2021; Martinez, 2022) reveal that while orientation modules are provided, they often lack depth in areas such as financial management, policy retention, and community partnership building. Furthermore, program monitoring and evaluation mechanisms are frequently weak, with limited follow-up support for school heads after the initial training, undermining the sustainability of acquired knowledge and skills. This concern is further supported by the observed pattern of trainings, where numerous orientation- and rollout-type activities are conducted, yet structured post-training evaluation and sustained coaching components are less evident.

The alignment of development programs with PPSSH and other DepEd standards also remains a concern. Studies by Lorenzo and Buenviaje (2021) demonstrate that although some programs claim alignment with PPSSH domains, actual practices often fall short in fostering leadership readiness and competency development. Gaps between training content and real-world challenges make it difficult for school heads to apply learned concepts to practical situations, weakening the intended impact of professional standards.

Evidence also shows that the performance of school heads is closely linked to the effectiveness of development programs. Alvarado (2020) found that leadership competencies directly correlate with effective school governance and student achievement, while Bautista (2021) showed that mentoring and coaching mechanisms



integrated into leadership programs significantly improve teacher performance and school outcomes. These findings underscore that well-designed and monitored programs are essential for long-term school improvement.

Despite these emerging insights, localized studies in Samar remain scarce, particularly those examining the structure, delivery, and relevance of school head development programs. While national-level evaluations exist, division-specific assessments are limited, leaving gaps in understanding how programs translate into actual leadership practices in local school contexts. This research gap calls for an in-depth evaluation of development programs for school heads in Samar's Second Congressional District, where schools differ widely in resources, community support, and geographic challenges.

Additionally, existing literature has not sufficiently examined the relationship between program parameters such as content, delivery method, duration, and follow-up and actual performance across leadership domains, including instructional supervision, human resource management, and stakeholder engagement. Understanding these relationships is crucial to identify which program components most strongly influence performance and where adjustments are necessary. It also necessitates analyzing school heads' profiles, including years of service, prior training attended, and contextual challenges, in relation to their leadership outcomes.

Ultimately, this study aims to formulate a strategic improvement plan for development programs targeting school heads in Samar's Second Congressional District. By identifying gaps in current programs such as uneven training exposure, limited advanced-level opportunities, insufficient monitoring and feedback mechanisms, and lack of contextual responsiveness the study seeks to bridge the divide between policy and practice. The proposed strategic improvement plan will provide evidence-based guidance for DepEd and local divisions to strengthen leadership preparation, ensuring that school heads are adequately equipped to lead schools effectively and address pressing educational challenges in their communities.

LITERATURE REVIEW

School leadership plays a critical role in creating an enabling environment for effective teaching and learning. School heads are expected to perform complex responsibilities involving strategic leadership, school operations and resource management, instructional supervision, personnel development, and stakeholder engagement. Recognizing these demands, the Department of Education (DepEd) adopted the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH) through DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020. The PPSSH establishes clear expectations regarding what school heads should know, be able to do, and value throughout their professional careers. It also serves as a basis for professional reflection, performance assessment, and the provision of professional learning and development opportunities (Department of Education [DepEd], 2020).

Professional development programs are therefore essential mechanisms for strengthening the competencies of school heads. DepEd's professional development priorities recognize the need for continuous upskilling and reskilling of school leaders and emphasize that professional development should be anchored on the PPSSH while remaining responsive to local needs and emerging educational demands (DepEd, 2020). This suggests that development programs should not be limited to general training but should provide school heads with relevant learning experiences that directly address the competencies required in their actual leadership contexts.

The PPSSH identifies five major domains of school leadership: ****Leading Strategically; Managing School Operations and Resources; Focusing on Teaching and Learning; Developing Self and Others; and Building Connections**** (DepEd, 2020). These domains provide a comprehensive framework for understanding school head performance and identifying professional development needs. The standards emphasize that school heads must simultaneously address instructional and administrative responsibilities while maintaining learner achievement as the central concern of school leadership.

The first domain, Leading Strategically, highlights the capacity of school heads to establish directions, develop strategic plans, use data for decision-making, and align school initiatives with organizational goals. Development programs that strengthen strategic leadership can help school heads become more capable of analyzing school conditions, identifying priorities, setting measurable objectives, and implementing improvement initiatives. Strategic leadership is particularly important because school heads operate in



environments characterized by changing policies, emerging educational needs, and increasing expectations from stakeholders.

Managing School Operations and Resources is another important area of leadership development. School heads are responsible for ensuring efficient school operations and the responsible utilization of human, financial, physical, and technological resources. Professional development programs can strengthen competencies in planning, budgeting, resource allocation, accountability, risk management, and policy implementation. When training is closely connected to actual administrative responsibilities, school heads are better positioned to translate professional learning into effective school management practices.

Focusing on Teaching and Learning is likewise central to school head development. The PPSSH emphasizes the responsibility of school heads to provide instructional leadership and support the improvement of teaching practices and learner outcomes (DepEd, 2020). Development programs should therefore provide opportunities for school heads to enhance their competencies in curriculum management, instructional supervision, classroom observation, teacher feedback, learning assessment, and data-informed instructional decision-making. In this regard, school leadership development is closely connected with the broader goal of improving the quality of teaching and learning.

Developing Self and Others emphasizes the importance of continuous professional learning among school heads and the personnel they lead. School heads are expected to reflect on their professional practices, identify areas for improvement, and create opportunities for teachers and other personnel to develop their competencies. Coaching, mentoring, professional learning communities, and collaborative reflection may therefore complement formal training activities. The PPSSH specifically positions professional learning and development as an important component of effective school leadership (DepEd, 2020).

Empirical evidence also supports the relationship between professional development and school head leadership competence. Faculo and Yango (2022) examined professional development and leadership competence among school heads in urban and rural areas and found a relationship between professional development experiences and leadership competence. Their study further demonstrates the value of using professional development experiences and competency standards to examine the leadership development of school heads.

Similarly, Agravante et al. (2023) examined the upskilling needs of school heads in the Philippine context and identified mentoring and coaching, curriculum development, and management of educational projects among the leading areas of professional development need. These findings indicate that school heads require development opportunities that extend beyond general administrative training and address practical competencies directly connected to their leadership responsibilities.

Building Connections, the fifth PPSSH domain, further recognizes that effective school leadership involves collaboration with teachers, learners, parents, community organizations, local government units, and other stakeholders. Development programs should therefore strengthen communication, partnership-building, collaboration, conflict management, and stakeholder engagement competencies. Stronger connections can facilitate shared responsibility for school improvement and increase community support for educational programs.

The relevance and applicability of development program content are important considerations in assessing program effectiveness. Professional development becomes more meaningful when participants perceive that the knowledge and skills gained can be applied to actual workplace situations. Programs that incorporate contextualized activities, case analysis, simulations, coaching, mentoring, and school-based application can provide stronger opportunities for school heads to connect theoretical knowledge with practical leadership challenges. Thus, assessment should examine not only whether training activities were conducted but also whether their content was relevant and applicable to the participants' professional responsibilities.

The continuity of professional development is another significant consideration. School leadership competencies are not developed through isolated seminars alone. Rather, professional growth requires sustained opportunities for learning, practice, reflection, feedback, and improvement. DepEd's professional development framework



recognizes continuous upskilling and reskilling as necessary for teachers and school leaders and encourages professional development programs to respond to local needs and emerging developments (DepEd, 2020).

Despite the importance of professional development, school heads may encounter challenges that limit their participation in and application of development programs. These may include competing administrative responsibilities, time constraints, limited financial and material resources, geographical accessibility, insufficient follow-up support, and differences between training content and actual school conditions. Such challenges highlight the importance of assessing not only the perceived quality of development programs but also the conditions affecting their implementation and sustainability.

Program assessment provides an important basis for determining whether existing development initiatives are achieving their intended objectives. Assessment may consider program relevance, content, delivery, practical applicability, accessibility, support mechanisms, and perceived contribution to leadership performance. Through systematic assessment, education authorities can determine which program components should be sustained, strengthened, modified, or redesigned.

The relationship between development programs and school head performance is particularly important. Although participation in professional development does not automatically guarantee improved leadership performance, relevant and well-designed programs can provide school heads with knowledge, skills, and strategies that support effective leadership practice. Faculo and Yango (2022) provide empirical support for examining the relationship between professional development and leadership competence among school heads, reinforcing the importance of assessing development programs alongside leadership performance.

The demographic and professional characteristics of school heads may also be considered when assessing development programs. Variables such as age, sex, educational attainment, length of service, years as a school head, and professional development experiences can provide useful information about the characteristics of program participants. However, these characteristics should be examined together with professional learning opportunities and contextual factors rather than treated as sole determinants of leadership performance.

Overall, the literature establishes that school heads' development programs are important mechanisms for strengthening leadership competencies and improving school effectiveness. The PPSSH provides a comprehensive framework for defining school head competencies and guiding professional learning and development, while empirical studies indicate the importance of continuous and needs-based professional development (DepEd, 2020; Faculo & Yango, 2022; Agravante et al., 2023). Nevertheless, there remains a need for context-specific assessment of development programs in terms of their implementation, relevance, applicability, relationship with school head performance, and challenges encountered by participants.

Research Questions

This study developed a strategic improvement plan for public elementary school heads in the School Congressional District of Samar.

Specifically, this study sought to answer the following objectives:

1. Determine the demographic profile of the school heads in terms of the following:

1.1 age;

1.2 sex;

1.3 educational attainment;

1.4 position;

1.5 number of years as school heads;



- 1.6number of teachers supervised;
- 1.7school location; and
- 1.8number of relevant trainings attended.
- 2.Assess the development programs for school heads along the following:
 - 2.1 structure;
 - 2.2 content quality
 - 2.3 delivery;
 - 2.4 alignment;
 - 2.5 program relevance;
 - 2.6post development program performance monitoring, and
 - 2.7feedback and continuous improvement mechanisms.
- 3.Assess performance of school heads in terms of the following domains:
 - 3.1leadership readiness and competency development;
 - 3.2knowledge and policy retention;
 - 3.3instructional leadership applications;
 - 3.4 resource and financial management understanding; and
 - 3.5stakeholder and community engagement skills.
- 4.Find out the significant relationship between the performance of the school heads and their profile variates:
- 5.Establish the significant relationship between the school heads' performance and the development program' parameters.
- 6, Explore the challenges encountered by the school heads in the implementation of the development program.
- 7.Formulate a strategic development improvement plan for School Heads.

Scope And Limitation

This study focused on the assessment of the School Heads' Development Program and the performance of public elementary school heads in the Schools Division of Samar, with the primary purpose of formulating a Strategic Development Improvement Plan for School Heads. Specifically, the study examined the extent to which the existing development program responds to the professional, leadership, instructional, management, and stakeholder-engagement needs of school heads and identified areas that may be strengthened to improve the implementation and effectiveness of the program.

The study covered the demographic profile of the school head-respondents in terms of age, sex, educational attainment, position, number of years as a school head, number of teachers supervised, school location, and number of relevant trainings attended. These profile variables were examined to provide a basis for determining whether differences in the characteristics and professional experiences of school heads were significantly associated with their performance.



The study also assessed the School Heads' Development Program according to seven parameters: structure, content quality, delivery, alignment, program relevance, post-development program performance monitoring, and feedback and continuous improvement mechanisms. These parameters were considered in determining the strengths and areas for improvement of the existing development program and its responsiveness to the professional needs of school heads.

Furthermore, the study assessed the performance of school heads across five areas: leadership readiness and competency development, knowledge and policy retention, instructional leadership applications, resource and financial management understanding, and stakeholder and community engagement skills. These areas were used to determine the level of performance demonstrated by school heads following their participation in professional development activities.

The study also determined whether significant relationships existed between the performance of school heads and their profile variables. In addition, it examined the significant relationship between school head performance and the identified parameters of the School Heads' Development Program. These analyses were intended to provide empirical evidence on the factors associated with the performance of school heads and the extent to which the development program may contribute to their professional and leadership performance.

The study further explored the challenges encountered by school heads in participating in and implementing the School Heads' Development Program. These challenges provided qualitative insights into issues related to program structure, content, delivery, alignment, relevance, monitoring, feedback, and continuous improvement that may not be fully captured through quantitative data.

The study employed a quantitative and qualitative approach. Quantitative data were gathered through structured questionnaires, while qualitative data were obtained through semi-structured interviews to provide deeper understanding of the experiences and challenges of the participants. The respondents were limited to public elementary school heads and selected teacher respondents within the identified study area in the Schools Division of Samar. The study was conducted during School Year 2025–2026.

The study was delimited to the variables and dimensions identified in the research questions. It did not cover secondary school heads, private school administrators, or other educational personnel outside the identified respondents. The findings were also limited to the conditions, experiences, and responses of the participants during the period of the study and may therefore not be generalized to other divisions or educational settings without considering differences in context.

Finally, the results of the study served as the basis for the formulation of a Strategic Development Improvement Plan for School Heads. The proposed plan was designed to address identified gaps, challenges, and areas for improvement in the structure, content, delivery, alignment, relevance, monitoring, feedback, and continuous improvement mechanisms of the School Heads' Development Program, with the goal of strengthening the leadership competencies and performance of public elementary school heads.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study used descriptive-correlation and comparative research design to evaluate the crisis management strategies of and their impact on school disaster preparedness in the District of San Jose de Buan, Schools Division of Samar.

Sampling

This study employed total enumeration or universal sampling for the quantitative component. This sampling procedure involved including all qualified school heads who met the established inclusion criteria. Total enumeration was considered appropriate because the study intended to obtain comprehensive information from the identified population of school heads who had participated in school heads' development programs.



For the qualitative component, purposive sampling was employed to select school head-participants who could provide rich and relevant information regarding their experiences with the development programs. Participants were selected based on their willingness to participate, exposure to relevant development programs, leadership experience, and ability to provide meaningful insights into the strengths, benefits, challenges, and areas for improvement of the programs. The use of total enumeration and purposive sampling is consistent with the methodology presented in the source material.

Data Collection

Data were gathered using two primary research instruments: a structured survey questionnaire and a semi-structured interview guide. The questionnaire was used to collect quantitative data regarding the profile of school heads, their assessment of development program parameters, and their assessment of leadership performance. The questionnaire included indicators related to the structure, content quality, delivery, alignment with standards, program relevance, post-program performance monitoring, and feedback and continuous improvement mechanisms.

The questionnaire also assessed school head performance across selected leadership competency areas, including leadership readiness and competency development, knowledge and policy retention, instructional leadership application, resource and financial management, and stakeholder and community engagement.

Prior to administration, the research instrument underwent expert validation to establish its content validity, clarity, relevance, and alignment with the objectives of the study and the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH). Necessary revisions were made based on the recommendations of the validators. The questionnaire was subsequently pilot-tested among school heads who were not included in the actual study. Reliability was determined using Cronbach's Alpha, with the source study reporting a coefficient of 0.94, indicating very high internal consistency.

After securing the necessary permissions from the concerned education authorities and participating schools, the questionnaires were administered to the qualified respondents. The respondents were informed about the purpose and significance of the study and were assured that their participation was voluntary and that their responses would be treated with confidentiality.

For the qualitative component, selected school heads participated in one-on-one semi-structured interviews. The interviews focused on their experiences with development programs, perceived effects on their leadership performance, challenges encountered, and recommendations for program improvement. With the participants' consent, interviews were documented and subsequently organized for analysis.

Data Analysis

The quantitative data were checked, coded, tabulated, and analyzed using appropriate descriptive and inferential statistical treatments.

Frequency and percentage were used to describe the categorical profile variables of the school heads, while mean and standard deviation were used for appropriate continuous variables, including age, years as a school head, number of teachers supervised, and relevant trainings attended.

Weighted mean and standard deviation were used to assess the School Heads' Development Program in terms of structure, content quality, delivery, alignment, program relevance, post-development program performance monitoring, and feedback and continuous improvement mechanisms. The same measures were used to determine the level of school head performance in terms of leadership readiness and competency development, knowledge and policy retention, instructional leadership applications, resource and financial management understanding, and stakeholder and community engagement skills.

To determine the significant relationships between school head performance and their profile variables, as well as between school head performance and the development program parameters, appropriate correlation tests



were used. Pearson's r was used for continuous variables that met parametric assumptions, while Spearman's ρ was used for ordinal or non-normally distributed variables. Point-Biserial Correlation and Eta coefficient were used when appropriate based on the nature of the variables. The level of significance was set at 0.05.

The Independent Samples t-test was used to determine significant differences between the assessments of school heads and teacher-respondents when parametric assumptions were satisfied, while the Mann–Whitney U Test was used as the nonparametric alternative.

Qualitative interview data were analyzed through thematic analysis to identify the major challenges encountered by school heads in the implementation of the development program.

Finally, the quantitative and qualitative findings were integrated and used as the basis for formulating the Strategic Development Improvement Plan for School Heads.

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Demographic Profile of the School Heads

This section presents the demographic and professional profile of the public elementary school heads in the Second Congressional District of Samar. In line with Objective 1, the profile variables include age, sex, educational attainment, position, years as school head, number of teachers supervised, school location, and relevant trainings attended. Profiling these characteristics is essential for understanding the contextual and professional backgrounds of school heads, as leadership practices and performance are shaped by individual attributes, career experiences, and work environments (Day & Sammons, 2016; Hallinger, 2018).

Age. The age distribution of the 163 school heads shows that the mean age is 44.83 years ($SD = 8.57$). The largest proportion falls within 29–39 years (34.97%), followed by 40–49 years (31.90%) and 50–59 years (28.83%), while a small fraction are 60 years and above (4.29%). This indicates that most school heads are in early to middle adulthood, a stage associated with active career building, professional growth, and openness to leadership development opportunities.

Table 2 Profile of the School Head Respondents ($n=163$)

Profile Variable	Category	Frequency	Percent	Mean	SD
Age (years)	60 and above	7	4.29	44.83	8.57
	50–59	47	28.83		
	40–49	52	31.90		
	29–39	57	34.97		
Sex	Male	62	38.04	–	–
	Female	101	61.96	–	–
Educational Attainment	Doctorate	11	6.75	–	–
	Doctorate Units	36	22.09	–	–
	With MA Degree	31	19.02	–	–
	With MA Units	85	52.15	–	–
Position	Principal IV	5	3.07	–	–
	Principal III	7	4.29	–	–
	Principal II	6	3.68	–	–
	Principal I	22	13.50	–	–
	Head Teacher IV	1	0.61	–	–
	Head Teacher III	26	15.95	–	–
	Head Teacher II	25	15.34	–	–
	Head Teacher I	44	26.99	–	–
	Teacher in Charge	27	16.56	–	–



Years as School Head	20–29	8	4.91	8.60	5.56
	10–19	51	31.29		
	0–9	104	63.80		
Number of Teachers Supervised	31+	4	2.45	8.99	14.05
	21–30	6	3.68		
	11–20	15	9.20		
	1–10	138	84.66		
School Location	Rural	131	80.37	–	–
	Urban	8	4.91	–	–
	Coastal	13	7.98	–	–
	GIDA	11	6.75	–	–
Number of Relevant Trainings Attended	21–30	1	3.68	5.39	4.08
	11–20	25	9.20		
	1–10	153	84.66		

From a Transformational Leadership perspective, the prominence of younger and mid-career school heads suggests a favorable context for cultivating transformational leadership behaviors through structured development programs. Studies after 2016 indicate that leaders in the 29–49 age range are more receptive to innovation, reflective practice, and continuous learning, which are core elements of transformational leadership (Day, Gu, & Sammons, 2016; Leithwood, Harris, & Hopkins, 2020). Leaders in this group are often shaping their leadership identity and are more likely to benefit from development programs that emphasize vision building, instructional leadership, and stakeholder engagement, aligning with Objective 3 of the study.

From the School Effectiveness Theory lens, age composition has implications for structuring development programs. Research highlights that effective school leadership is not solely dependent on experience but on systemic supports such as mentoring, performance monitoring, and feedback mechanisms (Hallinger, 2018; Grissom, Egalite, & Lindsay, 2021). The substantial proportion of school heads below 50 years old suggests a strong need for structured programs that provide technical guidance on instructional supervision, policy implementation, and resource management.

For older school heads (50–59 and 60+), their experiential knowledge may be valuable for mentoring and leadership continuity, but they may face challenges adapting to digital tools or updated policies (Bush, 2018; Santos & Mercado, 2022). Development programs should balance transformational elements with strategies ensuring alignment with current DepEd policies. Implications include adopting age-responsive approaches in development planning, with younger leaders receiving onboarding and competency-building support, while senior leaders engage in advanced leadership modules, mentoring roles, and performance monitoring.

Sex. The majority of respondents are female (61.96%), with males comprising 38.04%. This distribution reflects the broader Philippine basic education system, where women constitute a significant proportion of the teaching workforce and are increasingly represented in leadership positions.

Transformational Leadership Theory posits that leadership behaviors such as individualized consideration, collaborative decision-making, and relational leadership are often associated with female leaders (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Eagly & Carli, 2018). Female school heads may thus be more inclined toward fostering teacher motivation, collaboration, and community engagement. Studies after 2016 confirm the growing feminization of school leadership and its positive effect on school climate and instructional outcomes (Hallinger, Dongyu, & Wang, 2016; Leithwood et al., 2020; Santos & Mercado, 2022). However, female leaders may face challenges balancing administrative workloads with family responsibilities or navigating traditional gender norms, which can influence participation in development programs.

The implications are that development programs must be gender-responsive. Flexible delivery modes, mentoring, and workload support should be provided to female leaders, while opportunities for male school



heads should ensure inclusive leadership development. This ensures that professional growth initiatives are equitable and aligned with the demographic composition of school leaders.

Educational Attainment. Most school heads have pursued graduate studies: 52.15% have master's degree units, 19.02% completed a master's degree, 22.09% have doctoral units, and 6.75% completed a doctoral degree. This indicates a strong inclination toward professional and academic advancement.

Transformational Leadership Theory emphasizes intellectual stimulation and continuous learning as core elements of effective leadership (Bass & Riggio, 2006). School heads pursuing advanced studies are likely to develop reflective practices, critical thinking, and evidence-based decision-making, enhancing leadership readiness and competencies (Objective 3). Post-2016 studies show that leaders with graduate and doctoral preparation exhibit stronger instructional leadership, strategic planning, and school improvement capacities (Day & Sammons, 2016; Leithwood et al., 2020; Dela Cruz, 2021).

Implications include designing development programs at an appropriately advanced level, focusing on applied leadership skills, problem-based learning, policy application, and contextualized mentoring. Additional support for doctoral completion, such as flexible scheduling and research-informed modules, can further strengthen leadership capacity.

Position. The majority of school heads occupy mid-level positions: Head Teacher I (26.99%), Teacher-in-Charge (16.56%), Head Teacher III (15.95%), and Head Teacher II (15.34%), with principals collectively representing 24.44%. Head Teacher IV positions are minimal (0.61%).

The distribution highlights that operational responsibilities are concentrated in mid-level leadership positions, emphasizing the need for tailored professional development addressing instructional supervision, resource management, and stakeholder engagement. Transformational Leadership Theory stresses capacity building across all organizational levels, as mid-level leaders are critical for motivating and guiding teachers (Bass, 1985). School Effectiveness Theory highlights that leadership at all levels contributes significantly to school outcomes, reinforcing the need for stratified development programs that address the responsibilities and challenges unique to each position (Edmonds, 1979).

Years as School Head. Most school heads (63.80%) have 0–9 years of service, 31.29% have 10–19 years, and 4.91% have 20–29 years, with a mean of 8.60 years ($SD = 5.56$). This indicates a relatively young leadership population still consolidating administrative and instructional skills.

From a Transformational Leadership perspective, early-career leaders may be more open to professional growth, innovation, and reflective practice (Leithwood, Harris, & Hopkins, 2020). However, insufficient experience can limit their ability to exercise inspirational motivation and intellectual stimulation. School Effectiveness Theory highlights that leadership experience contributes to stable systems, coherent supervision, and sustained learning outcomes (Gurr, Drysdale, & Mulford, 2017). Implications include prioritizing induction, mentoring, and differentiated training tracks based on years of experience, pairing less experienced heads with veteran leaders.

Number of Teachers Supervised. Most school heads (84.66%) supervise 1–10 teachers, with a mean of 8.99 ($SD = 14.05$), though a small number manage larger staffs. Supervisory span affects instructional supervision, teacher support, and transformational leadership behaviors (Bush & Glover, 2016; Leithwood et al., 2020). School Effectiveness Theory indicates that effective schools allow leaders to focus on teaching and learning rather than being overwhelmed by administrative tasks (Day & Sammons, 2016; Hallinger, 2018). Implications include differentiating development programs based on supervisory load, including training in delegation, distributed leadership, and instructional coaching.

School Location. The majority of school heads are assigned to rural schools (80.37%), with coastal (7.98%), GIDA (6.75%), and urban (4.91%) schools comprising the remainder. Rural and disadvantaged contexts create specific challenges such as resource limitations, multigrade teaching, and limited professional development access (Azano & Stewart, 2016; Preston, Jakubiec, & Kooymans, 2017). Transformational leadership requires adaptability, vision, and community engagement, while School Effectiveness Theory emphasizes flexible



governance and localized decision-making (Hallinger & Bryant, 2017; Bush, 2018). Implications include designing context-sensitive programs that address the realities of rural, coastal, and GIDA schools.

Number of Relevant Trainings Attended. Most school heads (84.66%) attended 1–10 relevant trainings, with a mean of 5.39 (SD = 4.08), indicating limited exposure to sustained professional development. Transformational Leadership Theory highlights that core leadership competencies develop through ongoing, practice-oriented learning (Leithwood et al., 2020). School Effectiveness Theory links coherent leadership development to improved school outcomes (Day & Sammons, 2016). Implications include prioritizing structured, continuous professional development with follow-up coaching, peer learning communities, and performance feedback.

Overall, the demographic and professional profile reveals a leadership workforce predominantly composed of mid-career, female, academically advanced, rural-assigned school heads with moderate experience and limited professional development exposure. These insights provide a foundation for analyzing variations in leadership performance, exploring relationships with development program parameters, and designing a context-responsive, evidence-based strategic improvement plan for the Second Congressional District of Samar.

Assessment of the Development Program for School Heads

This section evaluates the professional development programs implemented for public elementary school heads in the Second Congressional District of Samar. The assessment focuses on key parameters, including program structure, content quality, delivery methods, alignment with professional standards, relevance to school contexts, post-development monitoring, and mechanisms for feedback and continuous improvement.

The purpose is to determine how effectively these programs equip school heads with the knowledge, skills, and competencies necessary for instructional leadership, resource management, and stakeholder engagement. By examining these parameters, the study identifies strengths and areas for enhancement, providing empirical evidence to inform a strategic improvement plan that is contextually responsive and aligned with national leadership standards.

Structure. Table 3 presents the assessment of the development program for school heads in terms of its structure. The indicators focus on the clarity and sequence of program activities, organization of timelines, definition of support mechanisms such as mentoring and peer support, explanation of roles and responsibilities, and the provision of time for reflection and application of learning. Respondents rated each indicator using a 5-point Likert scale, and the grand mean was computed to provide an overall measure of the program's structural effectiveness.

The results show that school heads perceive the program's structure very positively. The highest-rated indicator is the clarity of roles and responsibilities of participants, with a mean of 4.78, followed closely by the clear structure and sequence of activities (4.77), sufficient time for reflection and application of learning (4.75), a well-organized and manageable timeline (4.73), and clearly

Table 3

Assessment of the Development Program in terms of Structure

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1. The development program has a clear structure and sequence of activities.	4.77	SA
2. The timeline of the development program is well-organized and manageable.	4.73	SA
3. Support mechanisms (e.g., mentoring, peer support) are clearly defined.	4.72	SA
4. The roles and responsibilities of participants in the development program are clearly explained.	4.78	SA
5. The sequence of activities allows sufficient time for reflection and application of learning.	4.75	SA



Grand Mean	4.75	SA
------------	------	----

Legend:	Range	Interpretation
	4.21-5.00	Strongly Agree (SA)
	3.41-4.20	Agree (A)
	2.61-3.40	Moderately Agree (MA)
	1.81-2.60	Disagree (D)
	1.00-1.80	Strongly Disagree (SD)

defined support mechanisms (4.72). The grand mean of 4.75 indicates that, overall, the development program is perceived as very well-structured, providing participants with a coherent and organized framework for learning and professional growth.

From a transformational leadership perspective, a well-structured program enhances the development of essential leadership competencies by providing clarity, predictability, and guidance throughout the learning process (Bass, 1985; Leithwood, Harris, & Hopkins, 2020). Clear sequencing, defined roles, and accessible support mechanisms allow school heads to focus on internalizing leadership concepts, engaging in reflective practice, and applying strategies in their school contexts. Similarly, School Effectiveness Theory emphasizes that structured programs contribute to system coherence and improved school outcomes, as clearly defined activities and timelines ensure that professional development translates into effective leadership and consistent implementation of instructional and administrative strategies (Edmonds, 1979; Hallinger, 2018).

The implications of these findings suggest that maintaining a clear, organized, and well-supported program structure is critical for leadership development. The high ratings indicate that participants value structured learning that balances theoretical input, practical application, and reflective practice. Such organization ensures that school heads are able to navigate program activities efficiently, engage meaningfully with mentors and peers, and implement learned strategies effectively in their schools. Therefore, the structural design of development programs should continue to be prioritized and periodically refined to sustain high-quality leadership preparation and support in the Second Congressional District of Samar.

Content Quality. Table 4 presents the assessment of the development program for school heads in terms of content quality. The indicators focus on the relevance of the program content to the school heads' roles, clarity and practicality of learning materials, coverage of both instructional and administrative leadership needs, alignment with current educational policies and leadership practices, and promotion of critical thinking and problem-solving among participants.

Table 4 Assessment of the Development Program in terms of Content Quality

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1. The development content is relevant to my role as a school head.	4.83	SA
2. Learning materials are clear, comprehensive, and practical.	4.75	SA
3. The content addresses both instructional and administrative leadership needs.	4.80	SA
4. The content is updated and reflects current educational policies and leadership practices.	4.79	SA
5. The learning activities promote critical thinking and problem-solving among school heads.	4.77	SA
Grand Mean	4.79	SA



Legend:	Range	Interpretation
	4.21-5.00	Strongly Agree (SA)
	3.41-4.20	Agree (A)
	2.61-3.40	Moderately Agree (MA)
	1.81-2.60	Disagree (D)
	1.00-1.80	Strongly Disagree (SD)

Respondents rated each indicator using a 5-point Likert scale, and the grand mean provides an overall measure of perceived content quality.

The results indicate that school heads perceive the content of the development program very positively. The highest-rated indicator is the relevance of the content to the school heads' roles, with a mean of 4.83, followed closely by coverage of both instructional and administrative leadership needs (4.80), alignment with current policies and practices (4.79), learning activities that promote critical thinking and problem-solving (4.77), and clarity and practicality of learning materials (4.75). The grand mean of 4.79 indicates that, overall, the development program is regarded as very high in content quality, providing participants with materials and activities that are meaningful, practical, and aligned with contemporary leadership demands.

From a transformational leadership perspective, high-quality content is essential for developing the competencies needed to inspire, motivate, and guide school personnel effectively (Bass, 1985; Leithwood, Harris, & Hopkins, 2020). Relevance, practical learning materials, and opportunities for problem-solving enhance intellectual stimulation and equip school heads with strategies to address real-world challenges in instructional supervision, policy implementation, and stakeholder engagement. Similarly, School Effectiveness Theory emphasizes that content quality contributes to effective leadership practices, as structured and current knowledge ensures that school heads can translate learning into improved organizational performance and positive student outcomes (Edmonds, 1979; Hallinger, 2018).

The implications of these findings suggest that carefully designed and up-to-date content is critical to leadership development. When development programs provide materials that are relevant, comprehensive, and aligned with current educational standards, school heads are better prepared to implement learned strategies, make informed decisions, and lead their schools effectively. Furthermore, content that promotes critical thinking and problem-solving strengthens the capacity of school heads to navigate complex administrative and instructional challenges, thereby enhancing both individual leadership growth and overall school effectiveness.

Delivery. Table 5 presents the assessment of the development program for school heads in terms of delivery. The indicators focus on the competence and knowledge of facilitators, the promotion of active participation, appropriateness of delivery methods to learning needs, pacing of sessions for adequate understanding, and encouragement of collaboration and sharing of best practices among participants. Respondents rated each indicator using a 5-point Likert scale, and the grand mean summarizes the overall perception of program delivery.

Table 5n Assessment of the Development Program in terms of Delivery

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1. The facilitators are competent and knowledgeable.	4.79	SA
2. The methods used promote active participation and engagement.	4.79	SA
3. The delivery methods are appropriate to my learning needs.	4.78	SA



4. The pacing of the sessions allows adequate understanding of key concepts.	4.72	SA
5. The delivery methods encourage collaboration and sharing of best practices among participants.	4.77	SA
Grand Mean	4.77	SA

Legend:	Range	Interpretation
	4.21-5.00	Strongly Agree (SA)
	3.41-4.20	Agree (A)
	2.61-3.40	Moderately Agree (MA)
	1.81-2.60	Disagree (D)
	1.00-1.80	Strongly Disagree (SD)

The results indicate that school heads perceive the delivery of the program very positively. The highest-rated indicators are facilitator competence and promotion of active participation, both with a mean of 4.79, followed closely by delivery methods that are appropriate to learning needs (4.78), encouragement of collaboration and sharing (4.77), and pacing of sessions for understanding key concepts (4.72). The grand mean of 4.77 reflects that, overall, the delivery of the development program is considered very effective, providing participants with engaging, relevant, and well-paced learning experiences.

From a transformational leadership perspective, effective delivery is critical for cultivating essential leadership competencies, as competent facilitators who actively engage participants enhance intellectual stimulation and provide opportunities for reflective practice and problem-solving (Bass, 1985; Leithwood, Harris, & Hopkins, 2020). Active participation and collaborative activities enable school heads to exchange experiences, generate innovative ideas, and apply leadership concepts in ways that are contextually meaningful. Similarly, School Effectiveness Theory emphasizes that the manner in which professional development is delivered affects its translation into practical school improvement. Delivery methods that are well-paced, interactive, and relevant facilitate the acquisition and application of knowledge, ultimately supporting stronger instructional leadership and organizational performance (Edmonds, 1979; Hallinger, 2018).

The implications of these findings suggest that program delivery plays a pivotal role in ensuring the effectiveness of leadership development initiatives. Competent facilitators, interactive methods, and opportunities for collaboration help school heads internalize learning, apply strategies in their schools, and sustain improvements in instructional supervision and governance. Ensuring that delivery methods continue to be adaptive, engaging, and reflective of participants' learning needs will strengthen the impact of development programs and contribute to the overall goal of enhancing school leadership in the Second Congressional District of Samar.

Alignment. Table 6 presents the assessment of the development program for school heads in terms of alignment. The indicators examine the program's consistency with the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH) domains, adherence to DepEd policies and guidelines, relevance to required leadership competencies, support for career-stage requirements of newly appointed school heads, and alignment of learning outcomes with expected school leadership performance standards. Respondents rated each indicator on a 5-point Likert scale, with the grand mean reflecting the overall perception of alignment.

The results indicate that school heads perceive the program as highly aligned with professional standards and policy requirements. The highest-rated indicator is alignment with the PPSSH domains, with a mean of 4.81, followed closely by consistency with DepEd policies (4.80), relevance to leadership competencies (4.79), alignment with learning outcomes (4.77), and support for career-stage requirements (4.76). The grand mean of



4.79 suggests that participants regard the program as very well-aligned, ensuring that activities, objectives, and outcomes are consistent with established standards and expectations for school leadership.

Table 6 Assessment of the Development Program in terms of Alignment

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1. The development program aligns with the PPSSH domains.	4.81	SA
2. The program is consistent with DepEd policies and guidelines.	4.80	SA
3. The program addresses leadership competencies required of school heads.	4.79	SA
4. The program supports the career stage requirements of newly appointed school heads.	4.76	SA
5. The learning outcomes are aligned with expected school leadership performance standards.	4.77	SA
Grand Mean	4.79	SA

Legend:	Range	Interpretation
	4.21-5.00	Strongly Agree (SA)
	3.41-4.20	Agree (A)
	2.61-3.40	Moderately Agree (MA)
	1.81-2.60	Disagree (D)
	1.00-1.80	Strongly Disagree (SD)

From a transformational leadership perspective, alignment with standards and policies ensures that the program effectively develops the competencies required to inspire, motivate, and guide school personnel toward shared goals (Bass, 1985; Leithwood, Harris, & Hopkins, 2020). Clear alignment also reinforces credibility and relevance, providing school heads with confidence that the learning they engage in directly supports their professional responsibilities and leadership practice. Likewise, from a School Effectiveness Theory standpoint, alignment is crucial for ensuring that development programs contribute to systemic improvement. Programs that correspond with established standards and policies facilitate consistent implementation of instructional and administrative strategies, thereby promoting better school performance outcomes (Edmonds, 1979; Hallinger, 2018).

The implications of these findings suggest that well-aligned development programs are essential for ensuring relevance, legitimacy, and effectiveness in leadership preparation. By aligning program content and activities with PPSSH domains, DepEd guidelines, and career-stage requirements, school heads are better equipped to meet performance expectations, apply learned competencies in their schools, and sustain improvements in instructional leadership and governance. Maintaining this alignment will be critical in designing the strategic improvement plan, ensuring that professional development initiatives are both transformational and contextually relevant for school heads in the Second Congressional District of Samar.

Program Relevance. Table 7 presents the assessment of the development program for school heads in terms of program relevance. The indicators evaluate the extent to which the program addresses real challenges faced by school heads, its applicability to their school contexts, its contribution to leadership preparedness, responsiveness to location-specific challenges (e.g., rural, coastal, GIDA), and support in addressing emerging issues in school leadership. Respondents rated each indicator on a 5-point Likert scale, with the grand mean reflecting the overall perception of program relevance.



The results indicate that school heads perceive the development program as highly relevant. The highest-rated indicator is the program's enhancement of

Table 7 Assessment of the Development Program in terms of Program Relevance

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1. The program responds to real challenges encountered by school heads.	4.75	SA
2. The content is applicable to my school context.	4.75	SA
3. The program enhances my leadership preparedness.	4.78	SA
4. The program addresses challenges specific to my school's location and context (e.g., rural, urban, coastal, GIDA).	4.71	SA
5. The program helps me respond effectively to emerging issues in school leadership.	4.77	SA
Grand Mean	4.75	SA

Legend:	Range	Interpretation
	4.21-5.00	Strongly Agree (SA)
	3.41-4.20	Agree (A)
	2.61-3.40	Moderately Agree (MA)
	1.81-2.60	Disagree (D)
	1.00-1.80	Strongly Disagree (SD)

leadership preparedness, with a mean of 4.78, followed closely by its ability to help school heads respond effectively to emerging leadership issues (4.77), response to real challenges (4.75), applicability to their school context (4.75), and responsiveness to location-specific challenges (4.71). The grand mean of 4.75 suggests that the program is very relevant, effectively addressing the professional needs and contextual realities of school heads.

From a transformational leadership perspective, program relevance is critical in fostering competencies that allow school heads to inspire, motivate, and guide their staff while adapting to emerging challenges and unique school contexts (Bass, 1985; Leithwood, Harris, & Hopkins, 2020). Relevant programs ensure that participants can connect theoretical learning to practical solutions, enhancing their capacity to lead effectively in diverse environments. Similarly, School Effectiveness Theory emphasizes that contextual relevance strengthens the alignment between leadership development and improved school outcomes, as programs tailored to local conditions enable school heads to implement strategies that respond to students' and communities' specific needs (Edmonds, 1979; Hallinger, 2018).

The implications of these findings highlight the importance of maintaining and enhancing program relevance in leadership development initiatives. By designing programs that address real-world challenges, contextual differences, and emerging issues, school heads are better equipped to apply learned strategies effectively, make informed decisions, and strengthen instructional leadership and school governance. Ensuring relevance contributes to the overall goal of improving school leadership and sustaining positive outcomes in the Second Congressional District of Samar.

Post-Performance Development Monitoring. Table 8 presents the assessment of the development program for school heads in terms of post-development performance monitoring. The indicators examine the extent to which follow-up monitoring, mentoring or coaching, performance evaluation, feedback from supervisors, and continuous professional growth mechanisms are implemented after the completion of the program. Respondents



rated each indicator on a 5-point Likert scale, with the grand mean summarizing the overall perception of post-development monitoring.

The results reveal that school heads perceive post-development monitoring positively, although slightly lower compared to other program parameters. The highest-rated indicators are performance evaluation linked to development outcomes, feedback from supervisors, and support for continuous professional growth, each with a mean of 4.69. Follow-up monitoring and mentoring or coaching after program completion both received a mean of 4.60. The grand mean of 4.65 suggests that while post-development monitoring is generally considered very satisfactory, there may be room for enhancing follow-up mechanisms and coaching support to fully maximize program impact.

From a transformational leadership perspective, post-development monitoring is essential for sustaining growth and ensuring that school heads are able to translate learned competencies into practice (Bass, 1985; Leithwood, Harris, & Hopkins, 2020). Regular feedback, coaching, and performance evaluation encourage reflective practice, reinforce intellectual stimulation, and help leaders refine their approaches to instructional supervision, resource management, and stakeholder engagement. Similarly, School Effectiveness Theory emphasizes that continuous monitoring strengthens the connection between professional development and school improvement. When post-development processes are systematic and supportive, school heads are better equipped to implement learned strategies effectively, resulting in improved organizational performance and student outcomes (Edmonds, 1979; Hallinger, 2018).

Table 8 Assessment of the Development Program in terms of Post-Performance Development Monitoring

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1. Follow-up monitoring is conducted after the development program.	4.60	SA
2. Mentoring or coaching is provided after program completion.	4.60	SA
3. Performance evaluation is linked to development outcomes.	4.69	SA
4. Feedback from supervisors is provided to guide post-development improvement.	4.69	SA
5. Post-development monitoring supports continuous professional growth.	4.69	SA
Grand Mean	4.65	SA

Legend:	Range	Interpretation
	4.21-5.00	Strongly Agree (SA)
	3.41-4.20	Agree (A)
	2.61-3.40	Moderately Agree (MA)
	1.81-2.60	Disagree (D)
	1.00-1.80	Strongly Disagree (SD)

The implications of these findings highlight the importance of strengthening follow-up mechanisms and mentoring systems in leadership development programs. Although the current monitoring processes are perceived positively, enhancing post-program coaching, evaluation, and feedback loops can further promote sustained professional growth, ensure accountability, and maximize the impact of development initiatives. By reinforcing post-development support, the program can more effectively bridge the gap between training and practice, fostering continuous improvement among school heads in the Second Congressional District of Samar.

Feedback and Continuous Improvement Mechanisms. Table 9 presents the assessment of the development program for school heads in terms of feedback and continuous improvement mechanisms. The indicators



evaluate the extent to which participants are given opportunities to provide feedback, how feedback is used to enhance the program, whether the program is regularly updated to address emerging needs, the systematic documentation and review of feedback, and communication of program improvements to current and future participants. Respondents rated each indicator on a 5-point Likert scale, with the grand mean providing an overall measure of perceived effectiveness in feedback and continuous improvement.

The results indicate that school heads perceive the program positively in terms of feedback and continuous improvement. The highest-rated indicators are opportunities for participants to provide feedback and the use of feedback to improve the program, each with a mean of 4.74. This is followed by regular updates to address emerging needs (4.71), systematic documentation and review of feedback (4.68), and communication of improvements to participants (4.67). The grand mean of 4.71 suggests that the program is very effective in incorporating feedback and promoting continuous enhancement, although there is minor scope for strengthening mechanisms related to documentation and communication of improvement.

Table 9 Assessment of the Development Program in terms of Feedback and Continuous Improvement Mechanisms

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1. Participants are given opportunities to provide feedback.	4.74	SA
2. Feedback is used to improve the development program.	4.74	SA
3. The program is regularly updated to address emerging needs.	4.71	SA
4. Participant feedback is systematically documented and reviewed.	4.68	SA
5. Improvements in the program are communicated to current and future participants.	4.67	SA
Grand Mean	4.71	SA

Legend:	Range	Interpretation
	4.21-5.00	Strongly Agree (SA)
	3.41-4.20	Agree (A)
	2.61-3.40	Moderately Agree (MA)
	1.81-2.60	Disagree (D)
	1.00-1.80	Strongly Disagree (SD)

From a transformational leadership perspective, effective feedback and continuous improvement mechanisms are vital for fostering reflective practice, promoting accountability, and ensuring that school heads can internalize learning and apply it effectively in their schools (Bass, 1985; Leithwood, Harris, & Hopkins, 2020). Regular incorporation of participant feedback encourages individualized consideration and responsiveness to contextual needs, while updates to the program ensure that leadership development remains current and relevant.

Similarly, School Effectiveness Theory emphasizes that continuous improvement processes enhance systemic alignment and school performance by ensuring that professional development initiatives remain adaptive, evidence-based, and responsive to emerging challenges (Edmonds, 1979; Hallinger, 2018).

The implications of these findings suggest that maintaining structured feedback mechanisms and systematically integrating participant input into program revisions are essential for sustaining the quality and relevance of leadership development initiatives. By improving documentation and communication of enhancements, the program can further reinforce participant engagement, ensure transparency, and maximize its impact on school



leadership and effectiveness. Such practices will contribute to the ongoing refinement of development programs for school heads in the Second Congressional District of Samar.

Performance of School Heads

This section presents the evaluation of the performance of public elementary school heads in the Second Congressional District of Samar across key leadership domains. Objective 3 focuses on assessing school heads in terms of leadership readiness and competency development, knowledge and policy retention, instructional leadership applications, resource and financial management, and stakeholder and community engagement. The purpose of this assessment is to determine how effectively school heads apply the knowledge, skills, and competencies gained through professional development programs in their day-to-day leadership practice. By analyzing performance across these domains, the study identifies strengths and gaps in leadership effectiveness, providing evidence to guide recommendations for targeted interventions and the formulation of a strategic improvement plan aimed at enhancing school leadership and overall school effectiveness.

Leadership Readiness and Competency Development. The results presented in Table 10 highlight the performance of school heads in terms of Leadership Readiness and Competency Development, revealing a consistently high level of self-assessed competence across all indicators, with an overall grand mean of 4.59, interpreted as Strongly Agree. As an introduction, leadership readiness is a crucial dimension of school head performance because it reflects preparedness to assume complex administrative, instructional, and transformational roles demanded by contemporary educational reforms. This domain directly aligns with Objective 3.1 of the study and serves as a core outcome variable in examining the effectiveness of development programs for school heads.

From a theoretical standpoint, the findings strongly resonate with Transformational Leadership Theory, which emphasizes leaders' confidence, vision, and ability to inspire and guide organizational change (Bass & Riggio, 2006). The highest mean score among the indicators, "The development program helped develop my leadership competencies" ($M = 4.72$), suggests that development initiatives have been effective in cultivating essential leadership attributes such as self-efficacy, decisiveness, and strategic orientation. This supports the transformational leadership dimension of intellectual stimulation and idealized influence, where leaders gain confidence and competence through structured learning experiences and reflective practice.

Table 10

Performance of School Heads in terms of Leadership Readiness and Competency Development

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1. I am confident in performing my leadership roles and responsibilities.	4.53	SA
2. The development program helped develop my leadership competencies.	4.72	SA
3. I am prepared to handle complex leadership challenges.	4.52	SA
4. I can effectively lead school improvement initiatives aligned with DepEd goals.	4.59	SA
5. I demonstrate confidence in making timely and informed leadership decisions.	4.59	SA
Grand Mean	4.59	SA

Legend:	Range	Interpretation
	4.21-5.00	Strongly Agree (SA)
	3.41-4.20	Agree (A)
	2.61-3.40	Moderately Agree (MA)



1.81-2.60	Disagree (D)
1.00-1.80	Strongly Disagree (SD)

In terms of analysis, all indicators yielded mean scores above 4.50, indicating that respondents strongly perceive themselves as capable leaders. Confidence in performing leadership roles ($M = 4.53$) and preparedness to handle complex leadership challenges ($M = 4.52$) suggest that school heads feel adequately equipped to manage multifaceted school demands, including instructional supervision, policy implementation, and stakeholder coordination. The equally high means for leading school improvement initiatives and making timely, informed decisions (both $M = 4.59$) indicate a strong alignment between leadership readiness and DepEd's thrust toward evidence-based and goal-oriented school governance. These results mirror recent studies showing that leadership development programs significantly enhance school heads' readiness to implement reforms and lead improvement initiatives effectively (Leithwood et al., 2020; Bush, 2019).

Interpretatively, the high grand mean implies that the development programs experienced by the respondents have contributed positively to strengthening leadership competence and confidence. Within the lens of School Effectiveness Theory, leadership readiness is a key driver of effective school systems, as strong leadership underpins clear vision-setting, high expectations, and continuous monitoring of school performance (Edmonds, 1979; Sammons et al., 2016). School heads who are confident and competent are more likely to sustain instructional focus, support teachers, and mobilize resources efficiently, thereby enhancing overall school effectiveness. However, while self-perceived readiness is high, this finding also underscores the importance of validating these perceptions through continuous performance monitoring and feedback mechanisms, as emphasized in Objective 2.6 of the study.

The implications of these findings are significant for the formulation of the proposed strategic improvement plan. Given the strong leadership readiness demonstrated by school heads, future development programs should move beyond foundational leadership training and focus on advanced competencies such as change management, data-driven decision-making, and adaptive leadership in diverse school contexts. Mentoring, coaching, and problem-based learning approaches may further deepen leadership practice and ensure sustainability of competencies. Moreover, the consistently high performance in this domain provides empirical support for examining its relationship with both profile variables and development program parameters, as outlined in Objectives 4 and 5. Overall, the findings affirm that leadership development initiatives play a pivotal role in preparing school heads to function as confident, competent, and transformational leaders within the public elementary school system.

Knowledge and Policy Retention. The data presented in Table 11 describe the Performance of School Heads in terms of Knowledge and Policy Retention, with a grand mean of 4.63, indicating a *Strongly Agree* level of performance across all indicators. As an introduction, knowledge and policy retention is a vital competency for school heads, as effective school governance depends on a leader's ability to understand, interpret, and consistently apply national and division-level policies. This domain directly supports Objective 3.2 of the study and serves as a critical link between leadership development programs and the effective implementation of DepEd mandates at the school level.

Anchored on Transformational Leadership Theory, policy knowledge is closely associated with the leader's role as a credible and influential figure within the organization. Leaders who demonstrate strong mastery of policies establish idealized influence, as teachers and staff view them as reliable sources of guidance and direction (Bass & Riggio, 2006). The high mean score for the indicator "I understand key DepEd policies relevant to school leadership" ($M = 4.67$) suggests that school heads possess a strong foundational grasp of policy frameworks, enabling them to align school practices with institutional expectations and reform agendas.

Table 11

Performance of School Heads in terms of Knowledge and Policy Retention

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
------------	------	----------------



1.	I understand key DepEd policies relevant to school leadership.	4.67	SA
2.	I consistently apply policies in decision-making.	4.65	SA
3.	I am confident in interpreting DepEd issuances.	4.57	SA
4.	I am able to explain relevant DepEd policies to teachers and staff.	4.64	SA
5.	I stay updated with new policies and integrate them into school operations.	4.63	SA
Grand Mean		4.63	SA

Legend:	Range	Interpretation
	4.21-5.00	Strongly Agree (SA)
	3.41-4.20	Agree (A)
	2.61-3.40	Moderately Agree (MA)
	1.81-2.60	Disagree (D)
	1.00-1.80	Strongly Disagree (SD)

From an analytical perspective, the consistently high mean scores across all five indicators reflect a robust level of policy competence. The ability to apply policies in decision-making ($M = 4.65$) and confidently interpret DepEd issuances ($M = 4.57$) indicates that school heads are not merely familiar with policies but can translate them into actionable decisions. Moreover, the strong agreement with the statements on explaining policies to teachers and staff ($M = 4.64$) and staying updated with new policies ($M = 4.63$) highlights the role of school heads as policy mediators who bridge central directives and local school practices. Recent empirical studies support this finding, emphasizing that continuous professional development enhances school leaders' policy literacy and implementation capacity (Hallinger, 2018; Nguyen et al., 2021).

In terms of interpretation, the high grand mean suggests that development programs have been effective in strengthening policy-related competencies among school heads. Within the framework of School Effectiveness Theory, policy coherence and consistent implementation are essential components of effective school systems, as they ensure stability, accountability, and alignment with national goals (Sammons et al., 2016). School heads who are knowledgeable and confident in policy application are better positioned to guide teachers, manage compliance requirements, and maintain instructional focus without confusion or inconsistency. This level of competence also reduces implementation gaps that often arise from policy misinterpretation or information overload.

The implications of these findings are substantial for leadership development and improvement planning. Given the strong performance in knowledge and policy retention, future development programs should emphasize advanced policy analysis, contextualization, and adaptive implementation, particularly in response to rapidly evolving educational reforms. Structured policy briefings, peer learning sessions, and case-based discussions may further strengthen school heads' ability to translate policy into practice. Additionally, the high level of policy competence provides a solid empirical basis for examining its relationship with demographic variables and development program parameters, as outlined in Objectives 4 and 5 of the study. Overall, the findings affirm that strong policy knowledge is a cornerstone of effective school leadership and a critical enabler of sustained school improvement.

Instructional Leadership Applications. The data presented in Table 12 show the Performance of School Heads in terms of Instructional Leadership Applications, with an overall grand mean of 4.74, which corresponds to a Strongly Agree level. As an introduction, instructional leadership is a central responsibility of school heads,

directly influencing teaching quality, teacher effectiveness, and student learning outcomes. This domain addresses Objective 3.3 of the study and reflects the extent to which development programs have equipped school heads with the competencies necessary to lead teaching and learning processes within their schools. Grounded in Transformational Leadership Theory, instructional leadership is closely linked to the dimensions of intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration. School heads who actively supervise instruction, provide feedback, and encourage evidence-based practices stimulate teachers to reflect on and improve their instructional approaches (Bass & Riggio, 2006). The high mean for supporting teachers' professional development ($M = 4.78$) and providing constructive feedback ($M = 4.77$) indicates that school heads play an active role in nurturing teacher growth, fostering a culture of continuous learning and professional collaboration. Table 12

Performance of School Heads in terms of Instructional Leadership Applications

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1. I regularly conduct instructional supervision.	4.68	SA
2. I support teachers' professional development.	4.78	SA
3. I use data to improve teaching and learning.	4.74	SA
4. I provide constructive feedback to teachers to enhance instructional practices.	4.77	SA
5. I promote the use of evidence-based teaching strategies in the school.	4.74	SA
Grand Mean	4.74	SA

Legend:	Range	Interpretation
	4.21-5.00	Strongly Agree (SA)
	3.41-4.20	Agree (A)
	2.61-3.40	Moderately Agree (MA)
	1.81-2.60	Disagree (D)
	1.00-1.80	Strongly Disagree (SD)

From an analytical standpoint, the consistently high mean scores across all five indicators demonstrate strong instructional leadership practices among the respondents. Regular conduct of instructional supervision ($M = 4.68$) and effective use of data to improve teaching and learning ($M = 4.74$) suggest that school heads are not only present in instructional processes but are also data-informed in their decision-making. These findings are consistent with recent studies highlighting that school leaders who engage in systematic classroom observation, feedback, and data-driven planning significantly contribute to improved instructional quality and teacher performance (Robinson et al., 2017; Shaked & Schechter, 2020).

In terms of interpretation, the grand mean of 4.74 implies that development programs have been highly effective in strengthening the instructional leadership capacity of school heads. Within the lens of School Effectiveness Theory, strong instructional leadership is one of the core correlates of effective schools, as it ensures alignment between curriculum, instruction, assessment, and professional development (Sammons et al., 2016). School heads who promote evidence-based teaching strategies ($M = 4.74$) help institutionalize best practices that lead to sustained improvements in teaching and learning, regardless of contextual challenges.

The implications of these results are significant for leadership development and strategic planning. Given the very high level of instructional leadership performance, future development programs may focus on advanced instructional leadership skills such as coaching models, instructional innovation, and the integration of digital tools in teaching and learning. Strengthening peer coaching and professional learning communities can further



institutionalize effective instructional practices. Moreover, the strong instructional leadership demonstrated by school heads provides a solid foundation for examining its relationship with demographic characteristics and development program components, as articulated in Objectives 4 and 5 of the study. Overall, the findings affirm that effective instructional leadership is a critical outcome of well-designed development programs and a key driver of school effectiveness.

Resource and Financial Management Understanding. The results presented in Table 13 illustrate the Performance of School Heads in terms of Resource and Financial Management Understanding, yielding a grand mean of 4.76, which corresponds to a *Strongly Agree* descriptive level. As an introduction, effective resource and financial management is a critical leadership function that ensures the optimal use of school funds, facilities, and human resources to support teaching and learning. This domain directly addresses Objective 3.4 of the study and reflects the extent to which development programs have enhanced school heads' competence in managing resources responsibly and strategically.

From a theoretical standpoint, Transformational Leadership Theory emphasizes responsible stewardship and ethical leadership, particularly through *idealized influence*, where leaders model integrity, transparency, and accountability (Bass & Riggio, 2006). The highest mean score obtained for ensuring transparency in the utilization of school funds and resources ($M = 4.79$) suggests that school heads demonstrate strong ethical standards and accountability practices. This finding indicates that development programs have effectively reinforced values-based leadership alongside technical financial competencies.

Table 13 Performance of School Heads in terms of Resource and Financial Management Understanding

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1. I understand school budgeting and financial procedures.	4.75	SA
2. I manage school resources effectively.	4.74	SA
3. I comply with financial accountability requirements.	4.76	SA
4. I ensure transparency in the utilization of school funds and resources.	4.79	SA
5. I align resource allocation with school improvement priorities.	4.77	SA
Grand Mean	4.76	SA

Legend:	Range	Interpretation
	4.21-5.00	Strongly Agree (SA)
	3.41-4.20	Agree (A)
	2.61-3.40	Moderately Agree (MA)
	1.81-2.60	Disagree (D)
	1.00-1.80	Strongly Disagree (SD)

Analytically, the consistently high mean scores across all indicators reveal a strong and well-balanced capacity among school heads to manage financial and material resources. High ratings in understanding budgeting and financial procedures ($M = 4.75$) and compliance with financial accountability requirements ($M = 4.76$) indicate that respondents are well-versed in DepEd financial policies and regulatory frameworks. These findings are consistent with recent studies which emphasize that school leaders' financial literacy and compliance significantly influence school efficiency and stakeholder trust (Bush & Glover, 2016; García & Weiss, 2019).

In terms of interpretation, the grand mean of 4.76 reflects a very high level of resource management competence among school heads, suggesting that development programs have effectively addressed both procedural and



strategic aspects of financial management. Anchored in School Effectiveness Theory, effective allocation and utilization of resources are essential correlates of effective schools, as they directly affect instructional quality, school infrastructure, and student support services (Sammons et al., 2016). The high mean for aligning resource allocation with school improvement priorities ($M = 4.77$) indicates that school heads are able to link financial decisions to instructional and organizational goals, thereby strengthening school performance.

The implications of these findings underscore the importance of sustaining and further enhancing financial management components in leadership development programs. While school heads already demonstrate strong competence in this area, advanced training in strategic resource mobilization, results-based budgeting, and financial risk management may further strengthen leadership effectiveness. Additionally, transparent and accountable financial practices can foster stronger stakeholder confidence and community support. These results also provide a solid empirical basis for examining the relationship between development program parameters and school head performance, as articulated in Objective 5 of the study. Overall, the findings affirm that strong resource and financial management understanding is a key outcome of effective leadership development and a vital contributor to sustainable school improvement.

Stakeholder and Communication Engagement Skills. The results presented in Table 14 reveal the Performance of School Heads in terms of Stakeholder and Communication Engagement Skills, with a grand mean of 4.75, interpreted as *Strongly Agree*. Stakeholder and communication engagement is a vital leadership domain that emphasizes transparency, collaboration, and shared decision-making among school heads, teachers, parents, and community partners. This domain directly supports Objective 3.5 of the study, as effective engagement and communication are essential in building trust, sustaining partnerships, and strengthening participatory school governance.

Anchored on Transformational Leadership Theory, effective stakeholder engagement reflects idealized influence and inspirational motivation, where school heads model openness, encourage collaboration, and inspire stakeholders to actively support school programs (Bass & Riggio, 2006). The consistently high mean scores across the indicators—particularly actively engaging parents and community stakeholders ($M = 4.79$) and sustaining collaborative relationships with community partners to support learners ($M = 4.76$)—indicate that school heads demonstrate strong leadership practices in fostering inclusive and cooperative school–community relationships. These practices enhance stakeholder trust and promote collective responsibility for learner outcomes.

Table 14 Performance of School Heads in terms of Stakeholder and Communication Engagement Skills

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1. I actively engage parents and community stakeholders.	4.79	SA
2. I establish partnerships to support school programs.	4.75	SA
3. I communicate effectively with stakeholders.	4.75	SA
4. I involve stakeholders in school planning and decision-making processes.	4.71	SA
5. I sustain collaborative relationships with community partners to support learners.	4.76	SA
Grand Mean	4.75	SA

Legend:	Range	Interpretation
	4.21-5.00	Strongly Agree (SA)
	3.41-4.20	Agree (A)
	2.61-3.40	Moderately Agree (MA)



1.81-2.60	Disagree (D)
1.00-1.80	Strongly Disagree (SD)

From an analytical perspective, the high ratings across all indicators suggest that school heads are highly competent in establishing partnerships ($M = 4.75$) and communicating effectively with stakeholders ($M = 4.75$). Effective communication serves as a foundation for meaningful stakeholder involvement, enabling school heads to convey school goals, initiatives, and concerns clearly and consistently. Moreover, the indicator on involving stakeholders in school planning and decision-making processes ($M = 4.71$) reflects a participatory leadership approach that values shared input and collaborative problem-solving. Recent studies emphasize that inclusive decision-making strengthens stakeholder commitment and improves the successful implementation of school programs (Epstein, 2018; Leithwood et al., 2020).

In terms of interpretation, the grand mean of 4.75 signifies that school heads are highly proficient in integrating stakeholder engagement into school leadership practices. Viewed through the lens of School Effectiveness Theory, strong home-school-community partnerships are critical correlates of effective schools, as they contribute to a positive organizational climate, increased stakeholder support, and improved learning conditions for students (Sammons et al., 2016). The high mean scores indicate that school heads are able to cultivate productive relationships with stakeholders and align collaborative efforts toward learner development and school improvement.

The implications of these findings underscore the importance of sustaining and enhancing professional development programs that strengthen stakeholder engagement and communication competencies among school heads. While the respondents already demonstrate a very high level of competence, future initiatives may focus on advanced partnership-building strategies, participatory governance, and inclusive communication practices to further deepen stakeholder involvement. These findings provide empirical support for Objective 5 of the study, highlighting that strong stakeholder and communication engagement skills are integral to effective leadership performance. Overall, the results affirm that collaborative engagement and effective communication are essential leadership competencies that significantly contribute to effective school management and sustained community support.

Relationship Between the School Heads' Performance and Their Profile Variates

Understanding the relationship between school heads' demographic characteristics and their professional performance is crucial in identifying patterns that may influence leadership effectiveness. Profile variates such as age, sex, educational attainment, position, years of service, number of teachers supervised, school location, and prior training experiences can shape how school heads execute their responsibilities, apply policies, and lead instructional practices. Examining these relationships provides insights into whether certain personal or professional attributes are associated with higher levels of leadership readiness, instructional competence, resource management, and community engagement. This section seeks to determine the extent to which these profile factors influence school heads' performance, informing targeted support and professional development strategies.

Leadership Readiness and Competency Development to School Heads Profile. Table 15 presents the relationship between Leadership Readiness and Competency Development and the profile variables of school heads, addressing Objective 4 of the study. As an introduction, examining these relationships is essential to determine whether demographic and professional characteristics influence leadership readiness and competency development, or whether such

Table 15

Relationship of Leadership Readiness and Competency Development to School Heads Profile



Performance (X)	Profile (Y)	Correlation Coefficient	p-value	Interpretation
Leadership Readiness and Competency Development	Age	0.07095	0.3681	Not Significant
	Sex	-0.05097	0.5182	Not Significant
	Educational Attainment	0.09212	0.2422	Not Significant
	Position	0.0591	0.4536	Not Significant
	Number Of Years as School Head	0.09746	0.2158	Not Significant
	Number Of Teachers Supervised	-0.05409	0.4929	Not Significant
	School Location	0.04415	0.5758	Not Significant
	Number Of Relevant Trainings Attended	0.1113	0.1572	Not Significant

Legend:	Coefficient	Degree of Correlation
± 0.00 to ± 0.20		Negligible Correlation
± 0.21 to ± 0.40		Low Correlation
± 0.41 to ± 0.60		Moderate Correlation
± 0.61 to ± 0.80		Substantial Correlation
± 0.81 to ± 1.00		High to Very High Correlation

competencies are shaped more strongly by structured development programs and organizational support. Understanding this relationship helps clarify whether leadership preparedness is dependent on individual background factors or on systemic interventions.

From the presentation of results, all computed correlation coefficients between leadership readiness and competency development and the profile variables—age, sex, educational attainment, position, number of years as school head, number of teachers supervised, school location, and number of relevant trainings attended—are weak in magnitude, ranging from -0.05409 to 0.11130 . Moreover, all corresponding p-values exceed the 0.05 level of significance, indicating that none of the relationships are statistically significant. This suggests that leadership readiness and competency development among school heads do not significantly vary based on these profile characteristics.

Analytically, the weak and non-significant correlations imply that leadership readiness is relatively consistent across different demographic and professional backgrounds. For instance, age ($r = 0.07095$, $p = 0.3681$) and years of experience as a school head ($r = 0.09746$, $p = 0.2158$) show only minimal positive associations, indicating that increased age or tenure does not necessarily translate into higher leadership readiness. Similarly, educational attainment ($r = 0.09212$, $p = 0.2422$) does not significantly influence competency development, suggesting that formal academic credentials alone may not guarantee leadership preparedness.

In terms of interpretation, these findings can be explained by contemporary perspectives on transformational and instructional leadership, which emphasize that leadership competencies are shaped primarily through continuous professional learning, reflective practice, and contextual engagement, rather than by fixed personal



or demographic characteristics. Recent studies highlight that effective school leadership develops over time through structured development programs, mentoring, and experiential learning that enable school heads to internalize leadership roles and adapt to complex school environments (Hallinger, 2018; Leithwood, Harris, & Hopkins, 2020).

These scholars argue that leadership growth is a dynamic process influenced by organizational support systems and professional development opportunities, explaining why variables such as age, sex, or length of service may not significantly determine leadership competence levels. Consequently, the non-significant relationships observed in this study reinforce the view that leadership readiness and policy competence are outcomes of intentional leadership development mechanisms rather than demographic advantage. Leadership readiness, therefore, is shaped more by exposure to meaningful leadership experiences, mentoring, and well-designed development programs than by static profile variables. This aligns with recent studies indicating that effective leadership development is less about who leaders are and more about the quality of support systems and professional learning opportunities they receive (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Leithwood et al., 2020).

From the perspective of School Effectiveness Theory, the non-significant relationships further suggest that effective leadership practices can emerge across varied contexts when organizational systems provide equitable access to development opportunities. Whether school heads are assigned to urban, rural, or geographically isolated and disadvantaged areas (GIDA), leadership readiness remains comparable, highlighting the role of standardized policies and centrally guided leadership frameworks such as the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH). This finding supports contemporary research emphasizing that system-level coherence and structured leadership support reduce disparities in leadership effectiveness across different school contexts (OECD, 2019).

The implications of these findings are substantial for policy and practice. Since leadership readiness and competency development are not significantly influenced by profile variables, development programs should continue to focus on inclusive, needs-based, and competency-driven interventions rather than targeting school heads based solely on age, sex, or experience. This reinforces the importance of Objective 5, which examines the relationship between development programs and performance, and Objective 7, which aims to formulate a strategic improvement plan. Ultimately, the results suggest that investing in high-quality, well-aligned development programs can ensure leadership readiness across diverse school heads, promoting equity, consistency, and effectiveness in school leadership within the Second Congressional District of Samar.

Knowledge and Policy Retention to School Heads Profile. Table 16 presents the relationship between Knowledge and Policy Retention and the profile variables of school heads, directly addressing Objective 4 of the study. This analysis is important in determining whether demographic and professional characteristics influence how well school heads understand, retain, and apply DepEd policies, or whether policy competence is shaped more by systemic supports such as development programs and institutional mechanisms.

Table 16 Relationship of Knowledge and Policy Retention to School Heads Profile

Performance (X)	Profile (Y)	Correlation Coefficient	p-value	Interpretation
Knowledge and Policy Retention	Age	0.03554	0.6525	Not Significant
	Sex	-0.08913	0.2579	Not Significant
	Educational Attainment	0.0633	0.4221	Not Significant
	Position	0.04444	0.5732	Not Significant
	Number Of Years as School Head	0.0423	0.5919	Not Significant
	Number Of Teachers Supervised	-0.07137	0.3653	Not Significant
	School Location	0.08794	0.2643	Not Significant



	Number Of Relevant Trainings Attended	0.08543	0.2783	Not Significant
--	---------------------------------------	---------	--------	-----------------

Legend: Coefficient Degree of Correlation

± 0.00 to ± 0.20	Negligible Correlation
± 0.21 to ± 0.40	Low Correlation
± 0.41 to ± 0.60	Moderate Correlation
± 0.61 to ± 0.80	Substantial Correlation
± 0.81 to ± 1.00	High to Very High Correlation

In terms of presentation, the results show that all computed correlation coefficients between knowledge and policy retention and the profile variables—age, sex, educational attainment, position, number of years as school head, number of teachers supervised, school location, and number of relevant trainings attended—are very weak, with values ranging from -0.08913 to 0.08794 . All corresponding p-values are greater than 0.05 , indicating that none of the relationships are statistically significant. This means that variations in school heads' demographic and professional backgrounds do not significantly relate to differences in their level of knowledge and retention of policies.

From an analytical standpoint, the findings suggest that policy understanding and retention are not dependent on age ($r = 0.03554$, $p = 0.6525$) or length of service as a school head ($r = 0.04230$, $p = 0.5919$). Similarly, educational attainment ($r = 0.06330$, $p = 0.4221$) shows only a negligible association, implying that having higher academic qualifications does not automatically translate into stronger policy mastery. Even the number of relevant trainings attended ($r = 0.08543$, $p = 0.2783$) does not show a statistically significant relationship, suggesting that training quantity alone may not guarantee deeper policy retention.

In interpreting these results, contemporary transformational and instructional leadership literature provides a useful explanatory lens. Recent studies emphasize that effective school leaders internalize policies not primarily through formal credentials or demographic attributes, but through reflective practice, values-driven leadership, and sustained engagement with real school contexts. Research by Hallinger (2018) and Leithwood et al. (2020) underscores that policy understanding and application among school heads are developed through continuous professional learning, mentoring, and situational leadership experiences rather than static personal characteristics. Similarly, Darling-Hammond, Flook, Cook-Harvey, Barron, and Osher (2020) highlight that leadership effectiveness emerges when leaders actively integrate policy knowledge with ethical judgment and contextual decision-making. These perspectives help explain why demographic variables showed no significant relationship with knowledge and policy retention, reinforcing the idea that leadership capacity is cultivated through intentional development processes rather than inherent attributes. Knowledge and policy retention, therefore, appear to be more closely linked to how development programs contextualize policies and support school heads in translating policy into practice, rather than who the school heads are in terms of profile characteristics.

Likewise, School Effectiveness Theory explains that policy coherence and consistent implementation across schools are outcomes of strong systems rather than individual traits (Edmonds, 1979). The non-significant relationships across variables such as school location and number of teachers supervised indicate that school heads, regardless of context, are exposed to relatively uniform policy frameworks and governance structures within DepEd. This aligns with recent studies showing that centralized policy dissemination and standardized leadership frameworks help minimize disparities in policy understanding across diverse school settings (Hallinger et al., 2018; OECD, 2019).



The implications of these findings are noteworthy for leadership development and policy implementation. Since knowledge and policy retention are not significantly influenced by demographic or professional profiles, development initiatives should focus on deepening policy application, interpretation, and contextualization, rather than differentiating support based on age, position, or experience alone. This reinforces the importance of strengthening development program components such as content quality, alignment, and post-development monitoring (Objective 2), as well as examining how these program parameters relate to performance outcomes (Objective 5). Ultimately, the results support the formulation of a strategic improvement plan (Objective 7) that emphasizes sustained mentoring, practical policy engagement, and continuous professional learning to ensure consistent and effective policy leadership among school heads in the Second Congressional District of Samar.

Instructional Leadership Applications to School Heads Profile. Table 17 presents the relationship between school heads' instructional leadership applications and their demographic and professional profile variables, including age, sex, educational attainment, position, number of years as school head, number of teachers supervised, school location, and number of relevant trainings attended. The purpose of this analysis is to determine whether certain profile characteristics significantly influence the way school heads implement instructional leadership practices in their schools. Correlation analysis was employed to examine the

Table 17 Relationship Of Instructional Leadership Applications to School Heads Profile

Performance (X)	Profile (Y)	Correlation Coefficient	p-value	Interpretation
Instructional Leadership Applications	Age	-0.09859	0.2105	Not Significant
	Sex	-0.07848	0.3194	Not Significant
	Educational Attainment	0.09087	0.2486	Not Significant
	Position	-0.007566	0.9236	Not Significant
	Number Of Years as School Head	-0.01065	0.8927	Not Significant
	Number Of Teachers Supervised	-0.1396	0.07555	Not Significant
	School Location	0.115	0.1439	Not Significant
	Number Of Relevant Trainings Attended	0.1243	0.114	Not Significant

Legend: Coefficient Degree of Correlation

± 0.00 to ± 0.20	Negligible Correlation
± 0.21 to ± 0.40	Low Correlation
± 0.41 to ± 0.60	Moderate Correlation
± 0.61 to ± 0.80	Substantial Correlation
± 0.81 to ± 1.00	High to Very High Correlation

strength and direction of these relationships, with p-values used to determine statistical significance at the 0.05 level.

The results show that all profile variables have no significant relationship with instructional leadership applications. Specifically, age ($r = -0.099$, $p = 0.211$), sex ($r = -0.078$, $p = 0.319$), educational attainment ($r = 0.091$, $p = 0.249$), position ($r = -0.008$, $p = 0.924$), number of years as school head ($r = -0.011$, $p = 0.893$), number of teachers supervised ($r = -0.140$, $p = 0.076$), school location ($r = 0.115$, $p = 0.144$), and number of relevant trainings attended ($r = 0.124$, $p = 0.114$) were all statistically non-significant. These findings suggest



that demographic factors and professional background characteristics do not have a measurable influence on how school heads apply instructional leadership in their respective schools.

From a theoretical perspective, these findings align with Transformational Leadership Theory (Burns, 1978; Bass, 1985), which emphasizes that effective leadership is shaped more by individual values, vision, motivation, and relational skills than by demographic or formal profile variables. Transformational leadership posits that instructional practices, such as guiding teacher development, monitoring classroom instruction, and fostering a culture of learning, are driven by a leader's commitment to intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration rather than by age, sex, or professional tenure. Similarly, School Effectiveness Theory underscores that instructional leadership impacts student learning outcomes when it is strategically enacted, contextually responsive, and aligned with school systems, regardless of the leader's demographic characteristics (Edmonds, 1979; Hallinger, 2018).

Recent studies reinforce these theoretical interpretations. For example, Ng and Chan (2020) found that school leaders' effectiveness in instructional supervision is more closely linked to leadership style, professional engagement, and reflective practice than to years of experience or educational attainment. Likewise, Al-Saadi et al. (2019) reported that demographic characteristics such as age, gender, or position had minimal influence on the application of instructional leadership competencies, highlighting the importance of ongoing professional development and transformational approaches to leadership practice. These studies suggest that school heads' ability to implement instructional leadership effectively is shaped by their engagement with developmental programs and the quality of their relational and cognitive competencies rather than their static profile variables.

The implications of these findings are significant for policy and practice. First, professional development programs should focus on enhancing the competencies, reflective capacities, and transformational leadership skills of school heads, rather than targeting participants based on demographic profiles. Second, school improvement initiatives should recognize that instructional leadership can be strengthened through targeted training, coaching, and mentoring, which cultivate vision-driven and adaptive practices applicable across diverse school contexts. Finally, the lack of significant correlations underscores the need for individualized support and capacity-building mechanisms that equip school heads to apply instructional leadership effectively, regardless of their personal or professional background.

Resource And Financial Management Understanding to School Heads Profile. Table 18 presents the relationship between school heads' understanding of resource and financial management and their demographic and professional profile variables, including age, sex, educational attainment, position, number of
Table 18

Relationship Of Resource and Financial Management Understanding to School Heads Profile

Performance (X)	Profile (Y)	Correlation Coefficient	p-value	Interpretation
Resource and Financial Management Understanding	Age	-0.1455	0.0638	Not Significant
	Sex	-0.01585	0.8409	Not Significant
	Educational Attainment	0.1438	0.06712	Not Significant
	Position	-0.02297	0.771	Not Significant
	Number Of Years as School Head	-0.04068	0.6061	Not Significant
	Number Of Teachers Supervised	-0.09847	0.2111	Not Significant
	School Location	0.09306	0.2374	Not Significant
	Number Of Relevant Trainings Attended	0.09136	0.2461	Not Significant

Legend: Coefficient Degree of Correlation



± 0.00 to ± 0.20	Negligible Correlation
± 0.21 to ± 0.40	Low Correlation
± 0.41 to ± 0.60	Moderate Correlation
± 0.61 to ± 0.80	Substantial Correlation
± 0.81 to ± 1.00	High to Very High Correlation

years as school head, number of teachers supervised, school location, and number of relevant trainings attended. The analysis aims to determine whether these profile characteristics influence the extent to which school heads comprehend and apply principles of resource allocation, budgeting, and financial oversight in their schools. Correlation coefficients and p-values were used to assess the strength, direction, and significance of these relationships at the 0.05 level.

The results indicate that none of the profile variables have a significant relationship with resource and financial management understanding. Age ($r = -0.146$, $p = 0.064$), sex ($r = -0.016$, $p = 0.841$), educational attainment ($r = 0.144$, $p = 0.067$), position ($r = -0.023$, $p = 0.771$), number of years as school head ($r = -0.041$, $p = 0.606$), number of teachers supervised ($r = -0.098$, $p = 0.211$), school location ($r = 0.093$, $p = 0.237$), and number of relevant trainings attended ($r = 0.091$, $p = 0.246$) were all statistically non-significant. These findings suggest that demographic and professional profile characteristics do not significantly influence a school head's understanding of resource and financial management practices.

From a theoretical perspective, this outcome aligns with Transformational Leadership Theory (Burns, 1978; Bass, 1985), which posits that leadership effectiveness—including the management of resources—is primarily shaped by personal motivation, vision, and relational capacities rather than demographic or positional factors. Transformational leaders are able to guide resource allocation, implement financial oversight, and make data-informed decisions based on strategic priorities, independent of age, sex, or formal training. Similarly, School Effectiveness Theory emphasizes that effective resource and financial management contributes to improved school functioning and student outcomes when processes are structured, transparent, and aligned with organizational goals, rather than being determined by the demographic profile of school leaders (Edmonds, 1979; Hallinger, 2018).

Recent research supports this interpretation. For instance, Choi and Tang (2018) found that the quality of school resource management is more strongly associated with leadership competencies, strategic planning, and engagement with stakeholders than with demographic variables. Likewise, a study by Sultana et al. (2020) indicated that a school head's effectiveness in financial and resource management is influenced more by ongoing professional development, coaching, and reflective practice than by years of experience or academic attainment. These studies reinforce the notion that understanding and effectively managing school resources requires skill development and strategic leadership rather than reliance on profile characteristics.

The implications of these findings suggest that professional development programs should emphasize capacity-building in resource and financial management through practical training, simulations, and mentoring rather than targeting school heads based on age, tenure, or position. By focusing on competency development, school leaders can enhance budgeting, resource allocation, and financial oversight across diverse school contexts, ensuring that limited resources are optimized to support teaching, learning, and school improvement initiatives. This evidence highlights the importance of contextually responsive and skill-focused interventions in strengthening resource and financial management understanding among school heads in the Second Congressional District of Samar.

Stakeholder and community engagement skills to School Heads Profile. Table 19 presents the correlation between school heads' stakeholder and community engagement skills and their demographic and professional



profile variables, including age, sex, educational attainment, position, number of years as school head, number of teachers supervised, school location, and number of relevant trainings attended. This analysis aims to examine whether specific profile characteristics significantly influence the ability of school heads to establish and maintain productive relationships with parents, community members, and other key stakeholders. Correlation coefficients and p-values were used to determine the strength and significance of these relationships at the 0.05 level.

The results indicate that none of the profile variables show a significant relationship with stakeholder and community engagement skills. Age ($r = -0.118$, $p = 0.133$), sex ($r = -0.081$, $p = 0.304$), educational attainment ($r = 0.130$, $p = 0.098$), position ($r = -0.022$, $p = 0.779$), number of years as school head ($r = -0.046$, $p = 0.563$), number of teachers supervised ($r = -0.045$, $p = 0.565$), school location ($r = 0.118$, $p = 0.134$), and number of relevant trainings attended ($r = 0.086$, $p = 0.278$) were all statistically non-significant. These findings suggest that demographic and professional characteristics do not significantly influence school heads' capacity to engage effectively with stakeholders and communities.

The findings align with Transformational Leadership Theory (Burns, 1978; Bass, 1985), which emphasizes that stakeholder engagement is largely determined by a leader's vision, relational competencies, motivation, and ability to inspire and

Table 19 Relationship of Stakeholder and Community Engagement Skills to School Heads Profile

Performance (X)	Profile (Y)	Correlation Coefficient	p-value	Interpretation
Stakeholder and Community Engagement Skills	Age	-0.1182	0.1328	Not Significant
	Sex	-0.08093	0.3044	Not Significant
	Educational Attainment	0.1299	0.09839	Not Significant
	Position	-0.0222	0.7785	Not Significant
	Number Of Years as School Head	-0.04563	0.563	Not Significant
	Number Of Teachers Supervised	-0.04543	0.5647	Not Significant
	School Location	0.1178	0.1342	Not Significant
	Number Of Relevant Trainings Attended	0.08553	0.2777	Not Significant

Legend:	Coefficient	Degree of Correlation
± 0.00 to ± 0.20		Negligible Correlation
± 0.21 to ± 0.40		Low Correlation
± 0.41 to ± 0.60		Moderate Correlation
± 0.61 to ± 0.80		Substantial Correlation
± 0.81 to ± 1.00		High to Very High Correlation



influence others, rather than by age, sex, or professional tenure. Transformational leaders foster trust, collaboration, and shared commitment among teachers, parents, and community members through individualized consideration and inspirational motivation, which are not constrained by profile characteristics. Likewise, School Effectiveness Theory highlights that strong school-community partnerships contribute to improved school outcomes, emphasizing the strategic and systemic enactment of engagement practices over demographic predictors (Edmonds, 1979; Hallinger, 2018).

Recent studies reinforce these theoretical insights. For example, Asad et al. (2019) found that effective stakeholder engagement is shaped more by leadership competencies, communication skills, and proactive involvement in school governance than by demographic factors. Similarly, Alharbi and Aldhafri (2021) reported that school leaders' ability to engage with parents and communities is enhanced by transformational leadership behaviors and participatory practices rather than by age, educational background, or years of service. These studies suggest that stakeholder engagement is a dynamic leadership practice that can be strengthened through targeted professional development and reflective practice, independent of a leader's profile.

The implications of these findings are important for school leadership development. Programs designed to enhance community and stakeholder engagement should focus on building competencies such as communication, participatory decision-making, and collaborative problem-solving, rather than targeting participants based on demographic or professional characteristics. Strengthening these skills can improve partnerships with parents, local authorities, and other stakeholders, ultimately supporting school improvement initiatives and fostering positive learning environments. By emphasizing competency-based approaches, school heads in the Second Congressional District of Samar can effectively cultivate community involvement and support for educational programs, contributing to overall school effectiveness.

Relationship Between the Performance and the Development Programs' Parameters

The effectiveness of leadership development programs depends not only on participant engagement but also on program characteristics such as structure, content quality, delivery, alignment with standards, relevance, post-development monitoring, and feedback mechanisms. Understanding the relationship between these program parameters and school heads' performance helps determine which elements most strongly contribute to competency development, instructional leadership application, and stakeholder engagement. This section explores how variations in program design and implementation are associated with measurable outcomes, providing empirical evidence for refining development initiatives and ensuring they effectively enhance leadership capacity in elementary schools.

Leadership Readiness and Competency Development to Programs' Parameters. Table 20 presents the relationship between school heads' leadership readiness and competency development and the parameters of the professional development programs they participated in. The program parameters include structure, content quality, delivery, alignment with professional standards, program relevance, post-development performance monitoring, and feedback and continuous improvement mechanisms. This analysis aims to determine whether and how these program elements influence the preparedness and competence of

Table 20

Relationship of Leadership Readiness and Competency Development to Programs' Parameters

Performance (X)	Program Parameters (Y)	Correlation Coefficient	p-value	Interpretation
Leadership Readiness and Competency Development	Structure	0.6514	0.00	Significant
	Content Quality	0.6601	0.00	Significant
	Delivery	0.6421	0.00	Significant
	Alignment	0.6423	0.00	Significant
	Program Relevance	0.5701	0.000001	Significant
	Post Development Performance Monitoring	0.5996	0.00	Significant



	Feedback And Continuous Improvement Mechanisms	0.688	0.00	Significant
--	--	-------	------	-------------

Legend: Coefficient Degree of Correlation

± 0.00 to ± 0.20	Negligible Correlation
± 0.21 to ± 0.40	Low Correlation
± 0.41 to ± 0.60	Moderate Correlation
± 0.61 to ± 0.80	Substantial Correlation
± 0.81 to ± 1.00	High to Very High Correlation

school heads in assuming leadership roles. Correlation coefficients and p-values were computed to assess the strength, direction, and significance of the relationships at the 0.05 significance level.

The results reveal that all program parameters are significantly and positively correlated with leadership readiness and competency development. Specifically, structure ($r = 0.651$, $p = 0.000$), content quality ($r = 0.660$, $p = 0.000$), delivery ($r = 0.642$, $p = 0.000$), alignment ($r = 0.642$, $p = 0.000$), program relevance ($r = 0.570$, $p < 0.001$), post-development performance monitoring ($r = 0.600$, $p = 0.000$), and feedback and continuous improvement mechanisms ($r = 0.688$, $p = 0.000$) all show strong, statistically significant positive relationships. These findings suggest that well-structured, relevant, and effectively delivered programs, coupled with alignment to professional standards and mechanisms for feedback and monitoring, substantially enhance school heads' readiness and leadership competencies.

From a theoretical standpoint, these results are consistent with Transformational Leadership Theory (Burns, 1978; Bass, 1985), which posits that leadership development is fostered through structured experiences that stimulate intellectual growth, provide individualized consideration, and cultivate visionary and motivational capacities. Programs that are well-structured, relevant, and systematically monitored encourage reflective practice, facilitate mastery of leadership skills, and build confidence in applying knowledge to real-world school contexts. Likewise, School Effectiveness Theory emphasizes that leadership development initiatives improve school outcomes when program parameters are systematically aligned with organizational goals, standards, and the needs of the school community (Edmonds, 1979; Hallinger, 2018). Strong correlations between program quality and leadership readiness suggest that effective professional development is a critical driver of competent and effective school leadership.

Recent empirical studies support these theoretical interpretations. For example, Ng and Chan (2020) found that comprehensive professional development programs with clear structure, practical content, and systematic follow-up significantly improved principals' leadership skills and confidence. Similarly, Al-Saadi et al. (2019) reported that alignment of training content with leadership standards and post-program monitoring are key determinants of school leaders' ability to translate training into effective school practices. These studies underscore the importance of program quality, relevance, and ongoing support in fostering leadership readiness and competency development.

The implications of these findings are critical for policy and practice. First, program designers and educational authorities should ensure that leadership development programs are systematically structured, aligned with professional standards, and relevant to participants' roles. Second, program delivery should emphasize interactive and participatory learning, while post-development monitoring and feedback mechanisms should be integrated to reinforce learning and support continuous improvement. By prioritizing these elements, professional development initiatives can maximize the impact on school heads' leadership readiness, ensuring that leaders are well-prepared to implement instructional leadership, manage resources effectively, and engage



stakeholders. Ultimately, such evidence-based improvements in development programs contribute to stronger school leadership and more effective school management in the Second Congressional District of Samar.

Knowledge and Policy Retention to Programs' Parameters. Table 21 presents the relationship between school heads' knowledge and policy retention and the parameters of the development programs they attended. The program parameters include structure, content quality, delivery, alignment with professional standards, program relevance, post-development performance monitoring, and feedback and continuous improvement mechanisms. The analysis examines whether these program elements significantly affect school heads' ability to retain knowledge and adhere to educational policies. Correlation coefficients and p-values were computed to determine the strength, direction, and significance of these relationships at the 0.05 significance level.

Table 21 Relationship of Knowledge and Policy Retention to Programs' Parameters

Performance (X)	Profile (Y)	Correlation Coefficient	p-value	Interpretation
Knowledge and Policy Retention	Structure	0.6733	0.00	Significant
	Content Quality	0.669	0.00	Significant
	Delivery	0.6872	0.00	Significant
	Alignment	0.6884	0.00	Significant
	Program Relevance	0.5901	0.0001	Significant
	Post Development Performance Monitoring	0.6145	0.00	Significant
	Feedback And Continuous Improvement Mechanisms	0.7041	0.00	Significant

Legend:	Coefficient	Degree of Correlation
± 0.00 to ± 0.20		Negligible Correlation
± 0.21 to ± 0.40		Low Correlation
± 0.41 to ± 0.60		Moderate Correlation
± 0.61 to ± 0.80		Substantial Correlation
± 0.81 to ± 1.00		High to Very High Correlation

The results reveal that all program parameters have strong, positive, and statistically significant relationships with knowledge and policy retention. Specifically, structure ($r = 0.673$, $p = 0.000$), content quality ($r = 0.669$, $p = 0.000$), delivery ($r = 0.687$, $p = 0.000$), alignment ($r = 0.688$, $p = 0.000$), program relevance ($r = 0.590$, $p = 0.0001$), post-development performance monitoring ($r = 0.615$, $p = 0.000$), and feedback and continuous improvement mechanisms ($r = 0.704$, $p = 0.000$) all demonstrate significant positive correlations. These findings suggest that well-designed, relevant, and systematically monitored programs substantially enhance school heads' ability to retain knowledge and comply with educational policies, thereby reinforcing their capacity to implement leadership responsibilities effectively.

From a theoretical perspective, these results are consistent with Transformational Leadership Theory (Burns, 1978; Bass, 1985), which emphasizes that leaders' cognitive and reflective capacities are cultivated through structured experiences, intellectual stimulation, and ongoing feedback. Development programs that are structured, aligned with standards, and reinforced with post-program support mechanisms facilitate knowledge consolidation and policy comprehension, enabling school heads to apply what they have learned in practical contexts. Similarly, School Effectiveness Theory highlights that the retention and application of policy knowledge are critical for effective school management and the achievement of organizational goals (Edmonds, 1979; Hallinger, 2018). When program parameters are well-aligned with leadership standards and the school context, knowledge retention is strengthened, which in turn enhances school performance.

Recent studies support these theoretical insights. Ng and Chan (2020) reported that structured professional development programs with interactive delivery and follow-up mechanisms significantly improve school leaders' policy retention and application in school management practices. Al-Saadi et al. (2019) also emphasized that alignment of program content with professional standards and systematic monitoring strongly predicts leaders' ability to retain critical knowledge and implement policies effectively. These studies underscore the importance of program design, delivery, and follow-up in strengthening school heads' knowledge base and policy adherence.

The implications of these findings suggest that educational authorities and program designers should prioritize development program parameters that maximize knowledge retention and policy compliance. This includes clearly structured programs, high-quality content, effective delivery methods, alignment with professional standards, relevance to participants' roles, and robust post-program monitoring and feedback mechanisms. By emphasizing these elements, professional development initiatives can ensure that school heads are better prepared to implement instructional leadership, adhere to policy requirements, and manage schools effectively, thereby contributing to improved school outcomes in the Second Congressional District of Samar.

Instructional Leadership Applications to Programs' Parameters. Table 22 presents the relationship between school heads' instructional leadership applications and the parameters of the development programs they attended. The program parameters analyzed include structure, content quality, delivery, alignment with professional standards, program relevance, post-development performance monitoring, and feedback and continuous improvement mechanisms. This analysis aims to determine the extent to which program design and quality influence the ability of school heads to apply instructional leadership practices effectively, including classroom supervision, curriculum implementation, teacher mentoring, and monitoring of learning outcomes. Correlation coefficients and p-values were used to examine the strength and significance of these relationships at the 0.05 significance level.

The results indicate that all program parameters are significantly and positively correlated with instructional leadership applications. Structure ($r = 0.742$, $p = 0.000$), content quality ($r = 0.764$, $p = 0.000$), delivery ($r = 0.762$, $p = 0.000$), alignment ($r = 0.794$, $p = 0.000$), program relevance ($r = 0.656$, $p = 0.000$), post-development performance monitoring ($r = 0.596$, $p = 0.000$), and feedback and continuous improvement mechanisms ($r = 0.755$, $p = 0.000$) all demonstrate strong, statistically significant positive relationships. These findings suggest that school heads are more likely to implement effective instructional leadership practices when development programs are well-structured, relevant, systematically delivered, and reinforced with monitoring and feedback.

Table 22 Relationship Of Instructional Leadership Applications to Programs' Parameters

Performance (X)	Profile (Y)	Correlation Coefficient	p-value	Interpretation
Instructional Leadership Applications	Structure	0.7418	0.00	Significant
	Content Quality	0.7643	0.00	Significant
	Delivery	0.7624	0.00	Significant
	Alignment	0.7942	0.00	Significant
	Program Relevance	0.6555	0.00	Significant
	Post Development Performance Monitoring	0.5959	0.00	Significant



	Feedback And Continuous Improvement Mechanisms	0.7547	0.00	Significant

Legend: Coefficient Degree of Correlation

± 0.00 to ± 0.20	Negligible Correlation
± 0.21 to ± 0.40	Low Correlation
± 0.41 to ± 0.60	Moderate Correlation
± 0.61 to ± 0.80	Substantial Correlation
± 0.81 to ± 1.00	High to Very High Correlation

From a theoretical perspective, these findings are consistent with Transformational Leadership Theory (Burns, 1978; Bass, 1985), which emphasizes that leadership competencies—including instructional supervision and the facilitation of teacher growth—are developed through structured experiences that foster intellectual stimulation, reflective practice, and individualized consideration. Programs that are systematically designed, aligned with professional standards, and reinforced with post-program feedback enable school heads to translate learning into actionable instructional leadership practices. Likewise, School Effectiveness Theory underscores the importance of instructional leadership in improving student outcomes, highlighting that leaders' ability to guide teaching and learning is strengthened by structured, evidence-based professional development (Edmonds, 1979; Hallinger, 2018).

Recent studies support these conclusions. For instance, Ng and Chan (2020) reported that principals who participated in well-structured and monitored leadership programs demonstrated higher levels of classroom supervision, curriculum implementation, and teacher support. Similarly, Al-Saadi et al. (2019) emphasized that alignment of program content with leadership standards, interactive delivery, and continuous feedback are crucial determinants of instructional leadership effectiveness. These findings confirm that the quality and structure of professional development programs directly influence school heads' capacity to apply instructional leadership skills in their schools.

The implications of these findings are significant for policy and practice. Development programs should prioritize strong program structure, high-quality content, effective delivery methods, alignment with professional standards, contextual relevance, and robust mechanisms for post-program monitoring and feedback. By ensuring that these elements are present, educational authorities can enhance the instructional leadership capabilities of school heads, which is essential for improving teaching quality, student learning outcomes, and overall school performance. In the context of the Second Congressional District of Samar, such evidence-based program design can strengthen school heads' effectiveness in guiding teachers and creating a culture of continuous instructional improvement.

Resource And Financial Management Understanding to Programs' Parameters. Table 23 presents the relationship between school heads' understanding of resource and financial management and the parameters of their professional development programs, including structure, content quality, delivery, alignment with professional standards, program relevance, post-development performance monitoring, and feedback and continuous improvement mechanisms. This analysis seeks to determine whether the design and quality of development programs significantly influence school heads' competence in planning, allocating, and managing school resources and finances. Correlation coefficients and p-values were analyzed to determine the strength, direction, and significance of these relationships at a 0.05 significance level.

The results show that all program parameters are significantly and positively correlated with resource and financial management understanding. Structure ($r = 0.706$, $p = 0.000$), content quality ($r = 0.785$, $p = 0.000$),



delivery ($r = 0.754$, $p = 0.000$), alignment ($r = 0.769$, $p = 0.000$), program relevance ($r = 0.628$, $p = 0.000$), post-development performance monitoring ($r = 0.593$, $p = 0.000$), and feedback and continuous improvement mechanisms ($r = 0.773$, $p = 0.000$) all indicate strong positive relationships. These findings suggest that school heads' competency in financial and resource management improves substantially when

Table 23 Relationship of Resource and Financial Management Understanding to Programs' Parameters

Performance (X)	Profile (Y)	Correlation Coefficient	p-value	Interpretation
Resource and Financial Management Understanding	Structure	0.7059	0.00	Significant
	Content Quality	0.785	0.00	Significant
	Delivery	0.7535	0.00	Significant
	Alignment	0.7693	0.00	Significant
	Program Relevance	0.6276	0.00	Significant
	Post Development Performance Monitoring	0.593	0.00	Significant
	Feedback And Continuous Improvement Mechanisms	0.7729	0.00	Significant

Legend:	Coefficient	Degree of Correlation
± 0.00 to ± 0.20		Negligible Correlation
± 0.21 to ± 0.40		Low Correlation
± 0.41 to ± 0.60		Moderate Correlation
± 0.61 to ± 0.80		Substantial Correlation
± 0.81 to ± 1.00		High to Very High Correlation

development programs are well-structured, relevant, aligned with professional standards, and reinforced with monitoring and feedback.

From a theoretical perspective, these findings align with Transformational Leadership Theory (Burns, 1978; Bass, 1985), which emphasizes that effective leaders develop practical and strategic skills through structured experiences that promote intellectual growth, problem-solving, and reflective practice. Development programs that provide clear content, systematic delivery, and post-program support equip school heads with the knowledge and skills necessary to manage school resources efficiently, make informed financial decisions, and implement policies effectively. Similarly, School Effectiveness Theory emphasizes that school leaders' management of resources and finances is a critical determinant of school performance and student outcomes (Edmonds, 1979; Hallinger, 2018). Strong program parameters help ensure that leaders are equipped to maintain operational efficiency, optimize resource utilization, and support teaching and learning processes.

Recent studies support these conclusions. For example, Ng and Chan (2020) found that school leaders' resource management skills improve significantly when professional development programs provide structured, content-rich, and systematically monitored training aligned with leadership standards. Al-Saadi et al. (2019) also



highlighted that alignment of program content with leadership competencies, practical delivery, and feedback mechanisms are essential for school leaders to apply resource and financial management skills effectively in their schools. These studies indicate that well-designed programs directly influence school heads' capacity to manage school resources strategically and efficiently.

The implications of these findings are critical for policy and practice. Educational authorities and program designers should prioritize development program parameters that enhance knowledge and application of resource and financial management. Programs should be structured, aligned with leadership standards, relevant to school contexts, and reinforced with post-program monitoring and feedback mechanisms. Strengthening these aspects ensures that school heads are capable of managing school resources and finances effectively, thereby supporting instructional programs, promoting accountability, and enhancing overall school performance in the Second Congressional District of Samar.

Stakeholder and community engagement skills to Programs' Parameters. Table 24 presents the relationship between school heads' stakeholder and community engagement skills and the parameters of the professional development programs they attended. The program parameters include structure, content quality, delivery, alignment with professional standards, program relevance, post-development performance monitoring, and feedback and continuous improvement mechanisms. The purpose of this analysis is to determine whether these program components significantly influence school heads' capacity to build partnerships, collaborate with parents and communities, and engage stakeholders effectively in school governance and improvement initiatives. Correlation coefficients and p-values were calculated to assess the strength and significance of these relationships at the 0.05 significance level.

The results indicate that all program parameters are significantly and positively correlated with stakeholder and community engagement skills. Structure ($r = 0.685$, $p = 0.000$), content quality ($r = 0.739$, $p = 0.000$), delivery ($r = 0.669$, $p = 0.000$), alignment ($r = 0.715$, $p = 0.000$), program relevance ($r = 0.569$, $p =$
Table 24

Relationship of Stakeholder and Community Engagement Skills to Programs' Parameters

Performance (X)	Profile (Y)	Correlation Coefficient	p-value	Interpretation
Stakeholder and Community Engagement Skills	Structure	0.6849	0.00	Significant
	Content Quality	0.7387	0.00	Significant
	Delivery	0.6688	0.00	Significant
	Alignment	0.7148	0.00	Significant
	Program Relevance	0.5693	0.000002	Significant
	Post Development Performance Monitoring	0.5245	0.000006	Significant
	Feedback And Continuous Improvement Mechanisms	0.7062	0.00	Significant

Legend: Coefficient Degree of Correlation

± 0.00 to ± 0.20 Negligible Correlation

± 0.21 to ± 0.40 Low Correlation

± 0.41 to ± 0.60 Moderate Correlation

± 0.61 to ± 0.80 Substantial Correlation



± 0.81 to ± 1.00

High to Very High Correlation

0.000002), post-development performance monitoring ($r = 0.525$, $p = 0.000006$), and feedback and continuous improvement mechanisms ($r = 0.706$, $p = 0.000$) all demonstrate strong positive relationships. These findings suggest that school heads' ability to engage stakeholders, foster community partnerships, and involve parents and other stakeholders in school decision-making improves significantly when development programs are well-structured, relevant, systematically delivered, and reinforced through monitoring and feedback.

Theoretically, these findings are aligned with Transformational Leadership Theory (Burns, 1978; Bass, 1985), which emphasizes that effective leaders develop relational and motivational capacities through structured experiences that encourage reflection, collaboration, and individualized consideration. Development programs with high-quality content, structured delivery, and mechanisms for continuous feedback enhance school heads' skills in building trust, fostering collaboration, and motivating stakeholders to support school goals. In parallel, School Effectiveness Theory highlights that stakeholder and community engagement is a key correlate of effective schools, contributing to improved resource mobilization, policy compliance, and student outcomes (Edmonds, 1979; Hallinger, 2018). Programs that align with these standards facilitate the development of leaders who can connect the school with its broader community context, fostering inclusive and participatory school governance.

Recent empirical studies reinforce these interpretations. Ng and Chan (2020) found that school leaders who participated in structured, well-aligned, and monitored leadership programs demonstrated higher levels of community engagement and stakeholder collaboration. Similarly, Al-Saadi et al. (2019) emphasized that leadership programs with clear content, interactive delivery, and follow-up mechanisms significantly enhance school leaders' ability to communicate with stakeholders, mobilize community resources, and implement participatory governance practices. These studies confirm that program quality, relevance, and post-development support are essential for developing effective stakeholder and community engagement skills among school heads.

The implications of these findings are critical for program design and educational leadership practice. Development programs should ensure that all parameters—structure, content, delivery, alignment, relevance, monitoring, and feedback—are carefully implemented to strengthen school heads' relational, collaborative, and engagement competencies. By doing so, school leaders can effectively involve parents, teachers, local organizations, and community members in decision-making and school improvement initiatives, fostering a supportive environment that enhances student learning and overall school effectiveness. In the Second Congressional District of Samar, this evidence-based approach to professional development can ensure that school heads are equipped to lead schools not only as instructional leaders but also as community-engaged managers.

Even well-designed development programs can encounter barriers that limit their impact. Challenges such as **Challenges Encountered by the School Heads in the Implementation of the Development Programs**

workload pressures, insufficient resources, limited mentoring, inadequate post-development support, and contextual mismatches can hinder school heads from fully benefiting from training initiatives. Exploring these challenges provides a nuanced understanding of the practical and systemic obstacles faced by school heads, highlighting areas where

Table 25 Theme Development

Raw Data (Verbatim Quotations)	Initial Codes	Categories	Emergent Themes
"It was as if I was groping in the dark... it helped me cope with my duties." (P-B) "Provided me with a solid foundation in leadership..." (P-I) "Equipped me with knowledge, skills, and values..." (P-D)	Leadership uncertainty Role confusion Foundational knowledge Leadership preparation	Leadership transition support Role clarification Foundational training	Theme 1: Establishing Development Programs as Foundational Support for Leadership Transition and Role Clarity



"The content is the most helpful... a lot of ideas and knowledge." (P-A) "Practical workshops on budgeting and law..." (P-C) "Seeing actual forms was a 'eureka' moment." (P-H)	Practical knowledge Relevant content Experiential learning Technical skill development	Content relevance Practice-based learning Applied leadership skills	Theme 2: High Relevance and Practical Value of Program Content and Delivery
"I already know what to do before, during, and after supervision." (P-L) "Regular classroom observations... focused coaching." (P-D) "Taught me how to manage people and stakeholders." (P-E)	Increased confidence Instructional supervision skills Decision-making ability Leadership application	Leadership competence Instructional leadership Decision-making skills	Theme 3: Strengthening Leadership Confidence, Decision-Making, and Instructional Leadership Competence
"Prepared me for managing resources... budgeting, procurement..." (P-D) "We need linkages with stakeholders..." (P-B) "Importance of stakeholder support..." (P-A)	Resource management skills Financial literacy Stakeholder collaboration Partnership building	Resource management Stakeholder engagement External collaboration	Theme 4: Building Competence in Resource Management and Stakeholder Engagement
"Heavy administrative workloads affect my participation..." (P-E) "I had to catch up on modules late at night." (P-C) "Administrative workload is neglected or set aside." (P-K)	Workload pressure Time constraints Role conflict Limited engagement	Administrative burden Time management issues Contextual constraints	Theme 5: Managing Administrative Workload and Contextual Constraints as Barriers to Program Implementation
"Gaps are the follow-up support and mentoring..." (P-A) "Limited follow-up support..." (P-I) "There must be coaching and mentoring..." (P-L)	Lack of mentoring Absence of follow-up Limited monitoring Need for coaching	Post-training gaps Lack of sustained support Monitoring deficiencies	Theme 6: Addressing Gaps in Post-Development Support, Mentoring, and Monitoring Systems
"Incorporate simulated crisis management..." (P-C) "Gap between theory and practice..." (P-G) "Include sessions on budget, digital tools..." (P-E)	Need for simulation Theory-practice gap Contextual relevance Skills application	Experiential learning needs Contextualization Practice-oriented training	Theme 7: Promoting Contextualized, Practical, and Experiential Learning Approaches
"Ongoing mentoring and coaching enhance confidence..." (P-D) "Combination of induction, mentoring, coaching..." (P-I) "All types of support should be provided." (P-B)	Continuous mentoring Institutional support Coaching systems Sustained development	Institutional support systems Continuous professional development Leadership sustainability	Theme 8: Sustaining Mentoring, Coaching, and Institutional Support for Leadership Effectiveness

programs can be improved. This section investigates the nature, frequency, and perceived impact of these challenges, providing critical insights for designing strategic improvement plans that address real-world constraints and optimize the effectiveness of leadership development programs.

Theme 1: Establishing Development Programs as Foundational Support for Leadership Transition and Role Clarity. The findings under Theme 1 highlight that development programs serve as a foundational support system that facilitates leadership transition and enhances role clarity among newly appointed school heads. This is clearly reflected in the participants' lived experiences, particularly in their initial struggles and eventual leadership growth through structured leadership preparation. Participant B vividly described the uncertainty experienced during leadership transition, stating, *"When I was newly appointed as a school head, it was as if I was groping in the dark... With the development program... it helped me a lot to cope with my duties and responsibilities as a school head."* This statement illustrates the critical role of development programs in reducing leadership ambiguity and enabling school heads to gradually understand their responsibilities. Similarly, Participant I emphasized the program's foundational value, stating that it *"provided me with a solid foundation in school leadership, management, and governance, which helped me better understand my roles and responsibilities."* This reinforces the view that development programs serve as structured mechanisms for leadership orientation and professional preparation. Participant D further affirmed this transformative impact, noting that the program *"equipped me with the knowledge, skills, and values needed to lead the school effectively and responsibly."* These testimonies collectively demonstrate that development programs provide both cognitive and professional grounding necessary for effective leadership transition.

These experiences strongly reflect the core principles of Transformational Leadership Theory, which emphasizes leadership development as a process of professional transformation rather than a static function of



position or experience. Transformational leadership highlights the importance of leadership preparation in developing leaders' ability to influence, guide, and inspire organizational members toward shared goals. The experience of Participant B, who initially felt disoriented but later gained leadership competence through the development program, exemplifies the transformational process wherein leadership capacity is cultivated through structured learning and professional support. Transformational leadership emphasizes that leadership competence is developed through continuous professional learning, which strengthens leaders' confidence, clarity of purpose, and capacity to guide organizational change. Recent research supports this perspective, emphasizing that leadership preparation programs enhance leaders' self-efficacy, leadership identity, and organizational competence (Grissom et al., 2021). Leadership development programs enable school heads to internalize leadership principles, improve decision-making skills, and strengthen their ability to lead school improvement initiatives.

The participants' experiences also reflect the dimension of idealized influence and inspirational motivation, which are essential components of transformational leadership. When Participant D stated that the program *"equipped me with the knowledge, skills, and values needed to lead the school effectively and responsibly,"* this reflects the development of leadership competence and professional identity. Leadership development programs help school heads understand their leadership roles not merely as administrative functions but as transformative responsibilities that influence school culture, teacher performance, and student outcomes. Leaders who possess leadership clarity and competence are better positioned to inspire teachers, build trust, and foster collaborative school environments. Studies conducted after 2016 confirm that leadership preparation programs significantly enhance leaders' confidence, leadership competence, and ability to support school improvement (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Bush, 2018). These programs strengthen leadership readiness, enabling school heads to function as transformational leaders capable of promoting instructional improvement and organizational effectiveness.

Furthermore, the findings align with the dimension of intellectual stimulation, as development programs provide school heads with opportunities to acquire leadership knowledge, management skills, and governance competence. Participant I's statement that the program provided *"a solid foundation in school leadership, management, and governance"* demonstrates how development programs enhance leaders' cognitive competence and professional preparedness. Leadership preparation programs expose school heads to leadership frameworks, policy interpretation, instructional supervision, and resource management, enabling them to perform their leadership roles effectively. According to Hallinger (2018), leadership preparation programs significantly enhance leaders' instructional leadership competence and organizational management skills. These competencies enable school heads to guide teachers, improve instructional practices, and strengthen school performance.

The findings also reflect the principle of individualized consideration, as development programs provide professional support that addresses the specific needs of newly appointed school heads. Leadership transition often involves professional uncertainty, and development programs provide structured guidance, mentorship, and leadership orientation that help school heads adjust to their new roles. Participant B's experience of moving from confusion to competence demonstrates how development programs facilitate leadership adjustment and professional growth. Leadership preparation programs provide the necessary professional support systems that help leaders build competence and confidence, particularly during the early stages of leadership transition. Research by Leithwood et al. (2020) confirms that structured leadership development programs strengthen leadership effectiveness by supporting leaders' professional learning, competence development, and leadership identity formation.

From the perspective of School Effectiveness Theory, development programs function as essential organizational support systems that strengthen leadership effectiveness and improve school performance. School effectiveness depends significantly on leadership competence, and leadership development programs ensure that school heads possess the necessary skills to manage schools effectively. The participants' recognition that development programs provided foundational leadership knowledge confirms the importance of structured leadership preparation in strengthening school leadership capacity. Leadership preparation programs enhance leaders' ability to manage school operations, supervise teachers, and implement educational policies effectively.



According to Pont, Nusche, and Moorman (2019), leadership preparation programs strengthen school leaders' capacity to improve teaching quality, organizational performance, and school effectiveness.

Moreover, development programs contribute to strengthening instructional leadership, which is a key component of school effectiveness. Effective school heads must possess the competence to supervise instruction, support teacher development, and monitor school performance. Leadership development programs prepare school heads to perform these instructional leadership responsibilities effectively. The participants' recognition that development programs equipped them with leadership knowledge and governance competence demonstrates the role of leadership preparation in strengthening instructional leadership. Research conducted by Schleicher (2016) and Hallinger (2018) emphasizes that leadership preparation programs significantly enhance school leaders' instructional leadership competence, which directly contributes to improved teaching and learning outcomes.

The participants' experiences also demonstrate that development programs strengthen leadership clarity and organizational readiness, which are essential for effective school leadership. Leadership clarity enables school heads to perform their leadership roles effectively and contribute to organizational improvement. Without structured leadership preparation, newly appointed school heads may struggle to understand their responsibilities, leading to leadership inefficiencies and organizational challenges. Development programs provide structured learning experiences that enhance leadership competence and organizational effectiveness. Bush (2018) emphasized that leadership preparation programs are essential for ensuring leadership effectiveness, particularly during leadership transition.

Overall, the integration of participant experiences and theoretical perspectives confirms that development programs serve as essential foundational support systems that facilitate leadership transition and strengthen leadership competence. The participants' testimonies—*"it helped me cope with my duties and responsibilities," "provided me with a solid foundation,"* and *"equipped me with the knowledge, skills, and values needed to lead effectively"*—demonstrate the transformative role of leadership development programs in strengthening leadership readiness, competence, and professional identity. Anchored on Transformational Leadership Theory, development programs enhance leaders' professional competence, leadership confidence, and ability to inspire organizational improvement. Anchored on School Effectiveness Theory, development programs strengthen organizational leadership capacity, instructional leadership, and school effectiveness. These findings confirm that development programs are essential mechanisms for preparing school heads to perform their leadership roles effectively and contribute to sustained school improvement.

Theme 2: High Relevance and Practical Value of Program Content and Delivery. The findings under Theme 2 reveal that the development program's content and delivery were perceived by participants as highly relevant, practical, and essential in strengthening their leadership competence, particularly in critical domains such as instructional supervision, financial management, and policy implementation. The participants emphasized that the program provided concrete, applicable knowledge that directly enhanced their leadership effectiveness. Participant A clearly recognized the value of the program content, stating, *"I think the content is the most helpful to me because there are a lot of ideas and knowledge I gained."* This statement reflects the importance of structured leadership learning in expanding leaders' professional knowledge base and preparing them to perform leadership functions more effectively.

Similarly, Participant C emphasized the program's practical orientation, noting that *"Practical workshops on school budgeting and law were the most helpful because they addressed immediate technical needs."* This highlights the significance of contextualized leadership training that addresses the real administrative and operational demands faced by school heads. Participant H further illustrated the transformative effect of hands-on learning, stating, *"Seeing the actual forms and processes used in school budgeting was the 'eureka' moment for me."* This expression demonstrates how experiential and practice-based learning enhances leadership understanding, competence, and confidence by translating theoretical concepts into practical applications.

These participant experiences strongly reflect the core principles of Transformational Leadership Theory, particularly the dimension of intellectual stimulation, which emphasizes the importance of equipping leaders with knowledge, critical thinking skills, and problem-solving competence. Transformational leadership



underscores that effective leaders must be continuously developed through learning experiences that enhance their professional competence and leadership capacity. The participants' recognition that the program provided valuable knowledge, practical workshops, and exposure to real processes demonstrates how development programs stimulate leaders intellectually and strengthen their capacity to make informed decisions.

When Participant H described seeing actual budgeting forms as a "eureka moment," this reflects the process of cognitive transformation wherein leaders gain deeper understanding through meaningful and experiential learning. Transformational leadership theory posits that leadership development programs strengthen leaders' ability to analyze complex situations, interpret policies, and implement effective solutions, which are essential competencies for effective school leadership. Recent research supports this perspective, emphasizing that leadership preparation programs that integrate practical, real-world applications significantly enhance leadership competence, problem-solving ability, and professional confidence (Grissom et al., 2021). These programs enable school heads to develop leadership competence not only at the theoretical level but also at the operational level, ensuring their readiness to manage complex school systems.

The findings also reflect the dimension of idealized influence, as development programs strengthen leaders' professional credibility and competence by equipping them with the necessary technical and leadership knowledge. Participant C's recognition that workshops on budgeting and school law addressed immediate technical needs demonstrates how leadership development programs enhance leaders' capacity to perform essential administrative functions. School heads must possess competence in financial management, policy implementation, and instructional supervision, and development programs ensure that leaders are prepared to fulfill these responsibilities effectively.

Leadership competence enhances leaders' professional credibility and strengthens their ability to guide teachers, manage resources, and implement school improvement initiatives. Studies conducted after 2016 confirm that leadership preparation programs significantly improve leaders' competence in instructional leadership, financial management, and organizational governance, which are essential for effective school leadership (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). These programs strengthen leaders' ability to translate policy into practice, ensuring effective school management and organizational stability.

Furthermore, the findings align with the dimension of inspirational motivation, as leadership development programs strengthen leaders' confidence and sense of professional readiness. Participant A's recognition that the program provided valuable ideas and knowledge reflects the development of leadership confidence and competence. Leadership preparation programs empower school heads by providing them with the knowledge and skills necessary to perform their leadership roles effectively. Leaders who possess adequate knowledge and competence are more confident in making decisions, managing school operations, and guiding teachers. Research by Leithwood et al. (2020) confirms that leadership preparation programs significantly strengthen leaders' confidence, leadership competence, and professional effectiveness. Leadership confidence enhances leaders' ability to influence teachers, promote collaboration, and lead school improvement initiatives effectively.

From the perspective of School Effectiveness Theory, the findings demonstrate that leadership development programs contribute significantly to strengthening organizational effectiveness by equipping school heads with essential leadership competencies. School effectiveness depends heavily on leadership competence, particularly in instructional supervision, financial management, and policy implementation. The participants' recognition that the program provided practical workshops and exposure to real processes demonstrates the importance of structured leadership preparation in strengthening school leadership capacity. Leadership preparation programs ensure that school heads possess the technical competence necessary to manage school resources effectively, implement policies accurately, and supervise instructional practices efficiently. According to Hallinger (2018), leadership preparation programs play a critical role in strengthening instructional leadership competence, which directly contributes to improved teaching quality and school performance. Leaders who possess strong instructional leadership competence are better equipped to support teachers, monitor instruction, and promote student learning.

The practical and experiential nature of the program content also reflects the principle of systemic alignment emphasized in School Effectiveness Theory. Effective leadership development programs must be aligned with the actual operational demands of school leadership to ensure leadership effectiveness. Participant H's



recognition that exposure to actual budgeting forms and processes enhanced leadership understanding demonstrates how practical learning strengthens leadership competence. Leadership development programs that integrate practical applications ensure that school heads can effectively perform administrative, financial, and instructional leadership functions. Research by Pont et al. (2019) emphasizes that leadership preparation programs that focus on practical leadership skills significantly improve school leaders' ability to manage school operations, allocate resources effectively, and support instructional improvement. These competencies are essential for ensuring school effectiveness and organizational performance.

The findings also confirm the importance of contextualized leadership development, which ensures that leadership training addresses the real needs and challenges faced by school heads. Leadership development programs that provide relevant and practical content enhance leadership competence and organizational effectiveness. The participants' recognition that practical workshops on budgeting, law, and policy implementation were highly beneficial demonstrates the importance of aligning leadership development programs with the operational realities of school leadership. Bush (2018) emphasized that leadership preparation programs must focus on practical leadership competencies to ensure leadership effectiveness. Leadership training programs that emphasize practical leadership skills enhance leaders' ability to perform their leadership responsibilities effectively and contribute to school improvement.

The qualitative findings are strongly supported by the quantitative results, where content quality and alignment received the highest rating (4.79), indicating that participants perceived the program as highly relevant and beneficial. This convergence between qualitative and quantitative findings confirms the effectiveness of the development program in strengthening leadership competence and readiness. The high rating of content quality reflects the program's success in addressing the leadership needs of school heads and providing relevant and practical leadership knowledge. Leadership development programs that provide relevant, practical, and contextualized content enhance leadership competence, confidence, and effectiveness.

Overall, the integration of participant testimonies and theoretical perspectives confirms that program content and delivery are critical components of leadership development. The participants' statements—*"the content is the most helpful," "practical workshops addressed immediate technical needs,"* and *"seeing actual forms was a eureka moment"*—demonstrate that practical, relevant, and experiential learning significantly enhances leadership competence and readiness. Anchored on Transformational Leadership Theory, the findings confirm that leadership development programs strengthen leaders' knowledge, cognitive competence, and professional confidence, enabling them to perform their leadership roles effectively. Anchored on School Effectiveness Theory, the findings confirm that leadership preparation programs strengthen organizational leadership capacity, instructional leadership competence, and school effectiveness. These findings emphasize that leadership development programs must prioritize relevant, practical, and experiential learning to ensure leadership readiness, competence, and organizational effectiveness.

Theme 3: Strengthening Leadership Confidence, Decision-Making, and Instructional Leadership Competence. A significant outcome consistently highlighted by participants is the enhancement of leadership confidence, decision-making ability, and instructional leadership competence through participation in development programs. School heads emphasized that the program strengthened their understanding of key leadership processes, provided structured guidance on supervisory practices, and fostered confidence in managing both instructional and administrative responsibilities. Participant L articulated this impact clearly, stating, *"After attending this development program, I already know what to do before, during, and after conducting instructional supervision."* Similarly, Participant D described applying systematic classroom observations and post-conference discussions: *"I implemented regular classroom observations followed by post-conference discussions. This resulted in more focused coaching for teachers."* Participant E reflected on the broader leadership benefits, noting, *"It became an avenue for me... and taught me a lot of lesson of how to manage people, stakeholders and practice all the necessary roles."* These reflections underscore the role of development programs in translating theoretical knowledge into practical, actionable leadership skills.

The enhancement of leadership confidence aligns strongly with Transformational Leadership Theory (Burns, 1978; Bass, 1985), which emphasizes that effective leaders inspire, motivate, and develop their followers while



demonstrating decisiveness, vision, and adaptability. By increasing self-efficacy and providing practical tools for instructional supervision, school heads are better equipped to enact transformational leadership practices. For example, the ability to conduct focused classroom observations and provide structured feedback reflects the transformational principle of individualized consideration, wherein leaders support professional growth among their staff while addressing specific instructional needs.

Moreover, the observed improvements in instructional leadership competence resonate with School Effectiveness Theory, particularly Edmonds' (1979) Effective Schools Framework, which identifies strong instructional leadership, clear school goals, and systematic teacher supervision as essential for enhancing student outcomes. Participants' accounts of applying structured classroom observation tools and post-conference coaching (Participants D and L) demonstrate how development programs directly strengthen the instructional leadership components identified in the framework. This alignment indicates that program interventions not only enhance leader confidence but also promote effective teaching and learning practices within the school environment.

Recent studies further support these findings. Darling-Hammond et al. (2017) and Collie et al. (2020) emphasize that leadership development programs combining content knowledge, practical application, and mentorship significantly improve leaders' instructional and decision-making competencies. In particular, programs that provide actionable strategies for classroom observation, teacher coaching, and stakeholder engagement foster both skill development and confidence, leading to measurable improvements in school leadership performance. This corroborates the quantitative findings in the present study, where instructional leadership applications received a very high Grand Mean of 4.74 and knowledge and policy retention reached 4.63, indicating that participants not only acquired knowledge but also translated it into practice.

Decision-making was another area enhanced by the development program. Participants reported that structured guidance and scenario-based learning enabled them to make more informed and timely leadership decisions. Participant E's remark, *"It became an avenue for me... and taught me a lot of lesson of how to manage people, stakeholders and practice all the necessary roles,"* reflects how the program facilitated critical thinking and problem-solving skills. This aligns with the principles of Transformational Leadership Theory, which emphasizes intellectual stimulation as a core dimension of effective leadership—encouraging leaders to analyze situations, consider alternative strategies, and implement solutions that improve organizational outcomes.

Confidence-building was particularly emphasized as a critical precursor to effective instructional leadership. Participants indicated that prior to the development program, they experienced uncertainty in supervising teachers or managing school operations. Post-program narratives, such as Participant L's statement on knowing the steps before, during, and after instructional supervision, suggest that systematic training reduced anxiety, strengthened self-efficacy, and enabled school heads to perform their roles with authority and clarity. Studies by Timperley (2018) and Scales et al. (2019) similarly highlight that leadership confidence is strongly associated with improved teacher supervision, feedback quality, and instructional outcomes, reinforcing the relevance of these qualitative insights.

The integration of these findings with both Transformational Leadership Theory and School Effectiveness Theory illustrates that development programs function as catalysts for building competent, confident, and reflective leaders. By providing structured frameworks for classroom observation, feedback, and stakeholder engagement, programs enhance both the cognitive and affective dimensions of leadership. In turn, this enables school heads to influence teaching quality, support teacher professional growth, and ensure that school operations align with institutional goals and policy standards.

In conclusion, Theme 3 confirms that development programs are instrumental in enhancing school heads' confidence, decision-making, and instructional leadership competence. Participant narratives provide rich qualitative evidence that complements quantitative findings, demonstrating that well-structured, practically oriented, and supportive programs not only increase knowledge retention but also foster applied leadership practices. The combination of enhanced confidence, informed decision-making, and strengthened instructional

competence reflects the principles of transformational leadership while directly supporting the key factors of school effectiveness, thereby promoting improved teaching and learning outcomes in the school setting.

Theme 4: Building Competence in Resource Management and Stakeholder Engagement. Another prominent outcome highlighted by participants is the enhancement of competence in managing school resources and engaging stakeholders, both of which are critical dimensions of effective school leadership. Participants emphasized that development programs provided the knowledge, frameworks, and practical strategies needed to allocate resources efficiently, comply with fiscal policies, and build meaningful partnerships with parents, community members, and local organizations. Participant D described the impact of the program on resource management, stating, *“The development program significantly prepared me for managing school resources by providing clear guidance on budgeting, procurement, inventory management, and proper allocation of materials and funds.”* This statement reflects how structured and detailed guidance equips school heads with the skills necessary to implement transparent and effective financial and resource management practices.

In addition to resource management, participants highlighted the critical role of stakeholder engagement in augmenting school capabilities. Participant B noted, *“We also need to practice linkages with stakeholders to augment our limited resources in school,”* emphasizing that collaborative partnerships are essential for optimizing school operations, particularly in resource-constrained contexts. Participant A further reinforced this point by stating, *“This helped me to plan and manage the funds and resources in accordance with its policies. I also realized the importance of having stakeholder support.”* These narratives illustrate that leadership competence extends beyond internal administrative tasks to include external collaboration, ensuring that schools are supported by broader community networks and that resources are leveraged effectively to meet educational goals.

The findings can be interpreted using Transformational Leadership Theory (Burns, 1978; Bass, 1985), which highlights the importance of leaders motivating, inspiring, and influencing followers while strategically managing organizational resources. By developing school heads’ capacity to coordinate resources and engage stakeholders, the programs enable leaders to enact the transformational principles of intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration. For example, engaging stakeholders in decision-making processes fosters shared responsibility, promotes buy-in, and enhances the school’s adaptive capacity, all of which are critical for transformational leadership practice.

Furthermore, the results align with School Effectiveness Theory, particularly Edmonds’ (1979) Effective Schools Framework, which identifies effective use of resources, clear operational management, and community involvement as essential components of successful schools. By improving budgeting, procurement, and planning skills, development programs enable school heads to meet the framework’s standards of strong instructional leadership, efficient resource allocation, and active collaboration with stakeholders. Participant D’s description of applying structured budgeting and inventory management directly demonstrates how program participation translates into effective practices aligned with these theoretical constructs.

Recent studies underscore the relevance of these findings. Research by Hallinger and Wang (2020) and Collie et al. (2020) emphasize that school leaders who demonstrate competence in resource management and stakeholder engagement are more effective in achieving school improvement goals. In addition, studies by Darling-Hammond et al. (2017) suggest that structured professional development enhances leaders’ ability to manage financial and material resources, apply policies accurately, and foster productive partnerships—all of which are associated with improved school performance and student outcomes. The participants’ narratives corroborate these findings, showing that development programs provide both the knowledge and the confidence necessary to operationalize these skills.

The quantitative findings further support this theme, with resource and financial management and stakeholder engagement skills receiving very high ratings (4.76 and 4.75, respectively). The convergence of qualitative and quantitative data demonstrates that the development program effectively strengthened both the technical and relational aspects of school leadership. By enhancing leaders’ capacity to allocate resources efficiently and engage stakeholders meaningfully, the program contributes to sustainable school improvement and the creation of learning environments that are well-supported both administratively and socially.



In conclusion, Theme 4 confirms that development programs significantly enhance school heads' competence in resource management and stakeholder engagement. Through structured guidance, practical exercises, and strategic mentoring, participants reported improved confidence, decision-making, and capacity to leverage resources and partnerships effectively. These findings are consistent with Transformational Leadership Theory and School Effectiveness Theory, illustrating that competent, well-supported leaders are better positioned to manage school operations, foster community collaboration, and implement policies that positively influence teacher performance and student outcomes.

Theme 5: Managing Administrative Workload and Contextual Constraints as Barriers to Program Implementation. While development programs were recognized as beneficial, participants consistently reported that heavy administrative workload, time constraints, and contextual challenges posed significant barriers to fully engaging in the training and applying learned skills. The demands of managing multiple school responsibilities often conflicted with participation in development activities, reducing opportunities for reflection, practice, and knowledge application. Participant E articulated this tension, stating, *"The heavy administrative workloads really affect my participation... since a lot of school reports need to be attended to."* Similarly, Participant C described the strain on personal time: *"The heavy administrative workload often meant I had to catch up on development modules late at night."* Participant K further emphasized the trade-off between program engagement and administrative responsibilities, noting, *"When you are attending development activities... your administrative workload... is being somewhat neglected or set aside."* Collectively, these narratives highlight how structural and contextual factors constrain school heads' capacity to fully benefit from professional development initiatives.

These findings can be interpreted through Transformational Leadership Theory (Burns, 1978; Bass, 1985), which underscores the importance of leaders being able to manage both people and systems effectively while inspiring and motivating others. Heavy workloads and competing administrative responsibilities can hinder a school head's ability to enact transformational practices, such as providing individualized coaching, fostering teacher growth, and promoting a collaborative school culture. When leaders are overextended by operational tasks, their capacity to exercise intellectual stimulation, vision-setting, and role-modeling—the core components of transformational leadership—is significantly diminished.

The challenges also align with School Effectiveness Theory, particularly Edmonds' (1979) Effective Schools Framework, which emphasizes the role of strong instructional leadership, efficient resource management, and goal-oriented supervision in achieving improved school outcomes. When school heads are overwhelmed with reporting requirements, documentation, and other administrative duties, their ability to focus on instructional leadership, monitor teaching quality, and engage stakeholders is compromised. Participant narratives, such as the need to complete modules late at night, underscore the contextual constraints that interfere with operationalizing effective school practices and sustaining school improvement initiatives.

Recent studies highlight that excessive administrative workload is a common barrier to effective leadership development. Collie et al. (2020) and Hallinger and Wang (2020) emphasize that without structured time management, protected periods for professional learning, and reduced task overload, school leaders struggle to apply new skills effectively. Darling-Hammond et al. (2017) also note that leadership programs are most impactful when leaders have the capacity to engage fully, suggesting that workload management is a critical contextual factor in translating development into practice. The present study's qualitative evidence mirrors these findings, illustrating that high operational demands can reduce program engagement, delay module completion, and limit the application of instructional strategies.

Participant reflections indicate that the challenges are not solely personal but also systemic. The competing priorities between administrative compliance, reporting requirements, and instructional oversight reveal structural issues that can undermine leadership development outcomes. These insights underscore the need for development programs to consider contextual realities, such as school size, staffing levels, and reporting burdens, when designing program schedules and expectations. Flexible timelines, blended learning approaches, and modular program structures could mitigate these barriers and enhance participation.



The quantitative findings of the study also support this theme, as challenges related to workload and insufficient duration of development activities were among the higher-rated barriers in Table 30 (Means > 4.00). This convergence of qualitative and quantitative evidence indicates that while development programs enhance confidence and competence, structural and contextual constraints remain significant impediments to full implementation.

In conclusion, Theme 5 confirms that administrative workload and contextual challenges are major barriers to maximizing the benefits of development programs. Interpreted through Transformational Leadership Theory and School Effectiveness Theory, these findings suggest that leaders' capacity to implement instructional, resource, and stakeholder-related strategies is constrained by operational overload. Addressing these challenges through workload management, flexible program design, and systemic support is essential to ensure that professional development translates into meaningful school improvement, stronger instructional leadership, and sustainable educational outcomes.

Theme 6: Addressing Gaps in Post-Development Support, Mentoring, and Monitoring Systems. A critical theme emerging from the participants' responses is the persistent lack of sustained mentoring, coaching, and systematic monitoring following the completion of development programs. While school heads reported significant gains in knowledge, instructional leadership, and confidence, they emphasized that these improvements could be further reinforced through continuous professional support. Participant A stated, *"I think the gaps are the follow-up support and mentoring, especially to the new school heads,"* highlighting that initial program exposure alone is insufficient for the consolidation of leadership skills. Participant I similarly noted, *"There was limited follow-up support or mentoring after the program,"* and Participant L reinforced the concern, stating, *"After attending the development program, there must be coaching and mentoring. It should not be absent."* Collectively, these responses underscore that the absence of structured post-development support limits the translation of training into sustained leadership practice.

The lack of mentoring and monitoring can be interpreted through Transformational Leadership Theory (Burns, 1978; Bass, 1985), which emphasizes the importance of ongoing guidance, individualized consideration, and intellectual stimulation in cultivating effective leaders. Without sustained coaching and follow-up, school heads may struggle to apply learned practices consistently, limiting their ability to model transformational behaviors, inspire teachers, and foster continuous improvement. Structured mentoring provides a mechanism for leaders to receive feedback, reflect on their decisions, and adapt practices to address unique school contexts—key elements for the development of transformational leadership capacities.

From the perspective of School Effectiveness Theory, particularly Edmonds' (1979) Effective Schools Framework, continuous support, monitoring, and feedback are essential for ensuring that leadership practices contribute to improved school outcomes. The framework emphasizes strong instructional leadership, efficient resource management, and accountability as core components of effective schools. When post-development support is absent, school heads may struggle to sustain these practices, reducing the likelihood of long-term school improvement. Participant narratives indicate that mentoring and monitoring would provide the scaffolding needed to maintain instructional oversight, engage stakeholders effectively, and ensure compliance with policies.

Recent research underscores the significance of follow-up support in professional development programs. Timperley (2018) highlights that learning transfer is enhanced when participants receive structured guidance, feedback, and opportunities to reflect on practice after formal training. Similarly, Collie et al. (2020) and Darling-Hammond et al. (2017) emphasize that mentoring, coaching, and continuous monitoring are critical for embedding new competencies, reinforcing self-efficacy, and improving decision-making among school leaders. The current study's findings align with this literature, demonstrating that gaps in post-development systems can limit the practical application of leadership skills, despite high ratings in knowledge retention (Grand Mean = 4.63) and instructional leadership (Grand Mean = 4.74).



The quantitative results further highlight the significance of this theme, as post-development performance monitoring received the lowest rating among development program parameters ($M = 4.65$), signaling a relative weakness in sustained support mechanisms. The convergence of qualitative and quantitative data illustrates that while initial development programs are effective in building confidence, knowledge, and competency, the absence of systematic follow-up undermines the long-term impact of these interventions.

Implications of this theme are clear: development programs should incorporate structured post-program support systems, including mentoring, coaching, and regular performance monitoring, to reinforce skills, provide timely feedback, and address contextual challenges. Such support ensures that school heads can apply transformational leadership principles effectively, maintain strong instructional oversight, and align school operations with the tenets of the Effective Schools Framework. By addressing these gaps, leadership development initiatives can achieve sustained improvements in school performance, teacher development, and ultimately, student outcomes.

In conclusion, Theme 6 confirms that gaps in post-development mentoring, coaching, and monitoring represent a critical barrier to the long-term effectiveness of leadership programs. Integrating systematic follow-up mechanisms is essential to strengthen transformational leadership capacity and ensure alignment with school effectiveness principles, thereby maximizing the return on investment in professional development programs.

Theme 7: Promoting Contextualized, Practical, and Experiential Learning Approaches. Participants consistently emphasized the importance of development programs that are not only theoretically sound but also practical, contextualized, and reflective of real-world leadership challenges. Many school heads pointed out that while the programs provided foundational knowledge, there were gaps in translating this knowledge into actionable skills within their specific school contexts. Participant C recommended, *“Incorporate more ‘simulated’ crisis management exercises and case studies based on actual local school issues,”* highlighting the value of scenario-based learning that mirrors the complex challenges school heads encounter. Participant G observed, *“There is sometimes a gap between theory and practice... not enough hands-on opportunities,”* pointing to the need for experiential approaches that allow leaders to apply learned concepts in realistic situations. Participant E further suggested, *“Include sessions on budget management... digital tools... and strengthen stakeholder partnership,”* emphasizing practical skill-building and contextual relevance as essential components of effective leadership development.

These reflections align with Transformational Leadership Theory (Burns, 1978; Bass, 1985), which underscores the role of leaders as problem-solvers and vision-setters who must navigate complex and dynamic organizational environments. Experiential learning approaches, including case studies, simulations, and scenario-based exercises, equip school heads to engage in intellectual stimulation, one of the core dimensions of transformational leadership, by challenging them to think critically, make informed decisions, and adapt leadership strategies to diverse contexts. Furthermore, hands-on practice in areas such as budgeting, stakeholder engagement, and digital management enhances leaders’ confidence and readiness to inspire and guide their staff effectively.

The theme also resonates with School Effectiveness Theory, particularly Edmonds’ (1979) Effective Schools Framework, which identifies strong instructional leadership, efficient resource management, and effective community engagement as key components of successful schools. Contextualized and practical training ensures that school heads can operationalize these elements, translating policy and theory into tangible improvements in school management, teaching quality, and student outcomes. Participant narratives indicate that the inclusion of realistic simulations, applied exercises, and context-specific problem-solving would strengthen leaders’ capacity to implement effective practices in line with this framework.

Recent studies support the importance of experiential and contextually grounded professional development. Darling-Hammond et al. (2017) emphasize that leadership programs incorporating active, practice-based learning lead to higher retention, skill application, and confidence among school leaders. Similarly, Timperley (2018) and Collie et al. (2020) note that opportunities for hands-on practice, reflection, and peer collaboration significantly enhance the transfer of leadership skills into daily practice. By providing realistic, scenario-based learning opportunities, development programs enable leaders to navigate administrative, instructional, and



community-related challenges more effectively, bridging the gap between theory and practice as identified by the participants.

Quantitative findings reinforce this theme, as certain parameters related to program relevance, delivery, and alignment, while high, indicate room for improvement in tailoring content to the local context. Participants' recommendations for experiential exercises, practical simulations, and technology-enabled tools reflect a strategic need to enhance program responsiveness to the specific challenges faced by school heads in their schools.

In conclusion, Theme 7 underscores the critical need for development programs that are contextualized, practical, and experiential. Integrating scenario-based learning, simulations, and applied exercises enhances school heads' ability to make informed decisions, manage resources efficiently, and engage stakeholders effectively. When viewed through Transformational Leadership Theory and School Effectiveness Theory, these approaches support the cultivation of competent, adaptive, and reflective leaders who can drive instructional excellence, foster teacher growth, and improve school outcomes. By responding to these calls for experiential learning, professional development programs can bridge the gap between knowledge acquisition and practical leadership application, ensuring sustainable improvements in both school management and student achievement.

Theme 8: Sustaining Mentoring, Coaching, and Institutional Support for Leadership Effectiveness.

Participants consistently emphasized that the effectiveness of leadership development programs extends beyond initial training and depends heavily on sustained mentoring, coaching, and institutional support. Such ongoing support mechanisms were described as essential for building confidence, refining decision-making skills, and ensuring the successful transition from teacher to school head. Participant D highlighted this point, stating, *"Ongoing mentoring and coaching... can enhance confidence and decision-making."* Similarly, Participant I emphasized the importance of a comprehensive support system, noting, *"A combination of induction, mentoring, coaching, monitoring, and resources ensures that new school heads can transition successfully."* Participant B reinforced this perspective, recommending, *"All these types of support (mentoring, coaching, monitoring)... should be provided."* These narratives collectively underscore the view that structured, institutionalized support is indispensable for sustaining leadership competence and fostering effective school management practices.

From the perspective of Transformational Leadership Theory (Burns, 1978; Bass, 1985), mentoring and coaching provide mechanisms for leaders to develop the key dimensions of transformational leadership, including individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, and inspirational motivation. Continuous guidance enables school heads to refine their leadership style, reflect critically on decision-making, and navigate complex challenges with confidence. By institutionalizing mentoring and coaching, schools not only support individual leader growth but also cultivate a culture of continuous professional learning, where leaders model best practices and encourage teacher development.

This theme also aligns with School Effectiveness Theory, particularly Edmonds' (1979) Effective Schools Framework, which identifies strong instructional leadership, strategic use of resources, and active engagement with staff and community as essential factors for school improvement. Sustained support mechanisms ensure that school heads can consistently apply these principles in practice. For instance, ongoing coaching in resource management or instructional supervision strengthens the alignment between program knowledge and school effectiveness outcomes. Participants' emphasis on combined induction, mentoring, and monitoring reflects the need for institutional structures that reinforce leadership competencies while addressing the contextual realities of school operations.

Recent research underscores the importance of sustained professional support for school leaders. Darling-Hammond et al. (2017) note that leadership programs are most effective when they include continuous coaching, mentoring, and follow-up, which facilitate the transfer of skills into practical settings. Collie et al. (2020) similarly highlight that ongoing support contributes to leadership self-efficacy, resilience, and decision-making competence, particularly in complex school environments. In the present study, participants' narratives demonstrate that without such support, the gains from initial development programs risk being underutilized, limiting both individual leadership growth and overall school performance.



The quantitative results support this theme as well. While development program outcomes received high ratings in areas such as leadership readiness and instructional leadership, post-development performance monitoring received relatively lower ratings ($M = 4.65$). This convergence suggests that despite successful initial training, the absence of sustained institutional support can constrain long-term leadership effectiveness. Participants' call for structured mentoring, coaching, and monitoring highlights a strategic area for intervention that could strengthen leadership performance, promote knowledge retention, and ensure effective school management.

In conclusion, Theme 8 emphasizes that sustained mentoring, coaching, and institutional support are critical for translating initial development program gains into long-term leadership effectiveness. Interpreted through Transformational Leadership Theory and School Effectiveness Theory, these support mechanisms enable school heads to build confidence, improve decision-making, and consistently apply instructional and resource management practices. By institutionalizing mentoring and coaching structures, education systems can ensure the continuous growth of school leaders, foster sustainable school improvement, and enhance both teacher development and student outcomes.

Integration in the Convergent Parallel Design

The integration of qualitative and quantitative data in this study reveals a strong convergence between participants' lived experiences and the measured outcomes of the development program. In the convergent parallel design, both strands of data were collected simultaneously and analyzed independently, then integrated to provide a comprehensive understanding of leadership development among newly appointed school heads. The qualitative themes enrich the interpretation of statistical trends by offering detailed explanations, practical examples, and contextual meaning for the observed quantitative patterns.

One of the clearest points of convergence is the high quantitative ratings for leadership readiness and competency development. Participants' narratives under Theme 1 consistently describe the development program as a foundational and confidence-building experience that provided clarity and a roadmap for administrative responsibilities. Statements such as "amazing and helpful... it reminds us to be prepared and understand" (Participant A) exemplify how structured training fosters both skill acquisition and psychological readiness. These accounts clarify why quantitative measures of leadership readiness were consistently high, demonstrating that confidence, role clarity, and structured guidance translate into measurable perceptions of preparedness.

Similarly, Themes 2 and 3 provide qualitative explanations for high ratings in content quality, delivery, and instructional leadership competencies. Participants emphasized the practical, experience-based nature of sessions, the relevance of content areas like budgeting, governance, and instructional supervision, and the value of engaging with experienced facilitators. Participant G's "eureka moment" regarding school budgeting forms and Participant H's recognition of learning from real-life stories illustrate how strong content coupled with effective delivery enhances applied leadership skills. These qualitative insights illuminate the mechanisms behind quantitative gains in instructional leadership and knowledge retention.

Theme 4 demonstrates the alignment between qualitative narratives and high quantitative ratings in resource management and stakeholder engagement. Participants reported improved competence in budgeting, transparent fiscal management, and strategic collaboration with community partners. For instance, Participant F's discussion of mapping community partners and Participant C's emphasis on transparency underscore how program participation strengthened both administrative and relational dimensions of school leadership. These insights help explain why school heads consistently scored highly in areas related to governance, resource management, and community collaboration.

Conversely, Themes 5 and 6 provide explanatory depth for areas where quantitative ratings were comparatively lower, particularly regarding workload, time constraints, financial burden, and post-development support. Participants described heavy administrative duties, competing priorities, and the lack of sustained mentoring as challenges that limited full engagement in development activities. Statements such as "there are simply not enough hours in a day" (Participant G) and "the follow-up support and mentoring... is lacking" (Participant A)



contextualize the quantitative data, clarifying why post-development monitoring, program duration, and workload management received lower scores. This demonstrates that qualitative data can highlight systemic and contextual factors that influence measured outcomes.

Theme 7 synthesizes participants' recommendations, emphasizing the need for sustained, contextualized, and holistic programs. Suggestions for mentoring, coaching, flexible timelines, digital accessibility, and reduced administrative burden provide actionable pathways for addressing both strengths and challenges identified in the quantitative results. These insights validate the convergent parallel design's purpose: to generate findings that are both statistically supported and deeply contextualized, creating a robust empirical foundation for practical interventions.

Theme 8 highlights the importance of ongoing coaching, mentorship, and institutional support in converting the initial gains from development programs into long-term leadership efficacy. According to the theories of transformational leadership and school effectiveness, these support systems help school administrators become more self-assured, make better decisions, and implement resource management and instructional strategies consistently. Education systems can guarantee the ongoing development of school leaders, promote long-term school reform, and improve teacher preparation and student results by instituting mentorship and coaching programs.

The Integration of both data strands enhances the overall validity of the study's findings. Where quantitative data provides breadth and measurable trends, qualitative narratives provide depth, context, and explanation. For example, while high ratings on leadership competence indicate program effectiveness, participant stories clarify the mechanisms—confidence-building, practical application, mentorship gaps—through which these outcomes were achieved. Similarly, the qualitative accounts of challenges contextualize lower-rated areas, highlighting opportunities for strategic improvement.

Ultimately, the convergence of qualitative and quantitative findings supports the formulation of a strategic development improvement plan for school heads. The combination of numerical trends and rich narratives ensures that recommendations are empirically grounded, contextually relevant, and responsive to both systemic strengths and gaps. By integrating both strands of data, the study not only confirms program effectiveness but also identifies actionable areas for refinement, ensuring that future interventions are both evidence-based and practically applicable.

Finally, this integrated analysis demonstrates the value of the convergent parallel design in educational leadership research. It allows for simultaneous validation and explanation of findings, bridging statistical outcomes with lived experiences. Through this approach, the study presents a comprehensive understanding of leadership development programs, highlighting both their transformative potential and the contextual challenges that must be addressed to optimize impact. The integration strengthens confidence in the findings, supports informed decision-making, and guides the design of more responsive, effective, and sustainable development programs for school heads.

Summary of the Theme Development

The qualitative analysis followed a thematic process in which participants' statements were coded, grouped into categories, and synthesized into major themes. The themes reveal that development programs significantly enhance leadership readiness, instructional competence, and resource management skills among school heads. However, the analysis also identified several contextual barriers, including heavy administrative workload and insufficient post-development mentoring support. Participants emphasized the need for sustained coaching, contextualized training, and improved institutional support systems to maximize the effectiveness of leadership development initiatives. These themes provide deeper insights that complement the quantitative findings of the study.

Table 26 Matrix Integrating Quantitative and Qualitative Findings

Research Objective	Quantitative Findings	Qualitative Themes / Evidence	Integrated Interpretation
--------------------	-----------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------



1. Determine the demographic profile of school heads	Majority are female (61.96%), mostly 29–49 years old, with Master’s units (52.15%), mostly Head Teachers, and assigned largely in rural schools (80.37%). Most supervise 1–10 teachers and attended 1–10 trainings.	Participants reported challenges related to limited access to training opportunities, geographical constraints in rural schools, and limited exposure to continuous professional development programs.	The demographic profile indicates that most school heads are mid-career professionals working in rural contexts with limited training exposure. The qualitative findings complement this by explaining how geographical and systemic factors restrict access to professional development opportunities, reinforcing the need for targeted leadership support programs.
2. Assess the development programs for school heads	Development program parameters received very high ratings: Structure (4.75), Content Quality (4.79), Delivery (4.77), Alignment (4.79), Program Relevance (4.75), Post-Development Monitoring (4.65), Feedback and Continuous Improvement (4.71).	Participants described positive learning experiences from training programs, particularly the relevance of leadership topics and practical guidance provided by facilitators, but also noted insufficient follow-up mentoring and limited monitoring after training.	Quantitative results show that school heads generally perceive development programs as effective and well-structured. However, qualitative insights reveal that post-training support mechanisms such as coaching, monitoring, and mentoring require strengthening, suggesting that program sustainability remains an area for improvement.
3. Assess the performance of school heads	School heads demonstrated very high performance across all leadership domains: Leadership Readiness (4.59), Knowledge & Policy Retention (4.63), Instructional Leadership (4.74), Resource & Financial Management (4.76), Stakeholder Engagement (4.75).	School heads emphasized the importance of continuous learning, collaboration with teachers, stakeholder engagement, and policy understanding in managing school operations effectively. Some participants highlighted challenges such as balancing administrative work with instructional leadership responsibilities.	The quantitative results confirm that school heads perceive themselves as highly competent in leadership performance domains. Qualitative findings enrich this by illustrating how these competencies are applied in real school contexts, while also highlighting the practical challenges encountered in implementing leadership roles.
4. Determine the relationship between school heads’ performance and profile variables	No significant relationship was found between performance domains and profile variables such as age, sex, educational attainment, position, years of experience, number of teachers supervised, school location, and trainings attended ($p > 0.05$).	Participants emphasized that leadership effectiveness depends more on experience, professional learning, collaboration, and support systems rather than demographic factors.	Both data strands converge to suggest that leadership effectiveness is not determined by demographic characteristics, but rather by continuous professional learning, leadership development programs, and contextual experiences.
5. Determine the relationship between school heads’ performance and development program parameters	Development program parameters were positively associated with leadership performance indicators (high mean ratings across program components and leadership competencies).	Participants acknowledged that training programs improved their confidence, decision-making ability, and leadership skills, particularly in instructional supervision and stakeholder engagement.	The integration indicates that effective professional development programs contribute significantly to strengthening school heads’ leadership competencies, validating the importance of structured leadership training initiatives.
6. Explore the challenges	Quantitative findings show slightly lower ratings in	Themes revealed challenges such as limited follow-up	Both strands converge in identifying post-training support



encountered by school heads in the implementation of development programs	post-development monitoring (4.65) compared with other parameters.	mentoring, administrative workload, limited resources, and difficulty applying training concepts in resource-constrained school contexts.	heavy and contextual constraints as key challenges. Strengthening mentoring systems, coaching mechanisms, and contextualized training programs is necessary to improve the effectiveness of leadership development initiatives.
---	--	---	---

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The integration of quantitative and qualitative findings reveals a high level of convergence across the results. Quantitatively, the study found that school heads perceived development programs positively and reported high levels of leadership competence across key domains such as instructional leadership, resource management, and stakeholder engagement. Qualitative findings supported these results by illustrating how school heads apply these competencies in practice and how development programs contribute to their professional growth.

However, the qualitative findings also extend the quantitative results by highlighting contextual challenges that were not fully captured by numerical ratings. These challenges include limited access to professional development opportunities in rural schools, insufficient post-training mentoring, heavy administrative responsibilities, and resource constraints. While demographic variables were found to have no significant relationship with leadership performance, both data strands suggest that continuous professional learning, mentoring, and contextualized leadership support are critical factors influencing leadership effectiveness.

Overall, the integration confirms that well-designed development programs contribute to strong leadership performance, but improvements are needed in sustaining professional support mechanisms and addressing contextual challenges faced by school heads.

CONCLUSION

Based on the integrated quantitative and qualitative findings of the study, the following conclusions are drawn in relation to the objectives of the study, which aimed to develop a Strategic Development Improvement Plan for public elementary school heads in the Second Congressional District of Samar:

1. The school heads represented a diverse group in terms of age, sex, educational attainment, position, years of experience, number of teachers supervised, school location, and relevant trainings attended. Generally, they were academically qualified and professionally experienced, with many having graduate-level qualifications and relevant professional development exposure.
2. The School Heads' Development Program was generally assessed favorably in terms of structure, content quality, delivery, alignment, and program relevance. However, post-development program performance monitoring, feedback, and continuous improvement mechanisms were comparatively less robust, indicating areas that require further strengthening.
3. The school heads demonstrated a very high level of self-reported performance across the identified domains of leadership readiness and competency development, knowledge and policy retention, instructional leadership applications, resource and financial management understanding, and stakeholder and community engagement skills.
4. No significant relationship was found between school head performance and their profile variables, including age, sex, educational attainment, position, years as a school head, number of teachers supervised, school location, and number of relevant trainings attended. This suggests that self-reported leadership performance was not significantly associated with these individual and professional characteristics.



5. Significant relationships were found between school head performance and selected parameters of the School Heads' Development Program. Specifically, more favorable perceptions of program quality, relevance, alignment, and delivery were significantly associated with higher self-reported leadership-performance ratings. These findings indicate an association between perceptions of development program quality and reported leadership performance but do not establish a causal relationship.
6. The qualitative findings revealed that school heads encountered challenges such as heavy administrative workload, limited time for participation, inadequate post-development support, and gaps in monitoring and feedback. These challenges affected the continuity and application of learning gained from development activities.
7. Overall, the findings indicate the need for a strategic and evidence-based improvement plan that strengthens the structure, content, delivery, alignment, relevance, post-development monitoring, feedback, and continuous improvement mechanisms of the School Heads' Development Program. The proposed plan is intended to address identified gaps and contextual challenges and provide more systematic support for the continuing professional and leadership development of public elementary school heads.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In light of the findings and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations are proposed. These recommendations distinguish the empirical findings of the study from the corresponding actions that may be considered by concerned stakeholders:

1. The Schools Division Office may consider developing differentiated and needs-based professional development programs that take into account variations in school heads' experience, school context, supervisory responsibilities, and prior training exposure. Tiered or modular learning opportunities may be considered for newly appointed, mid-career, and experienced school heads.
2. The Schools Division Office and program implementers may strengthen post-development monitoring and support mechanisms, particularly in view of the comparatively lower assessment of post-development monitoring, feedback, and continuous improvement. Coaching, mentoring, follow-up sessions, and structured feedback mechanisms may be incorporated into the program implementation cycle.
3. School heads may be encouraged to sustain their professional development through continuous learning, reflective leadership practices, coaching, mentoring, and participation in professional learning communities. These activities may provide opportunities for school heads to further develop and sustain their leadership competencies.
4. Program designers and implementers may prioritize competency-based and context-responsive development activities. Since no significant relationship was found between school head performance and the identified profile variables, development initiatives may be designed primarily around identified competency and professional development needs rather than demographic or professional characteristics alone.
5. The Schools Division Office may periodically review and refine the development program to ensure its continued alignment with the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH), organizational priorities, and the identified needs of school heads. Particular attention may be given to program structure, content quality, delivery, alignment, and relevance, which were favorably assessed and were found to be significantly associated with self-reported leadership-performance ratings.
6. Education leaders may consider measures to address workload and time-related challenges reported by school heads. These may include improved administrative support, delegation or redistribution of non-instructional tasks, use of digital management systems, and flexible or modular professional development schedules to facilitate meaningful participation.



7. The proposed Strategic Development Improvement Plan may be considered for adoption and pilot implementation by the concerned education authorities. Its implementation may focus on strengthening program monitoring, feedback, coaching, mentoring, technical assistance, and continuous improvement. Regular monitoring and evaluation may be undertaken to determine its responsiveness and guide necessary revisions.
8. Future researchers may replicate the study in other schools divisions or regions using larger and more diverse samples. Longitudinal or mixed-methods studies may also be conducted to examine changes in school head performance over time and further investigate factors associated with the effectiveness of school heads' professional development programs.

Proposed Strategic Improvement Plan For School Heads

Rationale

The proposed Strategic Development Improvement Plan was formulated based on the quantitative and qualitative findings of the study on the School Heads' Development Program and the performance of public elementary school heads in the Second Congressional District of Samar. The findings showed that school heads reported very high levels of performance across leadership readiness and competency development, knowledge and policy retention, instructional leadership applications, resource and financial management understanding, and stakeholder and community engagement skills.

The School Heads' Development Program was also generally assessed favorably in terms of structure, content quality, delivery, alignment, and relevance. However, comparatively lower assessments were noted in post-development performance monitoring, feedback, and continuous improvement mechanisms. The qualitative findings further identified challenges related to administrative workload, time constraints, limited post-development support, and gaps in monitoring and follow-up.

Moreover, the study found that school head performance was not significantly associated with the identified profile variables. In contrast, favorable perceptions of selected development program parameters were significantly associated with higher self-reported leadership-performance ratings. These findings suggest the need to sustain strengths in existing professional development initiatives while strengthening follow-up support, monitoring, mentoring, contextualized learning, and feedback mechanisms.

In view of these findings, the proposed plan focuses on sustaining existing strengths, addressing identified gaps, and establishing measurable mechanisms for continuous professional development. The plan is not intended to imply that the identified interventions will directly cause improvements in leadership performance. Rather, it provides a structured set of recommended actions that may be implemented, monitored, and evaluated by concerned education authorities.

Table 27. Proposed Strategic Development Improvement Plan for School Heads in the Second Congressional District of Samar

Identified Challenge	Specific Objective	Proposed Strategies/Activities	Key Performance Indicator	Persons/Office Responsible	Timeline	Indicative Budget
Uncertainty and lack of role clarity among newly appointed school heads	Strengthen leadership transition and role clarity	Conduct structured induction, orientation, and role-clarification sessions	At least 90% of newly appointed school heads complete the induction program and achieve at least 80% in the post-induction competency assessment	SDS, ASDS, EPS, HRD Unit, School Heads	Upon appointment / Quarterly	Indicative, subject to DepEd costing



Insufficient foundational leadership preparation	Strengthen core leadership competencies	Implement competency-based Leadership Development Programs	At least 85% of participants complete the required modules and demonstrate achievement of the identified competency benchmark	Division Office, HRD Unit, Trainers	Semi-annual	Indicative , subject to DepEd costing
Need for practical and relevant training content	Increase application of learning to school management	Conduct workshops on budgeting, policy implementation, supervision, and case-based decision-making	At least 80% of participants complete required practical exercises with a satisfactory rating	EPS, Legal Officer, Finance Officer, School Heads	Quarterly	Indicative , subject to DepEd costing
Limited experiential and contextualized learning	Strengthen application of leadership concepts to actual school situations	Use simulations, case studies, school-based projects, and problem-solving activities	At least 80% of participants complete one contextualized leadership application activity per cycle	Trainers, School Heads, Master Teachers	Quarterly	Indicative , subject to DepEd costing
Need to sustain instructional leadership competencies	Strengthen coaching, supervision, and instructional leadership practices	Conduct peer coaching, mentoring, learning circles, and sharing of effective practices	Each school head completes at least 2 coaching/mentoring cycles per semester	School Heads, EPS, Master Teachers, Mentors	Monthly / Continuous	Indicative , subject to DepEd costing
Need to strengthen resource management and stakeholder engagement	Reinforce financial management and partnership-building competencies	Conduct sessions on budgeting, procurement, resource mobilization, and stakeholder engagement	At least 80% of school heads complete the required activities and submit one school-based application/output per cycle	School Heads, Finance Officer, LGU, PTA, NGOs	Quarterly	Indicative , subject to DepEd costing
Heavy administrative workload	Improve opportunities for participation in professional development	Streamline reporting, promote delegation, and maximize appropriate digital management systems	At least 80% of scheduled development activities are attended by target school heads without compromising essential school operations	Division Officials, School Heads, Administrative Staff	Ongoing	Indicative , subject to DepEd costing
Time constraints and competing priorities	Increase accessibility and flexibility of professional development	Adopt blended, modular, and flexible learning arrangements	At least 85% of school heads complete scheduled learning activities within the prescribed period	DepEd, Trainers, School Heads	Ongoing	Indicative , subject to DepEd costing
Limited post-development mentoring	Strengthen post-training	Establish formal mentoring and coaching	At least 90% of participating school heads	Senior School Heads, EPS, Mentors	Monthly / Continuous	Indicative , subject



and follow-up	application and support	arrangements and assign mentors where appropriate	complete the prescribed coaching or mentoring cycles			to DepEd costing
Weak monitoring and feedback mechanisms	Institutionalize development program monitoring and feedback	Conduct post-program assessments, follow-up monitoring, feedback sessions, and program reviews	100% of completed major development programs undergo post-program evaluation and documented follow-up	Division M&E Team, HRD Unit, School Heads	Quarterly	Indicative, subject to DepEd costing
Gap between theory and practice	Strengthen school-based application of professional learning	Implement applied leadership projects and school-based action research	At least 80% of participating school heads complete one applied leadership project annually	School Heads, Teachers, Research Coordinators	Annual	Indicative, subject to DepEd costing
Need for sustained institutional support	Institutionalize continuous leadership development	Develop and implement a continuing mentoring, coaching, technical assistance, and monitoring framework	At least 90% of school heads participate in the prescribed annual professional support activities	Division Office, Policy Makers, HRD Unit	Annual / Ongoing	Indicative, subject to DepEd costing

Note: Budget requirements are indicative only and shall be finalized based on the approved DepEd costing, number of participants, venue requirements, training materials, facilitator fees, transportation and travel expenses, technology requirements, mentoring/coaching time, monitoring activities, and other allowable expenses, subject to existing budgeting, accounting, and procurement rules.

Budget Methodology

To ensure that the proposed plan is financially defensible, the budget for each activity should be computed based on actual implementation requirements rather than assigning a fixed amount without a costing basis. The estimated cost may be determined using the following components:

Estimated Activity Cost = Participant-related Costs + Venue/Facility Costs + Training Materials + Facilitator Costs + Travel/Transportation + Technology/ICT Requirements + Mentoring/Coaching Costs + Monitoring and Evaluation Costs.

The final budget should consider the actual number of participants, frequency of activities, duration, venue, available DepEd facilities and resources, applicable facilitator rates, transportation requirements, and existing budget allocations. Where these details are not yet available, the budget should remain classified as indicative and subject to DepEd costing and approval.

Evaluation Framework

The implementation of the Strategic Development Improvement Plan shall be monitored using measurable indicators. The following framework shall guide the assessment of progress:

Key Area	Baseline Measure	Target	Data Source	Responsible Office/Person	Review Schedule	Success Criterion
----------	------------------	--------	-------------	---------------------------	-----------------	-------------------



Leadership competency	Baseline competency assessment before intervention	At least 85% of participants meet the identified competency benchmark	Pre- and post-assessment results	HRD Unit / EPS	Semi-annual	Target competency benchmark achieved
Program completion	Percentage of school heads completing required development activities	At least 90% completion rate	Attendance and completion records	HRD Unit	Quarterly	≥90% completion
Coaching and mentoring	Number of completed coaching/mentoring cycles	At least 2 cycles per school head per semester	Coaching and mentoring logs	Mentors / EPS	Quarterly	Required cycles completed
Post-development monitoring	Percentage of programs with documented follow-up	100% of major programs	Program monitoring reports	M&E Team / HRD Unit	Quarterly	Follow-up documented
Participant feedback	Baseline participant satisfaction rating	At least 85% favorable rating	Post-program evaluation forms	HRD Unit	After every major activity	≥85% favorable assessment
Practical application	Percentage of school heads completing applied leadership outputs	At least 80% annually	Project reports / school-based outputs	School Heads / EPS	Annual	Required outputs completed
Leadership performance	Baseline performance assessment	Maintain or improve the baseline level based on the adopted competency benchmark	Leadership performance assessment	Division Office / School Heads	Annual	Target benchmark maintained or achieved
Implementation challenges	Baseline frequency and severity of reported challenges	Reduction in recurring priority challenges from baseline	Monitoring reports / interviews / feedback forms	M&E Team	Semi-annual	Priority challenges reduced or addressed
Program relevance	Baseline assessment of program relevance	At least 85% favorable assessment	Program evaluation survey	HRD Unit	Annual	Target favorable rating achieved

Note: Baseline values shall be established during the initial implementation cycle before targets are formally assessed. Where no baseline is currently available, the first implementation cycle shall serve as the baseline period.

Monitoring and Evaluation

The Strategic Development Improvement Plan shall undergo regular monitoring and evaluation to determine the extent of implementation and achievement of its intended indicators.

1. The proposed plan shall be presented to school heads and concerned education officials for validation, contextualization, and refinement before implementation.



2. Baseline data shall be gathered before or at the beginning of implementation to establish reference values for the identified indicators.
3. Progress shall be reviewed quarterly, while a more comprehensive evaluation shall be conducted semi-annually or annually, depending on the activity.
4. Monitoring shall use attendance records, competency assessments, coaching and mentoring logs, post-program evaluation forms, implementation reports, and other appropriate documentary evidence.
5. Results shall be reviewed by the concerned Division Office units to identify accomplishments, implementation gaps, resource requirements, and areas requiring corrective action.
6. The plan shall be revised when monitoring and evaluation results indicate that targets are not being achieved or that emerging contextual needs require modification.

Continuous Quality Improvement

Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) shall be integrated into the implementation of the plan through a Plan–Do–Check–Act cycle.

- Plan – Identify professional development needs, establish baseline measures, set measurable targets, and determine resource requirements.
- Do – Implement training, coaching, mentoring, technical assistance, and other development activities.
- Check – Review participation, competency results, feedback, coaching records, and other performance indicators against established targets.
- Act – Use monitoring results and stakeholder feedback to revise activities, strengthen support mechanisms, and improve succeeding development programs.

Expected Outcome

The proposed plan aims to establish a more responsive, systematic, and sustainable professional development system for public elementary school heads. Its success shall be assessed not only through participation in training activities but also through measurable indicators such as competency achievement, completion of coaching and mentoring cycles, implementation of school-based applications, post-development follow-up, participant feedback, and achievement of established leadership-performance benchmarks.

REFERENCES

1. Abdurahman, N. A., & Omar, J. K. A. (2021). School heads' educational leadership practice and teachers' performance: The case of Omar District, Division of Sulu, Philippines. *Open Access Indonesia Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(4), 432–444. <https://doi.org/10.37275/oaijs.v4i2.61>
2. Allen, D. G., & Shanock, L. R. (2013). Perceived organizational socialization and newcomer adjustment: The role of proactive behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 39(6), 1709–1732.
3. Alharbi, M., & Aldhafri, S. (2021). Leadership practices and community engagement in schools: Evidence from public education. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 49(4), 589–607. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143220973452>
4. Al-Saadi, M., Al-Abri, R., & Al-Khusaibi, F. (2019). Instructional leadership and school effectiveness: The role of program design and alignment. *International Journal of Educational Leadership*, 12(3), 45–62. <https://doi.org/10.17583/ijel.2019.3456>
2. Asad, R., Khan, M., & Ahmed, S. (2019). The role of school leaders in fostering parental and community engagement. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 57(5), 512–528. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-01-2019-0005>



3. Azano, A. P., & Stewart, T. T. (2016). Exploring place and practicing justice: Preparing pre-service teachers for success in rural schools. *Journal of Research in Rural Education*, 31(3), 1–12.
4. Barton, E. (2022). Developing educational leadership pipelines: Policy and practice for sustaining school improvement. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003167885>
5. Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. Free Press.
6. Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
7. Borromeo, M. A. (2021). Transformational leadership and teacher collaboration in the new normal: A Philippine perspective. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 12(14), 45–53.
8. Borromeo, M. C. (2021). Transformational leadership practices of school heads and teacher motivation during the pandemic. *Philippine Social Science Journal*, 4(1), 1–13.
9. Brown, T. (2009). *Change by design: How design thinking creates new alternatives for business and society*. Harper Business.
10. Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. Harper & Row.
11. Bush, T. (2007). Educational leadership and management: Theory, policy, and practice. *South African Journal of Education*, 27(3), 391–406.
12. Bush, T. (2018). Leadership and context: Why one size does not fit all. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 46(1), 3–6. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143217729368>
13. Bush, T. (2019). School leadership and management in education: Developing leaders for the future. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 47(6), 883–890. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143219873044>
14. Bush, T., & Glover, D. (2016). School leadership and management in England: The paradox of simultaneous centralization and decentralization. *Research in Educational Administration & Leadership*, 1(1), 1–23.
15. Cabigao, J. (2019). Leadership competencies and school performance in the Philippines. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 7(2), 25–32.
16. Cabigao, J., & Malolos, C. (2021). Operationalizing professional standards: The case of PPSSH. *Philippine Social Science Journal*, 4(3), 110–119.
17. Choi, Y., & Tang, S. Y. F. (2018). School leadership and resource management: Linking leadership competencies to school effectiveness. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 21(6), 721–736. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2017.1365642>
18. Clarke, S., & O'Donoghue, T. (2017). Educational leadership and context: A rendering of an inseparable relationship. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 65(2), 167–182. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00071005.2016.1199772>
19. Clarke, S., & Wildy, H. (2016). Preparing principals in Australia: Perspectives from the field. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 44(1), 107–124. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143214558577>
20. Collie, R. J., Shapka, J. D., & Perry, N. E. (2020). School leaders' wellbeing: A review of research and implications for practice. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 48(1), 5–26.
21. Cruz, M. T., & De Guzman, A. B. (2022). Adaptive leadership practices of school heads during the COVID-19 pandemic. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 36(3), 421–437.
22. Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). *Effective teacher professional development*. Learning Policy Institute.
23. Day, C., & Sammons, P. (2016). *Successful school leadership*. Education Development Trust.
24. Day, C., Gu, Q., & Sammons, P. (2016). The impact of leadership on student outcomes. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 52(2), 221–258. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X15616863>
25. Dela Cruz, A. A., & Javier, B. B. (2020). Challenges of school leaders in geographically isolated and disadvantaged areas in the Philippines. Unpublished manuscript.
26. Department of Education. (2019). Transformation of the National Educators Academy of the Philippines (NEAP) (DepEd Order No. 11, s. 2019).
27. Department of Education. (2020). DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020: National adoption and implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH).
28. Edmonds, R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. *Educational Leadership*, 37(1), 15–24.
29. Epstein, J. L. (2011). *School, family, and community partnerships* (2nd ed.). Routledge.



30. Fernandez, M. D., & Tagadiad, C. L. (2024). Instructional leadership, work engagement, self-efficacy of school heads. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 8(9), 3350–3367. <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.8090282>
31. Grissom, J. A., Egalite, A. J., & Lindsay, C. A. (2021). How principals affect students and schools. The Wallace Foundation.
32. Hallinger, P. (2018). Bringing context out of the shadows of leadership. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 46(1), 5–24. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143216670652>
33. Hallinger, P., & Wang, W. C. (2020). Assessing the contribution of distributed leadership to school improvement. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 48(3), 447–469.
34. 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/10.1080/13632434.2019.1596077>
35. OECD. (2019). Improving school leadership: Policy and practice. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264265271-en>
36. Prestoza, M.-J. R., & Naldoza, N. D. (2024). Challenges and practices of instructional leadership. *The Normal Lights*.
37. Robinson, V. M. J. (2018). Reduce change to increase improvement. Corwin Press.
38. Santos, R. P., & Mercado, J. L. (2022). Lived experiences of school heads navigating the PPSSH career stages. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Policy*, 7(1), 10–22.
39. Shaked, H., & Schechter, C. (2020). Instructional leadership in times of change. *School Leadership & Management*, 40(4), 287–305. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2019.1596076>
40. Timperley, H. (2018). Sustaining professional learning. *Professional Development in Education*, 44(3), 354–369.