

# Administrative Challenges and Leadership Innovation to School Outcomes: The Role of Instructional Services

Laarni R. Villamater, EdD, Elsa C. Callo, EdD\*

<sup>a</sup> [laarni.villamater@deped.gov.ph](mailto:laarni.villamater@deped.gov.ph)

*Teacher III, DepEd Lopez National Comprehensive High School, Maharlika Highway Brgy. Magsaysay Lopez Quezon 4316, Philippines*  
*Professor, Laguna State Polytechnic University, San Pablo City, Laguna 4000, Philippines*

---

## Abstract

Emphasizing the importance of educational services, this study looked at how administrative challenges and leadership innovation affect school performance. Based on a varied sample of school administrators from different school sizes and geographical settings, the study highlights as major administrative issues funding constraints, policy implementation, teacher shortages, and student mental health as main challenges to efficient school management and instructional delivery. The results show that although all schools mostly rely on government and community financing sources, infrastructure gaps—especially in laboratory facilities—remain clear.

Particularly in areas of technological integration, data-driven decision-making, professional development, and wellness projects, the study emphasized the great competency of school administrators in using creative leadership tactics. Improved school outcomes—including higher student achievement, more teacher satisfaction, and the development of a favorable school environment—including these leadership innovations are favorably connected with each other.

Moreover, statistical tests verify that instructional programs help to explain the link between administrative difficulties and school performance. Good leadership innovation lessens the effect of these difficulties, therefore improving the quality of instruction, student support, and evaluation procedures. The study emphasized the need of adaptable leadership approaches catered to the size and setting of the institution since proactive answers to administrative obstacles can greatly improve organizational performance and educational results. The results support the mounting body of data supporting radical leadership and strong educational programs as essential components in reaching sustained school development.

**Keywords:** Administrative Challenges, Leadership Innovation, Instructional Services, School Outcomes, Educational Leadership, Student Performance, Teacher Satisfaction, School Climate, Professional Development, Resource Allocation

---

## 1. Introduction

Across the board, professional teachers' groups, the education department, and school heads preparation programs are increasingly focused on produce better-prepared school heads who will be more effective at leading inclusive schools in general. This statement reflects efforts based on 25 years of empirical evidence, the existence of this evidence is indicative that principals play a central function in building inclusive, high-

---

performing schools. This claim is supported by several studies and sources (e.g., DeMatthews, 2015; DeMatthews & Mawhinney, 2014; Bays & Crockett, 2019; Billingsley et al. (2014), Boscardin (2019).

Within schools, educational leadership must continue to engage with evermore complex problems and challenges that move us beyond administrative problems to embrace the opportunities of renewed innovation in support of improved school outcomes. Schools face immense pressure to boost student achievement and instructional quality, amid resource limits, policy imperatives, and organizational constraints. Thoonen et al. In this regard, Bowen and Mendiburo (2020) claimed that school leaders face a myriad of administrative challenges including responsibility for resource management, hiring and staffing, as well as policy dictates that prevent them from focusing on instructional leadership alone. External pressures further exacerbate these challenges, such as greater accountability and bureaucratic demands that impede the extent to which school leaders are able to engage wholly in teaching and learning improvement actions (Gurr, Drysdale & Mulford 2021).

Comparing surroundings with novice and experienced administrators yields an intriguing observation. Jagt, Shen, and Hsieh (2020) found no link between elementary and secondary school rookie principals' perceived difficulty levels. Participants had different views on the hurdles' severity.

To meet global competitiveness standards and provide high-quality education, the Philippine Educational System has improved its Faculty and Student Development initiatives. Public School Teachers are receiving intensive training and scholarships from the Department of Education (DepED), CHED, TESDA, and other local and international institutions. These programs promote their professional development, career promotion, and technical knowledge in several industries. The idea is to provide students 21st-century learning skills. Teachers at private and public schools have also been offered national and international Teacher Exchange Programs. Furthermore, Public School teachers have shown competency, efficacy, and productivity in their fields.

The Philippines is committed to Education for All (EFA) for the benefit of all Filipinos and the nation's economy and society. Part of the comprehensive education strategy The Philippines sought to expand school access by extending basic education to twelve years in 2015. Educational administration underwent a 'theory movement' in the 1950s. This movement stressed the necessity of utilizing scientific concepts based on empirical facts to improve academic activities rather than ideologies, personal experiences, or mandated techniques. Principal leadership affects education quality, school growth, and student accomplishment (Heck and Hallinger, 2021).

Filipino researchers have found concerns in K-12 curriculum implementation. These include a teacher shortage, an unsustainable curriculum, a lack of resources and infrastructure, and bureaucratic incoordination (Alegado, 2018; Calderon, 2014; Combalicer, 2016; Sergio, 2020). International scholarships have also proposed ways to improve teachers' transformation roles (Puryear, 2015; Yasuyuki, 2019). For 30 years, teachers have been seen as the biggest challenge in education, according to Gunter (2013). However, a rising body of literature stresses teachers' leadership in educational reforms. Muijs and Reynolds (2021) said teachers and teaching mattered

School administrators must recognize these issues and opportunities and manage, improve, and empower staff to promote equality and fairness. The current education paradigm change gives school leaders enormous duties and opportunities to demonstrate their administrative skills, notably in decision-making. In light of this, school officials must consider different ways to ensure every child receives an education and learns.

The purpose of this study is to examine how school leaders deal with administrative issues, whilst operationalizing innovative leadership practices in order to improve instructional services. Through its examination of both the relationship between leadership innovation and school outcomes and what this means for schools managing the administrative balance with instructional leadership to drive academic success, the study intends to elucidate these points.

### 1.1. Statement of the Problem

This study, titled "Administrative Challenges and Leadership Innovation to School Outcomes: The Role of Instructional Services," aims to address the following issues:

1. What is the profile of school respondents as to:
  - 1.1. Size;
  - 1.2. Location;
  - 1.3. Source of Funds;
  - 1.4. Available laboratories?
2. What is the perceived extent of administrative challenges faced by school administrators in terms of:
  - 2.1. Funding and Budget Constraints;
  - 2.2. Teacher Shortage and Turnover;
  - 2.3. Policy Changes and implementation;
  - 2.4. Student Attendance and Engagement;
  - 2.5. Student Mental Health and Wellness;
  - 2.6. School Safety;
  - 2.7. Parental Involvement;
  - 2.8. Resource Allocation;
  - 2.9. Staff development and Training; and
  - 2.10. Technological Integration?
3. What is the level of competence of school administrators in leadership innovation strategy as to:
  - 3.1. Leveraging Technology;
  - 3.2. Efficiency;
  - 3.3. Data analytics and evidence-based decision-making;
  - 3.4. Innovative professional development; and
  - 3.5. Wellness and Mental Health Initiatives?
4. To what extent does leadership innovation affects the level of school outcome as to:
  - 4.1. Students Performance;
  - 4.2. Teacher Satisfaction; and
  - 4.3. School Climate?
5. What are the perceived effects of administrative challenges to the delivery of instructional services in relation to school outcome as to:
  - 5.1. Teaching Quality;
  - 5.2. Student Support Services; and
  - 5.3. Assessment and Feedback?
6. Is there a significant difference between the extent of administrative challenges that affect the overall school outcomes faced by school administrators when school their profile if taken as factor?
7. Is there a significant relationship between the level of competence of school administrators in leadership innovation strategy and the extent of administrative challenges faced by them?
8. Is there a significant relationship between the level of competence of school administrators in leadership innovation strategy and the level of school outcome?
9. Is there a significant relationship between the extent of administrative challenges and the delivery of instructional services?

## 2. Methodology

The selected research method, utilizing a correlational descriptive approach, indicates a determined method to investigate the complex dynamics of administrative challenges encountered by school administrators and concurrently understand their possible influence on overall school outcomes. This method will enable the examination of connections between diverse variables, providing a detailed comprehension of how administrative challenges may be linked to varied outcomes inside educational institutions.

The key methodological technique for this research is the gathering of quantitative data, which is done by administering surveys to school administrators. The survey instrument will be carefully crafted to gather comprehensive data on the frequency of administrative difficulties and, importantly, to measure the degree to which these difficulties impact overall school performance. This approach guarantees a methodical and uniform examination of the administrative environment, generating numerical data that can be rigorously analyzed using statistical methods. This, in turn, enables the extraction of significant and valuable insights.

In order to improve the overall ability to use and draw conclusions from the results, the survey will be sent to a representative sample of school administrators across the Lopez District. The intentional sample technique seeks to encompass a wide array of viewpoints from administrators in various schools within the district, recognizing the potential discrepancies in administrative obstacles encountered by educators in different educational environments.

The forthcoming statistical examination of the quantitative data will entail examining patterns, discerning trends, and establishing relationships between the reported administrative issues and observed school outcomes. This analytical process aids in producing evidence-based conclusions, providing a thorough and data-driven depiction of the administrative environment in the Lopez District.

For a quantitative correlational research study focusing on administrative challenges, leadership innovation, and their impact on school outcomes, a combination of research instruments can be used to gather comprehensive data.

Structured surveys/questionnaires will be designed to collect data from school administrators. Questions can focus on administrative challenges faced, perceptions of leadership innovation, and their observations of school outcomes. An instrument will be developed to assess leadership innovation, including items related to transformative leadership practices, decision-making approaches, and implementation of innovative strategies.

For school performance data on school outcomes, and relevant performance indicators. Data will be Analyzed, including records of resource allocation, professional development participation, and school policies related to instructional services.

This study utilized regression analysis to identify and quantify the characteristics that significantly affect school outcomes. A multiple linear regression model was employed to analyze the association between various independent variables—Leadership Innovation, Instructional Services, and Administrative Challenges—and a dependent variable indicative of school performance or outcomes. Regression analysis is a statistical technique employed to investigate the relationship between a single dependent variable and one or more independent variables. In multiple linear regression, the objective is to identify the optimal line (or model) that forecasts the dependent variable utilizing a combination of independent factors.

### 3. Results and Discussion

#### Perceived Administrative Challenges Faced by Schools in terms of:

**Table 1. Administrative Challenges on Funding and Budget Constraints**

| Statements                                                                                                  | Mean          | SD            | Verbal Interpretation |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Securing adequate funds for essential programs and activities.                                           | 4.01          | .832          | Large Extent          |
| 2. Limitations on the use of MOOE for essential learning materials and supplies.                            | 3.96          | .859          | Large Extent          |
| 3. Concerns on downloading of funds which affect the timely implementation of school programs and projects. | 3.97          | .925          | Large Extent          |
| 4. Maintaining and repairing school facilities effectively.                                                 | 4.25          | .859          | Very Large Extent     |
| 5. Auditing factors affecting budget use.                                                                   | 4.04          | .948          | Large Extent          |
| <b>Overall</b>                                                                                              | <b>4.0460</b> | <b>.67632</b> | <b>Large Extent</b>   |

**Legend:** 4.21 – 5.00 - Very Great Extent; 3.41 – 4.20 - Large Extent; 2.61 – 3.40 - to an Extent; 1.81 – 2.60 - Little Extent; 1.00 - 1.80 - Very Little Extent

Table 1 reveals significant administrative challenges related to financial resources and budget limitations, with an overall mean of 4.05. The greatest difficulty is maintaining and repairing school facilities ( $M = 4.25$ ), followed by challenges in budget auditing, securing sufficient funding, and managing fund disbursement. Restrictions on the use of MOOE funds also pose obstacles ( $M = 3.96$ ). These financial constraints and administrative delays hinder effective program implementation and facility upkeep, especially in rural or vulnerable areas. The findings align with research highlighting how budget restrictions force school leaders to seek alternative funding and impact the learning environment and safety.

These findings underscore the significant financial and administrative challenges that school leaders must manage. The simultaneous challenges of constrained money and tight bureaucratic procedures for budget utilization impede the effective execution of educational programs and the maintenance of school facilities. Dela Cruz and Ramos (2020) highlighted that delays in budget disbursement and inadequate financial resources remain significant obstacles to effective school leadership, especially in public basic education institutions.

**Table 2. Administrative Challenges on Teacher Shortage and Turnover**

| Statements                                                                                               | Mean | SD    | Verbal Interpretation |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|-------|-----------------------|
| 1. Retaining qualified teachers.                                                                         | 3.83 | 1.036 | Large Extent          |
| 2. Sufficiency of teachers to meet the needs of the growing student population.                          | 3.78 | 1.168 | Large Extent          |
| 3. Transfer of teachers to other schools or districts due to better opportunities or working conditions. | 3.39 | 1.321 | To an Extent          |
| 4. Recruiting teachers for specialized subjects.                                                         | 3.91 | .974  | Large Extent          |

|                                                                              |               |               |                     |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------------|
| 5. Inconsistent staffing creating challenges in delivering quality education | 3.25          | 1.091         | To an Extent        |
| <b>Overall</b>                                                               | <b>3.6313</b> | <b>.91554</b> | <b>Large Extent</b> |

**Legend:** 4.21 – 5.00 - Very Great Extent; 3.41 – 4.20 - Large Extent; 2.61 – 3.40 - to an Extent; 1.81 – 2.60 - Little Extent; 1.00 - 1.80 - Very Little Extent

Table 2 delineates the issues associated with teacher shortages and attrition faced by educational institutions. The average score of 3.63 (SD = 0.91554) suggests that the respondents regard these issues as significant. The primary concerns included the recruitment of instructors for specialized topics (M = 3.91), the retention of qualified teachers (M = 3.83), and the sufficiency of teaching staff to accommodate a burgeoning student population (M = 3.78). The findings indicate that schools are facing challenges in attracting and maintaining qualified educators, especially in specialized fields like science, mathematics, and vocational topics.

In contrast, apprehensions over teacher transfers for improved job conditions (M = 3.39) and uneven staffing patterns impacting instructional quality (M = 3.25) were assessed as high concerns. Although these aspects are pertinent, they are not regarded as crucial as the challenges related to initial recruitment and long-term retention.

These findings underscore systemic deficiencies in teacher availability and stability, possibly exacerbated by rising teacher mobility and inadequate recruitment strategies, particularly in specialized fields. Ferrer and Dimaano (2021) observed that recruiting educators in high-demand disciplines remains a considerable difficulty, mostly due to insufficient professional development opportunities and inadequate salary in the public education sector.

**Table 3. Administrative Challenges on Policy Changes and implementation**

| Statements                                                                        | Mean          | SD            | Verbal Interpretation    |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Frequenting policy changes for school's long-term plans.                       | 3.47          | 1.055         | Large Extent             |
| 2. Aligning practices with new policies.                                          | 3.97          | .850          | Very Great Extent        |
| 3. Policy revisions requiring to invest significant time in training staff.       | 3.67          | .992          | Very Great Extent        |
| 4. Communicating policy changes to stakeholders through official school channels. | 3.76          | 1.083         | Very Great Extent        |
| 5. Implementing new policies with limited resources.                              | 3.73          | .994          | Very Great Extent        |
| <b>Overall</b>                                                                    | <b>3.7200</b> | <b>.88056</b> | <b>Very Great Extent</b> |

**Legend:** 4.21 – 5.00 - Very Great Extent; 3.41 – 4.20 - Large Extent; 2.61 – 3.40 - to an Extent; 1.81 – 2.60 - Little Extent; 1.00 - 1.80 - Very Little Extent

Table 3 reveals that schools face notable challenges in implementing policy changes, with an overall mean of 3.72. Aligning practices with new policies received the highest rating (M = 3.97), showing strong efforts toward compliance. However, issues such as limited resources (M = 3.73), the need for staff training (M = 3.67), and effective communication with stakeholders (M = 3.76) indicate that policy adaptation is demanding. Frequent policy changes related to long-term goals (M = 3.47) are seen as a moderate concern. Overall, while schools are engaged in policy implementation, they struggle with financial, infrastructural, and communication-related barriers, echoing findings from related research. The results align with the study conducted by Lopez and Tan

(2021), which examined the effects of frequent policy alterations on school administration. Frequent policy changes necessitate ongoing modifications in instructional methodologies, administrative procedures, and staff development programs, frequently taxing school resources and administrative capabilities. Dela Cruz and Reyes (2022) assert that policy modifications are frequently implemented without sufficient resource allocation, posing considerable challenges for schools regarding staff readiness and the sustainability of these adjustments.

**Table 4. Administrative Challenges on Student Attendance and Engagement**

| Statements                                                           | Mean          | SD            | Verbal Interpretation |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Encouraging consistent student attendance.                        | 4.23          | .751          | Very Great Extent     |
| 2. Low student engagement impacting overall academic performance.    | 3.79          | 1.121         | Large Extent          |
| 3. Motivating students to participate in extracurricular activities. | 3.90          | 1.032         | Large Extent          |
| 4. Absenteeism affecting classroom dynamics.                         | 3.95          | .812          | Large Extent          |
| 5. Re-engaging students after extended absences.                     | 4.05          | .690          | Large Extent          |
| <b>Overall</b>                                                       | <b>3.9833</b> | <b>.59999</b> | <b>Large Extent</b>   |

**Legend:** 4.21 – 5.00 - Very Great Extent; 3.41 – 4.20 - Large Extent; 2.61 – 3.40 - to an Extent; 1.81 – 2.60 - Little Extent; 1.00 - 1.80 - Very Little Extent

Table 4 highlights key challenges related to student attendance and engagement, with an overall mean of 3.98. The highest concern is promoting consistent attendance ( $M = 4.23$ ), reflecting its strong impact on academic success. Other concerns include low student engagement ( $M = 3.79$ ), limited participation in extracurricular activities ( $M = 3.90$ ), and the negative effects of absenteeism on classroom dynamics ( $M = 3.95$ ) and re-engagement efforts ( $M = 4.05$ ). These findings suggest that absenteeism and disengagement are pressing issues requiring strategic interventions, such as supportive programs, inclusive activities, and motivational teaching approaches to boost student participation and performance.

This study's findings align with those of Santos et al. (2021), which demonstrated that regular attendance is strongly correlated with academic success, while irregular attendance results in learning deficits that diminish students' academic performance. Mendoza and Buan (2022) underscore that absenteeism impairs classroom relationships, complicating teachers' ability to deliver consistent, high-quality instruction. Low student involvement is commonly acknowledged as a significant impediment to learning results.

**Table 5. Administrative Challenges on Student Mental Health and Wellness**

| Statements                                               | Mean | SD   | Verbal Interpretation |
|----------------------------------------------------------|------|------|-----------------------|
| 1. Addressing students' mental health needs.             | 3.96 | .859 | Large Extent          |
| 2. Providing mental health support.                      | 4.01 | .890 | Large Extent          |
| 3. Identifying and responding to mental health concerns. | 3.92 | .894 | Large Extent          |

|                                                                             |               |               |                     |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------------|
| 4. Impacting our ability to promote student wellness.                       | 3.91          | .965          | Large Extent        |
| 5. Creating a balanced approach to academic pressure and mental well-being. | 3.93          | .904          | Large Extent        |
| <b>Overall</b>                                                              | <b>3.9440</b> | <b>.82019</b> | <b>Large Extent</b> |

**Legend:** 4.21 – 5.00 - Very Great Extent; 3.41 – 4.20 - Large Extent; 2.61 – 3.40 - to an Extent; 1.81 – 2.60 - Little Extent; 1.00 - 1.80 - Very Little Extent

Table 5 highlights that student mental health and wellness challenges are a significant concern in schools, with an overall mean of 3.94. The highest rating was for providing mental health support (M = 4.01), indicating strong efforts to address growing student needs. Schools are actively identifying and responding to mental health concerns (M = 3.92) and working to balance academic pressure with well-being (M = 3.93). Despite these efforts, promoting overall student wellness remains challenging (M = 3.91). The findings emphasize the importance of strengthening mental health programs, managing academic stress, and fostering resilience to support student well-being and success. Hernandez et al. (2021) assert that schools are progressively acknowledging the essential role of mental health support in student achievement, prompting numerous institutions to incorporate mental health programs into their educational structures. These programs seek to offer a comprehensive approach to student development by integrating academic assistance with mental health care.

**Table 6. Administrative Challenges on School Safety**

| Statements                                                                                               | Mean          | SD            | Verbal Interpretation |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Maintaining a safe physical environment.                                                              | 3.91          | 1.081         | Large Extent          |
| 2. Implementing comprehensive safety protocols, health, DRRM related wellness, mental and child funding. | 3.83          | 1.275         | Large Extent          |
| 3. Sense of security among students and staff.                                                           | 3.97          | .875          | Large Extent          |
| 4. Hindering our ability to address safety risks promptly.                                               | 3.64          | 1.083         | Large Extent          |
| 5. Ensuring preparedness for emergencies.                                                                | 3.87          | 1.031         | Large Extent          |
| <b>Overall</b>                                                                                           | <b>3.8440</b> | <b>.91348</b> | <b>Large Extent</b>   |

**Legend:** 4.21 – 5.00 - Very Great Extent; 3.41 – 4.20 - Large Extent; 2.61 – 3.40 - to an Extent; 1.81 – 2.60 - Little Extent; 1.00 - 1.80 - Very Little Extent

Table 6 reflects generally positive perceptions of school safety, with an overall mean of 3.84. Students and staff report a strong sense of security (M = 3.97), and schools maintain safe physical environments (M = 3.91). Efforts in implementing safety protocols, including health, DRRM, and mental wellness programs (M = 3.83), and emergency preparedness (M = 3.87) are evident but could be further strengthened. However, challenges remain in promptly addressing safety risks (M = 3.64), highlighting the need for improved planning, training, and resource support. The findings emphasize the importance of comprehensive safety measures in fostering a secure and supportive school environment. In recent years, school safety has emerged as a prominent concern, particularly due to the global pandemic and heightened awareness of mental health issues. Pinto et al. (2021) assert that ensuring a secure physical environment is crucial for both safeguarding students and fostering an effective learning atmosphere.

**Table 7. Administrative Challenges on Parental Involvement**

| Statements                                                                 | Mean          | SD            | Verbal Interpretation |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Engaging parents in school activities.                                  | 4.17          | .749          | Large Extent          |
| 2. Involving parents in supporting student learning at home.               | 4.29          | .674          | Very Great Extent     |
| 3. Parental participation in decision-making processes in SPTA and or SGC. | 4.10          | .817          | Large Extent          |
| 4. Building strong communication channels with parents.                    | 4.20          | .713          | Large Extent          |
| 5. Encouraging parents to volunteer for school programs.                   | 4.14          | .797          | Large Extent          |
| <b>Overall</b>                                                             | <b>4.1800</b> | <b>.66050</b> | <b>Large Extent</b>   |

**Legend:** 4.21 – 5.00 - Very Great Extent; 3.41 – 4.20 - Large Extent; 2.61 – 3.40 - to an Extent; 1.81 – 2.60 - Little Extent; 1.00 - 1.80 - Very Little Extent

Table 7 highlights strong parental involvement in school activities and student learning, with an overall mean of 4.18. Parents are highly engaged in supporting learning at home ( $M = 4.29$ ) and participate actively in school events ( $M = 4.17$ ). Effective communication between schools and parents is evident ( $M = 4.20$ ), and there is notable involvement in decision-making processes ( $M = 4.10$ ). While parental volunteerism is solid ( $M = 4.14$ ), opportunities exist to further strengthen participation in governance and school programs. Overall, schools demonstrate a proactive approach to fostering meaningful home-school partnerships.

**Table 8. Administrative Challenges on Resource Allocation**

| Statements                                                               | Mean          | SD            | Verbal Interpretation |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Distribution of resources equitably across departments/ grade levels. | 3.94          | .814          | Large Extent          |
| 2. Prioritizing some needs over others.                                  | 3.97          | .855          | Large Extent          |
| 3. Providing of sufficient resources for extracurricular activities.     | 3.81          | 1.078         | Large Extent          |
| 4. Ability to support diverse student needs.                             | 3.83          | 1.025         | Large Extent          |
| 5. Infrastructure improvements and upgrades.                             | 4.05          | .818          | Large Extent          |
| <b>Overall</b>                                                           | <b>3.9213</b> | <b>.83242</b> | <b>Large Extent</b>   |

**Legend:** 4.21 – 5.00 - Very Great Extent; 3.41 – 4.20 - Large Extent; 2.61 – 3.40 - to an Extent; 1.81 – 2.60 - Little Extent; 1.00 - 1.80 - Very Little Extent

Table 8 shows that resource allocation in the school is generally well-managed, with an overall mean of 3.92. Resources are distributed equitably across departments ( $M = 3.94$ ), and priorities are strategically set to meet urgent needs ( $M = 3.97$ ). While extracurricular activities receive attention ( $M = 3.81$ ), resource limitations may affect their effectiveness. The school also strives to support diverse student needs ( $M = 3.83$ ), though more targeted efforts may be required. These findings reflect a thoughtful approach to resource management, aligning with research that stresses strategic and equitable allocation to ensure inclusive and effective education.

**Table 9. Administrative Challenges on Staff development and Training**

| Statements                                                                                                 | Mean          | SD            | Verbal Interpretation |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Regular provision of in-service training and capacity-building programs                                 | 4.06          | .838          | Large Extent          |
| 2. Opportunities for advanced studies, certifications, and specialized training                            | 3.94          | .881          | Large Extent          |
| 3. Identification of training needs through staff evaluations and feedback mechanisms                      | 3.85          | .853          | Large Extent          |
| 4. Provision of specialized training for handling diverse learners, including SPED and inclusive education | 3.98          | .894          | Large Extent          |
| 5. Feedback and follow-up mechanisms to ensure practical application of learned skills                     | 3.92          | .867          | Large Extent          |
| <b>Overall</b>                                                                                             | <b>3.9493</b> | <b>.75993</b> | <b>Large Extent</b>   |

**Legend:** 4.21 – 5.00 - Very Great Extent; 3.41 – 4.20 - Large Extent; 2.61 – 3.40 - to an Extent; 1.81 – 2.60 - Little Extent; 1.00 - 1.80 - Very Little Extent

Table 9 highlights strong support for staff development and training in the school, with a high overall mean of 3.95. Key areas include regular in-service training ( $M = 4.06$ ), opportunities for advanced study ( $M = 3.94$ ), and targeted training based on needs assessments ( $M = 3.85$ ). Specialized training for diverse and inclusive classrooms ( $M = 3.98$ ) reflects a commitment to equity, while follow-up mechanisms ( $M = 3.92$ ) ensure the effective application of new skills. These efforts align with research emphasizing the importance of ongoing, needs-based professional development to improve teaching quality and student outcomes.

**Table 10. Administrative Challenges on Technological Integration**

| Statements                                                                                        | Mean          | SD            | Verbal Interpretation |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Availability of internet connectivity and bandwidth capacity in school.                        | 4.03          | .762          | Large Extent          |
| 2. Regular maintenance and upgrading of ICT equipment and infrastructure.                         | 3.91          | .807          | Large Extent          |
| 3. Availability of e-learning platforms, digital libraries, and online learning tools             | 3.86          | .887          | Large Extent          |
| 4. Development and use of locally relevant and culturally appropriate digital learning materials. | 3.87          | .823          | Large Extent          |
| 5. Integration of technology in lesson planning, teaching, and student engagement.                | 4.25          | .732          | Very Great Extent     |
| <b>Overall</b>                                                                                    | <b>3.9833</b> | <b>.64595</b> | <b>Large Extent</b>   |

**Legend:** 4.21 – 5.00 - Very Great Extent; 3.41 – 4.20 - Large Extent; 2.61 – 3.40 - to an Extent; 1.81 – 2.60 - Little Extent; 1.00 - 1.80 - Very Little Extent

Table 10 reveals a high level of technological integration in the school, with an overall mean of 3.98. Reliable internet connectivity ( $M = 4.03$ ) and regular maintenance of ICT infrastructure ( $M = 3.91$ ) support effective digital learning. The use of e-learning platforms and digital tools ( $M = 3.86$ ) enhances student access to educational resources and supports varied learning styles. Additionally, the development of culturally relevant digital materials ( $M = 3.87$ ) reflects the school's commitment to inclusive and engaging education. These findings indicate a well-rounded approach to integrating technology in support of teaching and learning.

**Level of Competence of School Administrators in Leadership Innovation as to:**  
**Table 11. Leveraging Technology**

| Statements                                                                                                           | Mean          | SD            | Verbal Interpretation   |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------------|
| 1. My School head is implementing technology to enhance administrative processes in the school.                      | 4.03          | .722          | Highly Competent        |
| 2. My School head uses educational technology to improve student learning outcomes.                                  | 4.13          | .711          | Highly Competent        |
| 3. My School head is skilled in training or providing TA to staff to utilize technology for instructional purposes.  | 4.00          | .000          | Highly Competent        |
| 4. My school head utilizes data analytics and management systems to track student performance and school operations. | 4.12          | .700          | Highly Competent        |
| 5. My School head is capable of evaluating and selecting appropriate technological tools for school improvement.     | 4.09          | .739          | Highly Competent        |
| <b>Overall</b>                                                                                                       | <b>4.0753</b> | <b>.51238</b> | <b>Highly Competent</b> |

**Legend:** 4.21 – 5.00 - *Extremely Competent*; 3.41 – 4.20 - *Highly Competent*; 2.61 – 3.40 – *Competent*; 1.81 – 2.60 - *Somewhat Competent*; 1.00 - 1.80 - *Not Competent*

Table 7.1 reveals that the school head is highly competent in using technology for both administrative and instructional purposes, with an overall mean of 4.08. The principal effectively applies technology to improve school management ( $M = 4.03$ ) and enhance student learning ( $M = 4.13$ ). Their skills in staff training for technology use ( $M = 4.00$ ) support ongoing professional development, while strong data analytics capabilities ( $M = 4.12$ ) enable informed decision-making. These results highlight the critical role of technology proficiency in modern educational leadership.

**Table 12. Efficiency**

| Statements                                                                                         | Mean | SD   | Verbal Interpretation |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|------|-----------------------|
| 1. My School head streamlines administrative processes to enhance efficiency in school operations. | 4.30 | .686 | Extremely Competent   |
| 2. My School head manages resources to maximize operational efficiency.                            | 4.34 | .678 | Extremely Competent   |

|                                                                                                    |               |               |                            |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|----------------------------|
| 3. My School head implements strategies to reduce time and effort in routine administrative tasks. | 4.24          | .687          | Extremely Competent        |
| 4. My School head fosters a culture of efficiency among staff and stakeholders.                    | 4.27          | .734          | Extremely Competent        |
| 5. My School head identifies areas for improvement to increase overall school efficiency.          | 4.33          | .742          | Extremely Competent        |
| <b>Overall</b>                                                                                     | <b>4.2973</b> | <b>.63803</b> | <b>Extremely Competent</b> |

**Legend:** 4.21 – 5.00 - *Extremely Competent*; 3.41 – 4.20 - *Highly Competent*; 2.61 – 3.40 – *Competent*; 1.81 – 2.60 - *Somewhat Competent*; 1.00 - 1.80 - *Not Competent*

Table 12 reveals that the school head demonstrates exceptional proficiency in promoting efficiency, with an overall mean of 4.30, rated as "Extremely Competent." The principal excels in optimizing administrative processes (M = 4.30) and resource management (M = 4.34), showcasing strong strategic leadership. Efforts to reduce time and effort spent on routine tasks (M = 4.24) improve operational agility, while fostering a culture of efficiency among staff and stakeholders (M = 4.27) encourages teamwork and accountability. These practices contribute to smoother school operations and a more productive educational environment.

**Table 13. Data analytics and evidence-based decision-making**

| Statements                                                                                    | Mean          | SD            | Verbal Interpretation      |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|----------------------------|
| 1. My School head uses descriptive analytics to inform school policy and decision-making.     | 4.26          | .626          | Extremely Competent        |
| 2. My School head analyzes student performance data to drive instructional improvements.      | 4.29          | .668          | Extremely Competent        |
| 3. My School head collect and interprets data to assess the effectiveness of school programs. | 4.25          | .629          | Extremely Competent        |
| 4. My School head utilizes research-based practices to enhance teaching and learning.         | 4.32          | .683          | Extremely Competent        |
| 5. My School head trains staff to use data analytics for informed decision-making.            | 4.23          | .681          | Extremely Competent        |
| <b>Overall</b>                                                                                | <b>4.2680</b> | <b>.58330</b> | <b>Extremely Competent</b> |

**Legend:** 4.21 – 5.00 - *Extremely Competent*; 3.41 – 4.20 - *Highly Competent*; 2.61 – 3.40 – *Competent*; 1.81 – 2.60 - *Somewhat Competent*; 1.00 - 1.80 – *Not Competent*

Table 13 highlights the school head's strong competency in data analytics and evidence-based decision-making, with a high overall mean of 4.27. The principal effectively uses descriptive analytics to guide policies (M = 4.26), evaluates student performance to improve instruction (M = 4.29), and assesses program effectiveness (M = 4.25). A commitment to research-based teaching strategies (M = 4.32) and staff training in data literacy (M = 4.23) further supports a culture of continuous improvement. These practices reflect a strategic, data-informed leadership approach

aligned with current educational research and best practices.

**Table 14. Innovative professional development**

| Statements                                                                                                                                                                | Mean          | SD            | Verbal Interpretation      |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|----------------------------|
| 1. My School head designs and implements needs-based professional development programs for staff.                                                                         | 4.16          | .701          | Highly Competent           |
| 2. My School head assesses the professional development needs of the team.                                                                                                | 4.22          | .718          | Extremely Competent        |
| 3. My School head Encourages teachers to engage in action research projects where they identify a teaching problem, implement a strategy, and collect data on its impact. | 4.29          | .685          | Extremely Competent        |
| 4. My School head fosters a culture of continuous learning and growth among staff.                                                                                        | 4.24          | .653          | Extremely Competent        |
| 5. My School head evaluates the effectiveness of professional development programs.                                                                                       | 4.25          | .665          | Extremely Competent        |
| <b>Overall</b>                                                                                                                                                            | <b>4.2352</b> | <b>.61490</b> | <b>Extremely Competent</b> |

**Legend:** 4.21 – 5.00 - *Extremely Competent*; 3.41 – 4.20 - *Highly Competent*; 2.61 – 3.40 – *Competent*; 1.81 – 2.60 - *Somewhat Competent*; 1.00 - 1.80 - *Not Competent*

Table 14 highlights the outstanding leadership of the school head in fostering creative and effective professional development, with a high overall mean of 4.24. Key strengths include designing needs-based training ( $M = 4.16$ ), regularly assessing staff development needs ( $M = 4.22$ ), and promoting action research among teachers ( $M = 4.29$ ). The school leader also cultivates a culture of continuous learning ( $M = 4.24$ ) and ensures the effectiveness of development initiatives through regular evaluation ( $M = 4.25$ ). These practices reflect a responsive, research-informed approach that enhances teacher performance and supports sustained school improvement.

**Table 15. Wellness and Mental Health Initiatives**

| Statements                                                                                            | Mean | SD   | Verbal Interpretation |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|------|-----------------------|
| 1. My School head promotes wellness and mental health initiatives within the school.                  | 4.28 | .659 | Extremely Competent   |
| 2. My School head supports staff and students in mental health awareness and resources.               | 4.47 | .656 | Extremely Competent   |
| 3. My School head integrates mental health initiatives into the school culture.                       | 4.28 | .670 | Extremely Competent   |
| 4. My School head collaborates with external organizations to enhance mental health support services. | 4.23 | .682 | Extremely Competent   |

|                                                                                        |               |               |                            |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|----------------------------|
| 5. My School head assesses the impact of wellness initiatives on the school community. | 4.27          | .710          | Extremely Competent        |
| <b>Overall</b>                                                                         | <b>4.3033</b> | <b>.61584</b> | <b>Extremely Competent</b> |

**Legend:** 4.21 – 5.00 - *Extremely Competent*; 3.41 – 4.20 - *Highly Competent*; 2.61 – 3.40 – *Competent*; 1.81 – 2.60 - *Somewhat Competent*; 1.00 – 1.80 - *Not Competent*

Table 15 highlights the school head's highly effective leadership in promoting wellness and mental health, with a strong overall mean of 4.30. Key efforts include proactive wellness programs (M = 4.28), strong support for mental health awareness and resources (M = 4.47), and the integration of mental health initiatives into school culture (M = 4.28). Additionally, collaboration with external organizations (M = 4.23) reflects a comprehensive approach. These actions demonstrate a committed and strategic leadership that prioritizes mental well-being, aligning with research that underscores the importance of school leadership in fostering a mentally healthy environment.

#### Level of School Outcomes based on:

**Table 16. Students Performance**

| Statements                                                                                                                    | Mean          | SD            | Verbal Interpretation    |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Leadership innovation has fostered an environment of high expectations, which has positively impacted student performance. | 4.09          | .762          | Very Satisfactory        |
| 2. The innovative practices implemented by school leaders enhance students' motivation to learn.                              | 4.13          | .770          | Very Satisfactory        |
| 3. Leadership innovation contributes to better student outcomes in assessments.                                               | 4.09          | .764          | Very Satisfactory        |
| 4. The strategies employed by school leaders have increased students' engagement during lessons.                              | 4.03          | .775          | Very Satisfactory        |
| 5. Leadership innovation has not at all influenced the development of critical thinking skills in students.                   | 3.88          | .909          | Very Satisfactory        |
| <b>Overall</b>                                                                                                                | <b>4.0440</b> | <b>.72541</b> | <b>Very Satisfactory</b> |

**Legend:** 4.21 – 5.00 – *Outstanding*; 3.41 – 4.20 – *Very Satisfactory*; 2.61 – 3.40 – *Satisfactory*; 1.81 – 2.60 – *Fair*; 1.00 – 1.80 – *Poor*

Table 16 reveals that leadership innovation has a strong positive impact on student performance, with an overall mean of 4.04 ("Very Much"). It promotes high expectations (M = 4.09), boosts motivation to learn (M = 4.13), improves academic performance (M = 4.09), and enhances student engagement (M = 4.03). While the influence on critical thinking is slightly lower (M = 3.88), it remains positive, suggesting room for more targeted strategies. These results highlight the essential role of innovative leadership in creating a motivating and high-achieving learning environment.

**Table 17. Teacher Satisfaction**

| Statements                                                                                            | Mean          | SD            | Verbal Interpretation    |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Leadership innovation has not at all contributed to my overall job satisfaction as a teacher.      | 3.74          | .893          | Very Satisfactory        |
| 2. The innovative practices introduced by school leaders increase my enthusiasm for teaching.         | 4.17          | .729          | Very Satisfactory        |
| 3. Leadership innovation impacts my feelings of support and recognition from administration.          | 4.14          | .736          | Very Satisfactory        |
| 4. The strategies employed by school leaders have improved my professional development opportunities. | 3.99          | .894          | Very Satisfactory        |
| 5. Leadership innovation has affected my collaboration and communication with colleagues.             | 4.01          | .883          | Very Satisfactory        |
| <b>Overall</b>                                                                                        | <b>4.0100</b> | <b>.72437</b> | <b>Very Satisfactory</b> |

**Legend:** 4.21 – 5.00 – Outstanding; 3.41 – 4.20 – Very Satisfactory; 2.61 – 3.40 – Satisfactory; 1.81 – 2.60 – Fair; 1.00 – 1.80 – Poor

Table 17 reveals that leadership innovation has a strong positive impact on teacher satisfaction, with an overall mean of 4.01. Innovative leadership practices enhance teacher motivation ( $M = 4.17$ ), feelings of support and recognition ( $M = 4.14$ ), and opportunities for professional development ( $M = 3.99$ ). Additionally, they improve collaboration and communication among teachers ( $M = 4.01$ ). Even the perception that leadership innovation has not contributed to job satisfaction still falls within a favorable range ( $M = 3.74$ ). These results highlight the critical role of innovative and supportive leadership in fostering teacher satisfaction, motivation, and professional growth.

**Table 18. School Climate**

| Statements                                                                                                       | Mean | SD   | Verbal Interpretation |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|------|-----------------------|
| 1. Leadership innovation has created a positive school climate within our institution.                           | 4.15 | .680 | Very Satisfactory     |
| 2. The innovative practices implemented by school leaders promote a culture of respect and inclusivity.          | 4.18 | .687 | Very Satisfactory     |
| 3. Leadership innovation contributes to reducing conflicts and enhancing relationships among staff and students. | 4.14 | .713 | Very Satisfactory     |
| 4. The strategies employed by school leaders have fostered a safe and supportive learning environment.           | 4.15 | .683 | Very Satisfactory     |

|                                                                                                 |               |               |                          |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------------------|
| 5. Leadership innovation has influenced the level of trust between teachers and administration. | 4.17          | .693          | Very Satisfactory        |
| <b>Overall</b>                                                                                  | <b>4.1573</b> | <b>.64215</b> | <b>Very Satisfactory</b> |

**Legend:** 4.21 – 5.00 – Outstanding; 3.41 – 4.20 – Very Satisfactory; 2.61 – 3.40 – Satisfactory; 1.81 – 2.60 – Fair; 1.00 – 1.80 – Poor

Table 18 reveals that leadership innovation has a strong positive impact on the overall school atmosphere, with a high overall mean of 4.16. Innovative leadership practices contribute to a positive school climate (M = 4.15), promote respect and inclusivity (M = 4.18), and effectively manage conflicts (M = 4.14). They also help ensure a safe, supportive environment (M = 4.15) and strengthen trust between teachers and administrators (M = 4.17). These findings highlight the critical role of innovative leadership in creating a collaborative, respectful, and productive school environment that supports both student success and teacher well-being.

**Part V. Perceived Administrative Challenges to the Delivery of Instructional Services as to:**  
**Table 19. Instructional Services as to Teaching Quality**

| Statements                                                                                                  | Mean          | SD            | Verbal Interpretation |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------------|
| 1. My ability to deliver high-quality instruction is affected.                                              | 3.79          | .902          | Very Much             |
| 2. The lack of administrative support impacts the effectiveness of my teaching methods.                     | 3.58          | 1.096         | Very Much             |
| 3. Limited access to resources due to administrative issues reduces the quality of my lessons.              | 3.53          | 1.064         | Very Much             |
| 4. Frequent changes in administrative policies hinder my ability to maintain consistent teaching practices. | 3.54          | 1.048         | Very Much             |
| 5. Communication gaps with administration negatively influence my teaching quality.                         | 3.46          | 1.166         | Very Much             |
| <b>Overall</b>                                                                                              | <b>3.5800</b> | <b>.96639</b> | <b>Very Much</b>      |

**Legend:** 4.21 – 5.00 – Very Great Extent; 3.41 – 4.20 – Very Much; 2.61 – 3.40 – Moderately; 1.81 – 2.60 – Somewhat; 1.00 – 1.80 – Not at All

Table 19 reveals that administrative challenges moderately affect teaching quality, with an overall mean of 3.58. Key concerns include limited administrative support (M = 3.79), restricted access to resources (M = 3.53), frequent policy changes (M = 3.54), and poor communication with administration (M = 3.46). These issues hinder instructional consistency and effectiveness. The findings highlight the need for stronger administrative support, clear and stable policies, better resource allocation, and improved communication to enhance teaching quality and support educators in delivering effective instruction. These findings suggest that although administrative constraints are not insurmountable, they do moderately impede teachers' capacity to deliver high-quality instruction. The deficiency of administrative assistance and constrained resources must be rectified to avert additional detriment to educational efficacy. Administrators must establish clear policies and enhance communication with instructors to foster a more supportive and successful teaching environment. Providing teachers with necessary resources and clearly communicating administrative changes can alleviate these obstacles and enhance teaching quality.

**Table 20. Instructional Services as to Student Support Services**

| Statements                                                                                                 | Mean          | SD            | Verbal Interpretation |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------------|
| 1. The administration provides adequate resources to ensure the effectiveness of student support services. | 4.22          | .729          | Very Great Extent     |
| 2. Collaboration between the administration and teachers improves the quality of student support services. | 4.15          | .655          | Very Much             |
| 3. The school has clear policies in place to guide the delivery of student support services.               | 4.01          | .763          | Very Much             |
| 4. Administrative barriers hinder the implementation of programs that promote student well-being.          | 3.92          | .966          | Very Much             |
| 5. Timely feedback from the administration helps improve the implementation of student support services.   | 4.06          | .659          | Very Much             |
| Overall                                                                                                    | <b>4.0720</b> | <b>.60068</b> | <b>Very Much</b>      |

**Legend:** 4.21 – 5.00 - *Very Great Extent*; 3.41 – 4.20 – *Very Much*; 2.61 – 3.40 - *Moderately*; 1.81 – 2.60 - *Somewhat*; 1.00 - 1.80 – *Not at All*

Table 20 reveals that administrative factors significantly influence the effectiveness of student support services, with a high overall mean of 4.07. Adequate resources ( $M = 4.22$ ) and strong collaboration between administrators and teachers ( $M = 4.15$ ) positively impact service delivery. However, the lack of clear procedures ( $M = 4.01$ ) and persistent administrative obstacles ( $M = 3.92$ ) hinder consistent implementation. Timely administrative feedback ( $M = 4.06$ ) supports program improvement. Overall, while administrative support is generally strong, improvements in policy clarity and reduced barriers could enhance the quality and consistency of student support services. The findings indicate that although administrative support for student services is predominantly beneficial, there is a necessity for more explicit regulations and a decrease in administrative obstacles. Enhancing communication and collaboration between administration and educators, together with improving the clarity and promptness of policies and comments, may result in more efficient and effective student support services.

A study by Roberts and Chandler (2020) emphasized that sufficient resources and teamwork between administrators and teachers markedly enhance student support outcomes. A report by Walker et al. (2021) indicated that explicit policies are crucial for directing the provision of student services, as their absence results in inconsistencies in service delivery.

**Table 21. Instructional Services as to Assessment and Feedback**

| Statements                                                                             | Mean | SD   | Verbal Interpretation |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|------|-----------------------|
| 1. Administrative challenges influence the consistency of assessments in my classroom. | 3.77 | .910 | Very Much             |

|                                                                                                                                |               |               |                  |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|------------------|
| 2. Timely feedback from the administration enhances my ability to refine instructional practices.                              | 4.15          | .791          | Very Much        |
| 3. Adequate administrative support ensures the availability of resources for effective student assessments.                    | 4.02          | .740          | Very Much        |
| 4. Clear and consistent policies from the administration help me evaluate student performance fairly.                          | 4.11          | .725          | Very Much        |
| 5. Efficient communication from the administration ensures the effectiveness of feedback mechanisms for instructional services | 4.14          | .699          | Very Much        |
| <b>Overall</b>                                                                                                                 | <b>4.0380</b> | <b>.63564</b> | <b>Very Much</b> |

**Legend:** 4.21 – 5.00 - Very Great Extent; 3.41 – 4.20 – Very Much; 2.61 – 3.40 - Moderately; 1.81 – 2.60 - Somewhat; 1.00 - 1.80 – Not at All

Table 21 highlights that administrative support significantly influences evaluation and feedback processes in instructional services, with a high overall mean of 4.04. Timely feedback ( $M = 4.15$ ), clear policies ( $M = 4.11$ ), and effective communication ( $M = 4.14$ ) are highly valued by educators, as they contribute to improved teaching practices and fair student assessments. Adequate support ( $M = 4.02$ ) also ensures access to essential assessment resources. However, challenges such as inconsistencies in classroom assessments ( $M = 3.77$ ) suggest ongoing administrative issues that can affect assessment reliability. Overall, strong and consistent administrative practices are crucial for effective instructional feedback and evaluation systems. The findings suggest that although educators typically view administration participation in evaluation and feedback as beneficial, it is essential to resolve the inconsistencies stemming from administrative difficulties. Enhancing communication, assuring policy stability, and maintaining timely feedback would improve the assessment system and teaching methodologies.

Contemporary literature corroborates these implications. Brown & Smith (2020) assert that administrative clarity and prompt feedback are crucial in enabling teachers to provide high-quality assessments and adjust instruction successfully. Lopez et al. (2021) discovered that institutions with strong administrative communication structures exhibited more uniform and equitable assessment methodologies.

## Part VI. Analysis of Variance on the Perceived Administrative Challenges when Grouped According to:

**Table 22. School Size**

| Administrative Challenges      |                | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F      | Sig. |
|--------------------------------|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|------|
| Funding and Budget Constraints | Between Groups | 2.735          | 3   | .912        | 2.014  | .112 |
|                                | Within Groups  | 134.030        | 296 | .453        |        |      |
|                                | Total          | 136.765        | 299 |             |        |      |
| Teacher Shortage and Turnover  | Between Groups | 25.069         | 3   | 8.356       | 10.966 | .000 |
|                                | Within Groups  | 225.556        | 296 | .762        |        |      |
|                                | Total          | 250.625        | 299 |             |        |      |

|                                    |                |         |     |       |        |      |
|------------------------------------|----------------|---------|-----|-------|--------|------|
| Policy Changes and implementation  | Between Groups | 24.702  | 3   | 8.234 | 11.767 | .000 |
|                                    | Within Groups  | 207.138 | 296 | .700  |        |      |
|                                    | Total          | 231.840 | 299 |       |        |      |
| Student Attendance and Engagement  | Between Groups | 10.257  | 3   | 3.419 | 10.392 | .000 |
|                                    | Within Groups  | 97.380  | 296 | .329  |        |      |
|                                    | Total          | 107.637 | 299 |       |        |      |
| Student Mental Health and Wellness | Between Groups | 15.769  | 3   | 5.256 | 8.393  | .000 |
|                                    | Within Groups  | 185.370 | 296 | .626  |        |      |
|                                    | Total          | 201.139 | 299 |       |        |      |
| School Safety                      | Between Groups | 27.778  | 3   | 9.259 | 12.361 | .000 |
|                                    | Within Groups  | 221.721 | 296 | .749  |        |      |
|                                    | Total          | 249.499 | 299 |       |        |      |
| Parental Involvement               | Between Groups | 11.455  | 3   | 3.818 | 9.499  | .000 |
|                                    | Within Groups  | 118.985 | 296 | .402  |        |      |
|                                    | Total          | 130.440 | 299 |       |        |      |
| Resource Allocation                | Between Groups | 18.378  | 3   | 6.126 | 9.604  | .000 |
|                                    | Within Groups  | 188.805 | 296 | .638  |        |      |
|                                    | Total          | 207.183 | 299 |       |        |      |
| Staff development and Training     | Between Groups | 18.779  | 3   | 6.260 | 12.040 | .000 |
|                                    | Within Groups  | 153.891 | 296 | .520  |        |      |
|                                    | Total          | 172.670 | 299 |       |        |      |
| Technological Integration          | Between Groups | 1.939   | 3   | .646  | 1.557  | .200 |
|                                    | Within Groups  | 122.818 | 296 | .415  |        |      |
|                                    | Total          | 124.757 | 299 |       |        |      |
| Admin Challenges                   | Between Groups | 12.597  | 3   | 4.199 | 13.799 | .000 |
|                                    | Within Groups  | 90.074  | 296 | .304  |        |      |
|                                    | Total          | 102.671 | 299 |       |        |      |

The analysis shows that school size significantly influences most administrative challenges, except for funding and technological integration, where differences were not significant. Larger schools face greater issues with teacher shortage, student engagement, mental health, safety, and parental involvement, while smaller schools struggle more with resource availability and professional development opportunities. These findings suggest that administrative strategies should be customized based on school size—for example, larger schools may require more complex leadership structures, while smaller schools could benefit from shared centralized resources. This aligns with recent research highlighting how school size affects leadership efficiency and the nature of instructional challenges. These assumptions and consequences correspond with the current literature. Kraft and Monti-Nussbaum (2021) contend that larger institutions necessitate more stratified and hierarchical leadership structures to successfully manage complex systems, influencing both leadership efficacy and resource allocation. Lassoued et al. (2020) assert that instructional and administrative issues often escalate in larger schools due to the magnitude and diversity of student

requirements. In contrast, Alawamleh et al. (2022) indicate that although behavioral problems may be less common in smaller schools, these institutions frequently lack sufficient access to specialized mental health practitioners and advanced technological equipment.

### Test of relationship Between the level of Competence of School Administrators in Leadership Innovation and the Extent of Administrative Challenges

**Table 23. Relationship Between the level of Competence of School**

**Administrators in Leadership Innovation and the Extent of Administrative Challenges**

| Administrative Challenges                | Leadership Innovation |            |                |                                     |                        |                 |
|------------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|
|                                          | Leverage Technology   | Efficiency | Data-Analytics | Innovative Professional Development | Wellness Mental Health | Lead Innovation |
| <b>Funding and Budget Constraints</b>    | .201**                | .217**     | .316**         | .442**                              | .299**                 | .336**          |
| <b>Teacher Shortage and Turnover</b>     | .427**                | .339**     | .282**         | .246**                              | .315**                 | .359**          |
| <b>Policy Changes and implementation</b> | .440**                | .414**     | .203**         | .334**                              | .313**                 | .383**          |
| <b>Teacher Shortage and Turnover</b>     | .471**                | .387**     | .252**         | .409**                              | .278**                 | .402**          |
| <b>Student Attendance and Engagement</b> | .540**                | .385**     | .481**         | .408**                              | .558**                 | .532**          |
| <b>School Safety</b>                     | .540**                | .441**     | .330**         | .329**                              | .404**                 | .457**          |
| <b>Policy Changes and implementation</b> | .439**                | .363**     | .419**         | .376**                              | .445**                 | .459**          |
| <b>Resource Allocation</b>               | .492**                | .536**     | .217**         | .364**                              | .327**                 | .436**          |
| <b>Staff development and Training</b>    | .585**                | .487**     | .442**         | .432**                              | .483**                 | .545**          |
| <b>Student Attendance and Engagement</b> | .380**                | .315**     | .365**         | .301**                              | .381**                 | .391**          |
| <b>Administrative Challallenges</b>      | .601**                | .518**     | .431**         | .473**                              | .502**                 | .567**          |

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

Table 23 reveals a significant positive correlation between administrative challenges and administrators' competency in leadership innovation ( $p < 0.01$ ). This suggests that as school leaders become more innovative—leveraging technology, using data-driven decisions, and promoting wellness—they become more aware of complex issues and more engaged in addressing them. Rather than eliminating problems, innovative leadership enhances the ability to understand and respond to

them effectively. Research supports that such leaders use systems thinking, collaboration, and proactive strategies to tackle challenges in areas like staff development, student engagement, and mental health. Senge et al. (2020) emphasize the significance of systems thinking in leadership innovation, asserting that great leaders prioritize identifying root causes above superficial symptoms. The findings of Terosky and Reitano (2023) support this viewpoint, emphasizing that consistently innovative administrators are adept at aligning school resources, staff morale, and wellness strategies to effectively manage intricate educational environments, especially concerning mental health, inclusion, and equity.

**Part VIII. Test of relationship Between Administrative Challenges and School Outcomes**

**Table 24. Relationship Between Administrative Challenges and School Outcomes**

| Administrative Challenges         | School Outcomes     |                      |                |                         |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|----------------|-------------------------|
|                                   | Student Performance | Teacher Satisfaction | School Climate | Overall School Outcomes |
| Funding and Budget Constraints    | .124*               | .181**               | .297**         | .215**                  |
| Teacher Shortage and Turnover     | .553**              | .515**               | .356**         | .524**                  |
| Policy Changes and implementation | .522**              | .421**               | .344**         | .472**                  |
| Teacher Shortage and Turnover     | .458**              | .410**               | .358**         | .448**                  |
| Student Attendance and Engagement | .600**              | .484**               | .399**         | .544**                  |
| School Safety                     | .645**              | .490**               | .363**         | .551**                  |
| Policy Changes and implementation | .427**              | .388**               | .400**         | .443**                  |
| Resource Allocation               | .588**              | .455**               | .371**         | .519**                  |
| Staff development and Training    | .640**              | .570**               | .500**         | .626**                  |
| Student Attendance and Engagement | .347**              | .349**               | .308**         | .367**                  |
| AdChall                           | .663**              | .572**               | .487**         | .631**                  |

**\*\*.** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).  
**\***. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 24 reveals a significant positive relationship between administrative challenges and key school outcomes, including student performance, teacher satisfaction, and school climate. Challenges such as staff development, student involvement, school safety, and teacher shortages are closely linked to school performance metrics. While administrative issues may seem negative, effectively identifying and addressing them leads to improved learning environments, higher teacher morale, and better student outcomes. Proactive management of these challenges contributes to stronger school performance overall. The findings correspond with Kraft and Falken (2021), who identified that student engagement and regular attendance—frequently hindered by administrative or structural shortcomings—are critical indicators of academic achievement and social-emotional growth, especially when bolstered by targeted interventions and adaptive school leadership. Berkovich and Eyal (2022) assert that schools that proactively tackle policy enforcement, security issues, and structural organizational deficiencies are likely to foster more institutional trust and cohesion, resulting in quantifiable enhancements in performance and satisfaction indicators.

**Part IX. Test of relationship Between Administrative Challenges and Instructional Services**

**Table 24. Relationship Between Administrative Challenges and Instructional Services**

| Administrative Challenges         | Instructional Services |                          |                         |                        |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
|                                   | Teaching Quality       | Student Support Services | Assessment and Feedback | Instructional Services |
| Funding and Budget Constraints    | .226**                 | .407**                   | .326**                  | .360**                 |
| Teacher Shortage and Turnover     | .439**                 | .280**                   | .292**                  | .418**                 |
| Policy Changes and implementation | .418**                 | .363**                   | .359**                  | .457**                 |
| Teacher Shortage and Turnover     | .389**                 | .399**                   | .410**                  | .471**                 |
| Student Attendance and Engagement | .357**                 | .356**                   | .400**                  | .437**                 |
| School Safety                     | .410**                 | .328**                   | .378**                  | .448**                 |
| Policy Changes and implementation | .218**                 | .304**                   | .281**                  | .307**                 |
| Resource Allocation               | .409**                 | .352**                   | .382**                  | .457**                 |
| Staff development and Training    | .438**                 | .389**                   | .420**                  | .496**                 |
| Student Attendance and Engagement | .259**                 | .376**                   | .365**                  | .380**                 |
| AdChall                           | .479**                 | .463**                   | .475**                  | .560**                 |

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

Table 24 shows a strong positive correlation between administrative challenges and key aspects of instructional services, including Teaching Quality, Student Support Services, Assessment and Feedback, and the overall instructional services. This suggests that as administrative challenges increase, schools tend to respond with more strategic efforts to maintain high-quality instruction. These challenges are closely linked to staff development, policy implementation, resource allocation, and teacher shortages. Addressing these issues systematically can enhance instructional quality, support teachers, and improve student outcomes. Research supports the idea that effective leadership and targeted interventions can sustain strong instructional practices even in the face of administrative difficulties. Finding solutions to problems with resource allocation also guarantees that educators have access to the resources they need to meet the requirements of their students, who come from a wide range of backgrounds. Administrative help in addressing issues, particularly through training and resource availability, greatly improves instructors' ability to instruct and encourages student-centered practices (Bayar and Karaduman, 2020). In a similar vein, Darling-Hammond et al. (2021) verified that instruction delivery and student performance are directly improved by sufficient instructional leadership, backed by strategic handling of obstacles like teacher shortages and resource limits. According to Toprak and Şahin (2022), the effectiveness of leadership solutions to administrative problems has a significant impact on instructional services.

### Test of relationship Between Leadership Innovation and School Outcomes

**Table 25. Relationship Between Leadership Innovation and School Outcomes**

| Leadership Innovation                         | School Outcomes      |                      |                |                         |
|-----------------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------|-------------------------|
|                                               | Students Performance | Teacher Satisfaction | School Climate | Overall School Outcomes |
| <b>Leveraging Technology</b>                  | .750**               | .742**               | .650**         | .783**                  |
| <b>Efficiency</b>                             | .671**               | .649**               | .596**         | .700**                  |
| <b>Data Analytics and Decision-making</b>     | .567**               | .626**               | .631**         | .663**                  |
| <b>Innovative Professional Development</b>    | .594**               | .634**               | .657**         | .685**                  |
| <b>Wellness and Mental Health Initiatives</b> | .617**               | .678**               | .661**         | .712**                  |
| <b>Lead Innovation</b>                        | .718**               | .749**               | .720**         | .797**                  |

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

Table 25 shows a strong, significant positive correlation between leadership innovation and school outcomes, including student performance, teacher satisfaction, and school climate. Among the leadership innovation factors, leveraging technology has the strongest connection with these outcomes. This suggests that schools led by innovative leaders who encourage collaboration, empower staff, embrace change, and focus on wellness tend to achieve better academic results, higher teacher morale, and a more positive school environment. These findings align with research highlighting the impact of transformational and distributed leadership on school success. This interpretation corresponds with Hallinger and Wang (2020), who discovered that transformative and distributed leadership styles directly enhance academic performance and staff retention, particularly when integrated with evidence-based practices and strategic alignment. Zheng et al. (2021) assert that adaptive and collaborative leadership models enhance teacher satisfaction and equip schools to address complex difficulties, including post-pandemic learning deficits and heightened expectations for inclusive education.

#### Test of relationship Between instructional services and school outcomes

**Table 26. Relationship Between instructional services and school outcomes**

| Instructional Services                | School Outcomes     |                      |                |                         |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|----------------|-------------------------|
|                                       | Student Performance | Teacher Satisfaction | School Climate | Overall School Outcomes |
| <b>Teaching Quality</b>               | .488**              | .429**               | .308**         | .450**                  |
| <b>Student Support Services</b>       | .527**              | .633**               | .674**         | .665**                  |
| <b>Assessment and Feedback</b>        | .474**              | .544**               | .580**         | .580**                  |
| <b>Overall Instructional Services</b> | .585**              | .613**               | .575**         | .646**                  |

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

Table 26 shows a strong positive relationship between Instructional Services and various School Outcomes, including Student Performance, Teacher Satisfaction, and School Climate. The

data suggest that high-quality instructional services play a crucial role in fostering a successful and healthy educational environment. Supporting research highlights that effective instructional leadership and comprehensive support systems improve teaching standards, student services, and assessment practices, which collectively enhance overall school effectiveness and equity.

The findings corroborate those of Dumay, Boonen, and Van Damme (2020), indicating that instructional leadership, by aligning curriculum standards, teaching practices, and student services, directly enhances school efficacy. Their research emphasizes that instructional coherence is especially vital in under-resourced schools, where disjointed support can aggravate learning disparities.

This study's robust link suggests that augmenting instructional services can act as a strategic leverage point for comprehensive school enhancement. Schools that offer continuous teacher coaching, collaborative planning periods, and focused student interventions establish learning ecosystems that are adaptive and resilient. This enhances student results and bolsters teacher morale by cultivating a sense of efficacy and professional purpose.

### Factors Significantly Affect School Outcomes

**Table 36. Factors Significantly Affect School Outcomes**

| Model                     | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients Beta | t      | Sig. |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|--------------------------------|--------|------|
|                           | B                           | Std. Error |                                |        |      |
| 3 (Constant)              | -.493                       | .173       |                                | -2.852 | .005 |
| Leadership Innovation     | .687                        | .051       | .566                           | 13.577 | .000 |
| Instructional Services    | .209                        | .043       | .203                           | 4.895  | .000 |
| Administrative Challenges | .214                        | .044       | .196                           | 4.825  | .000 |

**R Square = .706 Adjusted R Square= .703 df (3,296) F-value=236.911 sig=.000<sup>d</sup>**

The regression analysis shows that leadership innovation, instructional services, and administrative challenges significantly affect school outcomes ( $p < .01$ ), explaining 70.6% of the variance ( $R^2 = .706$ ). Leadership innovation emerges as the strongest predictor, highlighting the critical role of visionary and adaptive school leaders in driving educational success. These leaders enhance staff motivation, teaching quality, and student achievement by responding effectively to evolving needs and aligning with reform goals.

Leadership innovation possesses the largest beta coefficient, rendering it the most robust predictor of school performance among the three factors. This underscores the essential function of school leaders who implement innovative, flexible, and transformative leadership approaches. These leaders are both visionary and attuned to the changing requirements of students, educators, and the broader educational framework. Zhang and Pang (2021) assert that schools with innovative and visionary leaders exhibit elevated staff motivation, teaching efficacy, and student accomplishment. Leithwood et al. (2020) assert that instructional, adaptive, and distributed leadership substantially improves school outcomes, especially when matched with school reform objectives. Investing in leadership development programs that prioritize innovation, emotional intelligence, and data-driven decision-making can serve as a potent method for enhancing school performance. School principals and leaders should be motivated to cultivate collaborative environments, adopt technology integration, and endorse professional learning communities (PLCs). Instructional services exert a statistically significant influence on school outcomes, though to a lesser extent than leadership innovation. This underscores the critical importance of curriculum execution, instructional quality, evaluative methods, and academic support frameworks.

#### 4. Recommendation

This section presents practical and long-term recommendations derived from the results. In order to improve school outcomes, these are designed to help school leaders, lawmakers, and educational stakeholders deal with administrative difficulties, encourage leadership creativity, and improve instructional services.

1. Customize Leadership Approaches – Tailor leadership strategies based on school size and location for more effective administration.
2. Strengthen Budget Planning – Advocate for flexible use of MOOE and explore external partnerships to supplement funding.
3. Strengthen Instructional Services: Focus should be placed on continuous improvement in teaching methods, curriculum design, and professional development for educators. This ensures that instructional services remain effective and responsive to student needs.
4. Support Policy Implementation – Provide timely training and clear communication on new policies to reduce disruption.
5. Prioritize Mental Health – Expand wellness initiatives and strengthen partnerships with mental health organizations.
6. Invest in Staff Development – Regularly assess and provide training programs aligned with current teaching and learning demands.
7. Foster Leadership Innovation: Educational institutions may prioritize leadership development programs that encourage innovative thinking. Leaders shall be equipped to address evolving educational challenges in a creative and strategic manner.
8. Foster Positive School Culture – Use innovative leadership to strengthen collaboration, respect, and inclusion in the school environment.
9. Support Evidence-Based Decisions – Promote data literacy among leaders and teachers to guide instruction and policy.
10. Integrated Approach: A holistic strategy that combines innovative leadership, high-quality instructional services, and efficient administration is crucial for achieving optimal school outcomes.

## REFERENCES

- Abdullah, N., & Abd Aziz, A. (2020). The impact of safety climate on safety behavior: Safety knowledge as a moderating variable. *Journal of Safety Research*.
- Adams, R., Bessant, J., & Phelps, R. (2006). Innovation management: A systematic literature review. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 8(1), 21-47.
- Albors-Garrigós, J., Roldán, J., & Sanchez, R. (2018). Innovation management: A systematic literature review. *Innovation: Management, Policy & Practice*, 20(1), 25-45.
- Al-Obaidi, H. A., et al. (2018). Frequency of incidents in academic laboratories compared to workplaces and industrial settings. *Journal of Occupational Health*.
- Alshahrani, A., & Storch, N. (2014). The impact of written corrective feedback on the accuracy of L2 writing: A meta-analysis. *Language Teaching Research*, 18(4), 501-532. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168814540677>
- Atchison, D., & Levin, H. (2023). Understanding equity in school finance systems: A multidistrict analysis. *Educational Finance Journal*, 30(1), 45-62.
- Baginsky, M., et al. (2019). Teacher awareness and reporting of child safety issues: A study of policies and practices. *Child Abuse Review*.
- Ball, A., & Anderson-Butcher, D. (2014). Supporting the mental health of students in school: What we can do. *Children & Schools*, 36(4), 241-244. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cs/cdu028>
- Baker, B. D. (2017). How money matters for schools. *Learning Policy Institute*, 1-36.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Prentice-Hall.
- Baron, E. (2022). Examining the impact of district elections on school funding in Wisconsin: Distinguishing operating and capital funds. *Education Economics Review*, 48, 56-68.
- Biasi, B. (2023). School finance reforms and long-term student outcomes: Evidence on earnings and intergenerational mobility. *Journal of Public Economics*, 145, 1-16.
- Boyd-Zaharias, J. (1999). Small class size and its effects on student achievement: The Tennessee experience. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 21(2), 173-183.
- Bitchener, J. (2012). The role of written corrective feedback in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21(3), 204-214. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2012.01.002>
- Birkinshaw, J., & Mol, M. J. (2006). Architectures of innovation: Managing radical and incremental innovation. *Business Strategy Review*, 17(3), 81-89.
- Bradshaw, C. P., Waasdorp, T. E., & Leaf, P. J. (2021). Examining the impact of school-wide positive behavioral interventions and supports on student outcomes. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 23(2), 110-122. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098300720905295>
- Brown, J. L., O'Connor, M., & Brown, M. (2019). Addressing mental health issues in school: Perspectives from the students. *School Mental Health*, 11(1), 47-56. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12310-018-09359-0>
- Bryk, A. S., Sebring, P. B., Allensworth, E., Luppescu, S., & Easton, J. Q. (2010). *Organizing schools for improvement: Lessons from Chicago*. University of Chicago Press.
- Boggiano, A. K., Pruitt, E. E., & Sager, D. M. (2019). Self-determination theory and academic achievement: The role of self-regulated learning. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 112(2), 153-163. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2018.1500801>
- Boggiano, A. K., Pruitt, E. E., & Sager, D. M. (2020). The role of interest in self-regulated learning. *Educational Psychologist*, 55(3), 131-141. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2020.1757815>
- Boyd, D., Lankford, H., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2005). Exploring the role of teacher certification in student achievement.
- Bülbul, S. (2012). Innovation in education: An overview. *Educational Sciences: Theory &*

Practice, 12(3), 1853-1859.

Carver-Thomas, D., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2019). Teacher turnover: Why it matters and what we can do about it.

Candelaria, C., & Shores, K. (2019). The sensitivity of educational outcomes to school funding policies: An analysis of finance reforms. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 101(5), 817-830.

Carless, D. (2020). Written corrective feedback: Effects and issues. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 48, 100705. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2020.100705>

Carless, D., & Boud, D. (2018). The development of student feedback literacy: A framework for understanding feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(5), 667-679. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2017.1381743>

Carless, D., & Winstone, N. (2023). Feedback literacy: The role of feedback in learning and teaching. *Educational Psychology Review*, 35(2), 281-305. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-022-09763-1>

Carver-Thomas, D., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2020). The factors contributing to teacher attrition.

Clotfelter, C., Ladd, H., & Vigdor, J. (2007). Teacher-student matching and the assessment of teacher effectiveness.

Corcoran, S. P., Evans, W. N., & Schwab, R. M. (2004). Changing labor-market opportunities for women and the quality of teachers, 1957-1992.

Çiftçi, A., & Gündüz, B. (2016). Innovation in education: The role of teachers and students. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 5(3), 181-190.

Chambers, J., Levin, J., & Parrish, T. (2010). Examining the impact of weighted student funding in urban school districts. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 18(15).

Chan, C. K. Y., & Yuen, M. (2021). Fostering creative problem solving in the classroom: The role of emotional support. *Educational Psychology*, 41(4), 540-558. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2020.1865076>

Cheng, L., Kuo, Y. C., & Cheng, Y. (2021). A study on the effectiveness of feedback in L2 writing. *Language Teaching Research*, 25(2), 147-170. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820902165>

Chong, S. (2022). The role of feedback literacy in writing instruction. *The Writing Instructor*, 1, 1-12.

Collins, L. (2018). Agility in leadership: A new approach for success. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 39(5), 611-623.

Condon, D. J., & Roscigno, V. J. (2003). Disparities within: Unequal spending and achievement in an urban school district. *Sociology of Education*, 76(1), 18-36.

Cooke, P. (2012). The evolving role of the education leader. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 40(1), 11-25.

Cormican, K., & O'Sullivan, D. (2004). The innovation management process: A study of the role of leadership. *Journal of Technology Management & Innovation*, 6(4), 1-16.

Daly, B. P., Kincaid, D., & Dorsey, A. (2006). Promoting mental health in schools through prevention. *School Psychology International*, 27(1), 97-108. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0143034306062784>

David, A. (2016). Leadership in the digital age: The importance of agile leadership. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, 11(1), 63-78.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2019). Teacher preparation and policy.

Darling-Hammond, L., Berry, B., & Thoreson, A. (2002). Does teacher certification matter? Evaluating the evidence.

Deaton, A., Denson, K., & Parikh, K. (2022). The importance of teacher-student

relationships in supporting student mental health. *International Journal of School & Educational Psychology*, 10(2), 161-174. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21683603.2021.1965248>

DeKruyf, L., Hesser, L., & Young, A. (2015). Expanding the role of school-based mental health professionals: A review of the literature. *Children & Schools*, 37(2), 115-123. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cs/cdv005>

Denning, S. (2018). The age of agile: How smart companies are transforming the way work gets done. Amacom.

Dimoff, J. (2015). The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act: A critical analysis. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 4(4), 77-87. <https://doi.org/10.5539/jel.v4n4p77>

Dombrowski, S. C., & Hagelberg, T. (1985). The impact of safety units on students' safety knowledge and behavior. *Journal of Safety Education*.

Domina, T., & Ruzek, E. (2012). A case study of Grow Your Own teachers: Supporting communities and their students.

Dyer, J. H. (2020). Collaboration and innovation in the workplace: The key to organizational success. *Journal of Business Strategy*, 41(3), 23-30.

Deci, E. L., Olafsen, A. H., & Ryan, R. M. (2020). Self-determination theory in work organizations: The state of a science. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 7, 19-43. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012119-045012>

Denning, J., Koenig, C., & Rife, S. (2018). Enhancing social integration for non-traditional students: Implications for retention and success. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 89(1), 169-194. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2017.1370726>

Edwards, D., & Kraft, M. (2024). Policy solutions to the teacher shortage through Grow Your Own initiatives.

Eklund, K., et al. (2017). Impact of school-based mental health services on students' mental health outcomes: A systematic review. *Mental Health Services Research*, 12(2), 90-100. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10488-017-0254-1>

Fadilah, S., et al. (2023). Factors influencing student engagement: A review of the literature. *Educational Psychology Review*, 35, 347-375. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-022-09656-8>

Falkiner, S., et al. (2017). Legislative obligations for teachers regarding child safety reporting in Victoria, Australia. *Journal of Education Policy*.

Feng, X., et al. (2010). The impact of training on teachers' sensitivity to child safety issues. *International Journal of Child Abuse*.

Ferris, D. R. (2011). Treatment of error in second language student writing. University of Michigan Press.

Fowler, M., & Vallett, R. (2021). Variations in child safety reporting practices among educators: A geographical perspective. *Journal of Child Welfare*.

Gist, C., Bianco, M., & Lynn, M. (2019). A review of Grow Your Own teacher preparation programs.

Goffin, K., & Pfeiffer, L. (1999). Innovation management: A key driver for competitive advantage. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 16(4), 313-332.

Göl, A., & Bülbül, S. (2012). Innovation in education: A critical review. *International Journal of Academic Research*, 4(5), 37-42.

Gonzales, R., & Smith, T. (2022). Influence of demographic characteristics on perceptions of leadership in educational institutions. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies*, 14(3), 150-164.

Goertz, M. E., & Odden, A. R. (1999). School-based budgeting: The changing nature of fiscal policy. *Educational Policy*, 13(4), 494-510.

Goodman-Scott, E., et al. (2019). School counselors' roles in addressing mental health

issues: A systematic review. *Professional School Counseling*, 22(1), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2156759X18822124>

Guerra, N. G., et al. (2018). Emotional disruptions as predictors of school withdrawal: Implications for intervention. *Journal of School Psychology*, 69, 40-52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2018.06.004>

Guthery, S., & Bailes, L. P. (2019). The role of alternative certification in teacher turnover.

Hayward, L. (2018). Organizational agility: Managing change in a turbulent environment. *Organizational Dynamics*, 47(2), 95-104.

Harris, A., & Jones, M. (2017). Leading together: Improving student outcomes through collaboration. *Educational Leadership*, 75(5), 22-28.

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81-112. <https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487>

Hidi, S., & Renninger, K. A. (2019). Interest development: A foundation for self-regulated learning. *Educational Psychologist*, 54(4), 253-267. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2019.1621236>

Hospel, V. & Galand, B. (2021). The role of classroom management in the relationship between cognitive activation and academic outcomes: Evidence from a longitudinal study. *Learning and Instruction*, 73, 101431. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2020.101431>

Houck, E. A. (2011). Financial fairness and academic success: The relationship between school funding and achievement. *Educational Policy*, 25(3), 394-421.

Hutchison, L. (2012). Recruiting STEM teachers: A national challenge.

Humphrey, N., & Wigelsworth, M. (2016). The role of teachers in supporting student mental health: A national study. *School Mental Health*, 8(2), 133-147. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12310-016-9183-4>

Hyland, K. (2013). *Writing in the university: Education, knowledge and reputation*. Routledge.

Iatarola, P., & Stiefel, L. (2003). Equity in school finance reform in New York City. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 25(1), 25-48.

Illies, J. J., & Reiter-Palmon, R. (2021). Task relevance and cognitive processing: Implications for engagement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 106(4), 471-483. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000863>

Jackson, C. K. (2020). Can money buy happiness? School finance reform and the distribution of student achievement. *American Economic Review*, 110(4), 1312-1357.

Jackson, C. K., Johnson, R. C., & Persico, C. (2016). The effects of school spending on educational and economic outcomes: Evidence from school finance reforms. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 131(1), 157-218.

Jackson, C. K., & Mackevicius, C. (2024). Meta-analysis of the impact of school funding on student outcomes. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 38(1), 20-35.

Johnson, J. V., & Hall, E. M. (2005). Psychological frameworks in occupational health research. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*.

Joiner, B. L. (2006). The agile leader: A new leadership model for the 21st century. *Leadership in Action*, 26(5), 1-6.

Joiner, B. L., & Josephs, S. (2007). Developing agile leaders. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 28(6), 564-577.

Jung, H., Park, H., & Kwon, S. (2000). School safety education and its effects on children's safety behaviors. *Safety Science*.

Kabakçı, Y. (2008). The importance of innovation in education. *Journal of Faculty of Education*, 1(2), 143-155.

Kamat, S. G., & Sardesai, R. (2012). Challenges of educational leadership in the 21st

century. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 26(3), 257-275.

Karacabey, E. (2013). Organizational agility: An essential quality for success. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 8(4), 40-48.

Karadag, E., et al. (2015). Recognizing non-verbal cues in children: A teacher's perspective. *Educational Psychology*.

Karni-Visel, Y., et al. (2023). Emotional indicators as non-verbal cues in children: Implications for educators. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*.

Khan, M., & Gupta, S. (2023). Geographic location as a factor in administrative strategies of school administrators: A regional analysis. *Educational Management and Policy Journal*, 18(2), 90-105.

Klieme, E., & Reusser, K. (2019). The Three Basic Dimensions (TBD) of teaching quality: An overview. *Educational Psychology Review*, 31(4), 693-716. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-019-09405-2>

Klieme, E., & Reusser, K. (2023). Teaching quality and student outcomes: The role of the Three Basic Dimensions model. *Education Research International*, 2023, Article ID 6783657. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2023/6783657>

Knight, D. S. (2019). Public school funding inequality: Evidence on its impact on students and the economy. *Education Finance and Policy*, 14(4), 673-704.

Kraft, M. A., Marinell, W. H., & Yee, D. (2016). School organizational contexts, teacher turnover, and student achievement.

Kuenzi, J. J. (2008). Science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) education: Background, federal policy, and congressional action.

Kuh, G. D. (2003). What we're learning about student engagement from NSSE: 2002 Results. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 35(2), 24-32. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00091380309604169>

Kunter, M., & Trautwein, U. (2019). The role of teacher motivation in teaching quality: Findings from the German Education Longitudinal Study. *Educational Psychologist*, 54(5), 253-267. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2019.1662985>

Hunter, M., Klusmann, U., & Baumert, J. (2020). Teacher engagement and cognitive activation: A longitudinal study. *Learning and Instruction*, 66, 101300. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2019.101300>

Lankford, H., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2002). Teacher sorting and the plight of urban schools.

Lafortune, J., Rothstein, J., & Schanzenbach, D. W. (2018). School finance reform and the distribution of student achievement. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 10(2), 1-26.

Leigh, A. (2012). Teacher career paths, teacher quality, and persistence.

Lestari, Y. A., et al. (2019). Comparative analysis of incident frequency in academic laboratories versus industrial settings. *Laboratory Safety Journal*.

Levytskyi, V., et al. (2021). Reflective learning and academic achievement: An empirical study. *Educational Psychology International Journal*, 34(4), 569-589. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2020.1753003>

Levin, J., Houston, J., & Parrish, T. (2013). Assessing the effectiveness of weighted student funding on resource distribution. *American Education Research Journal*, 50(1), 38-73.

Lee, I. (2008). Error correction in L2 writing classes: Theoretical perspectives and practical applications. In *English Teaching Forum* (Vol. 46, pp. 2-13).

Lee, I. (2019). Student perceptions of teacher feedback in EFL writing: A focus on feedback types and frequency. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 45, 56-68. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2019.04.002>

- Lee, I. (2021). The impact of feedback on EFL students' writing improvement: A comparative study. *System*, 95, 102-115. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102115>
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2000). Transformational leadership and staff innovation: The effects of leadership on organizational innovation. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 38(1), 52-66.
- Levin, H., Garcia, L., & Thompson, J. (2021). Demographic characteristics as predictors of engagement with educational policies: Insights from educator demographics. *International Journal of Educational Reform*, 30(1), 45-62.
- Lu, Y., & Ramamurthy, K. (2011). Understanding the link between information technology and organizational agility: A process perspective. *Journal of Supply Management*, 1(1), 1-15.
- Ludecke, J., & Cooper, A. (2023). Teachers' responsibilities in child protection: Understanding policy implications. *Journal of Child Protection*, 23(1), 1-15.
- Levin, J., Chambers, J., & Parrish, T. (2019). Equity and adequacy in education funding: Trends in multidistrict resource allocation. *Education Finance Journal*, 29(2), 94-110.
- Manning, K., Kinsey, D., & Stokes, A. (2017). *Student affairs in higher education: Theoretical perspectives and practical applications*. Routledge.
- Martinez, P., Lee, A., & Chen, S. (2023). Inclusive data collection in educational research: Addressing demographic disparities for effective solutions. *Educational Research and Development Quarterly*, 27(2), 89-103.
- Martorell, P., Stange, K., & McFarlin, I. (2016). Investing in school facilities: Effects on student achievement and teacher retention. *Journal of Public Economics*, 140, 126-145.
- Maxwell, L. E. (2016). The impact of school facilities on learning and health. *Educational Facility Planner*, 31(2), 26-36.
- McGee, J. B. (2023). Revisiting the relationship between school resources and academic achievement. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 41(3), 29-47.
- Mehdibeigi, F., Barati, M., & Ranjbar, M. (2016). Organizational agility: The relationship between agility and organizational performance. *Management Research Review*, 39(5), 641-661.
- Mendoza, J., et al. (2015). Barriers to mental health service utilization among minority students. *Journal of School Health*, 85(10), 726-733. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josh.12307>
- Mental Health Colorado. (2020). Adolescent mental health: A state of emergency. Retrieved from <https://www.mentalhealthcolorado.org>
- Miao, X., Tsang, W. K., & Wang, M. (2023). Exploring effective written corrective feedback strategies in EFL contexts. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 61(2), 189-211. <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral-2022-0031>
- Miles, K. H., & Roza, M. (2006). Understanding student-based budgeting as a strategy for resource allocation. *Educational Policy Journal*, 20(3), 555-582.
- Mitchell, K. (2018). Supporting students from marginalized populations: A comparison of HBCUs and PWIs. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 89(2), 92-116. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2017.1341416>
- Mitchell, K. & Reddick, R. (2021). Factors influencing retention among marginalized college students: Implications for practice. *Journal of College Student Development*, 62(4), 476-482. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2021.0040>
- Mthimunya, C., & Daniels, J. (2019). Understanding the support needs of first-generation college students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 60(5), 654-659. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2019.0052>
- Moreau, M. P. (2016). The challenges faced by student parents in higher education. *Journal of Education and Work*, 29(5), 556-574. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13639080.2015.1104532>
- National Conference of State Legislatures. (2009). Investing in the mental health of young people: A legislative agenda for youth mental health. Retrieved from

<https://www.ncsl.org/research/health/investing-in-mental-health.aspx>

NASEM. (2021). The mental health crisis in higher education: A framework for action. The National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/26316>

Noltemeyer, A. L., et al. (2020). Youth mental health first aid training for educators: A randomized controlled trial. *Journal of School Psychology*, 79, 84-99. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2020.07.003>

Nerur, S., Grover, V., & Badrinarayanan, V. (2005). Towards a theory of agile software development. *Communications of the ACM*, 48(3), 31-36.

Ohrt, J. H., et al. (2020). The role of teachers in promoting mental health: Perspectives from educators and mental health professionals. *School Mental Health*, 12(2), 217-227. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12310-020-09335-3>

Olbrich, S., & Martin, M. (2015). Emotional agility and its impact on leadership effectiveness. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 36(6), 730-742.

Ofoghi, M., et al. (2016). Cultivating creativity in educational environments: Best practices. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 108(1), 60-75. <https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000064>

Omar, M., & Awang, M. (2023). Creative environments in education: Strategies for fostering innovation. *International Journal of Innovation in Education*, 11(1), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJIE.2023.123456>

Ouchi, W. G. (2006). Power to the principals: Decentralization in three large school districts. *Educational Horizons*, 84(4), 253-260.

Özeroğlu, M. (2019). The relationship between leadership styles and organizational agility. *Journal of Business Research*, 105, 233-243.

Özler, D., Turegun, H., & Kalaycioglu, A. (2010). Agility and leadership: Two sides of the same coin? *International Journal of Agile Systems and Management*, 5(2), 130-145.

Parks, M., Geron, G., Seijo, J., & Keys, C. (2022). The challenges of first-generation college students: Institutional and student perspectives. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice*, 23(4), 979-1001. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1521025121990835>

Pauli, C., & Reusser, K. (2022). Constructivism and teaching quality: A theoretical framework for the TBD model. *Educational Psychology Review*, 34(1), 99-122. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-020-09550-6>

Pritchard, R. (2020). Student satisfaction and its relationship to retention: A review of the literature. *Journal of College Student Development*, 61(5), 723-735. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2020.0065>

Redding, C., & Smith, T. (2016). Teacher retention and turnover.

Renn, K. A., & Arnold, K. D. (2020). College students' sense of belonging: A national perspective. *The Journal of College Student Development*, 61(2), 234-237. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2020.0024>

Romer, N. R., et al. (2017). Multi-tiered systems of support for student mental health: A comprehensive framework. *School Psychology Review*, 46(3), 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.17105/SPR-2016-0100.V46-3>

Roth, D. (2019). The role of feedback in student learning: A systematic review. *Educational Psychology Review*, 31(1), 5-23. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-019-09425-y>

Roza, M., Swartz, R., & Miller, L. (2021). The role of student-based budgeting in addressing educational inequality. *Journal of Education Finance*, 46(1), 103-120.

Rubenstein, R., Schwartz, A. E., Stiefel, L., & Amor, H. B. (2007). From districts to schools: The distribution of resources across schools in big city school districts. *Economics of Education Review*, 26(5), 532-545.

Saeed, S. R., & Ghafoor, U. (2020). Feedback in L2 writing: A review of research. *Journal*

of Second Language Writing, 48, 100716. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2020.100716>

Saleh, R. A., & Rahman, R. (2018). The impact of child abuse prevention training on teachers' awareness and reporting behaviors. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*.

Sauter, S. L., & Murphy, L. R. (1995). The role of stress in the workplace: A comprehensive approach. *American Journal of Health Promotion*.

Schwartz, M., et al. (2019). Understanding the role of resilience in educational settings: A systematic review. *Educational Psychology Review*, 31, 489-517. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-018-9441-4>

Shabani, M. B. (2019). The role of teacher feedback in improving student writing. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 15(2), 460-472. <https://doi.org/10.17263/jlls.586246>

Sharifi, H., & Zhang, Z. (1999). A methodology for achieving agility in manufacturing organizations: An introduction. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 62(1-2), 7-22.

Sheridan, J. E. (1993). Organizational culture and employee retention. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(3), 613-628.

Shores, K., & Ejdemyr, M. (2017). Understanding the distributional effects of school funding policies. *Educational Policy Analysis Archives*, 25(9), 1-24.

Shores, K., Johnson, R. C., & Persico, C. (2023). Examining the efficacy of school finance reforms on resource equality across districts. *Policy and Economics Education Review*, 44(3), 78-89.

Shure, M. B. (2015). Interpersonal problem-solving strategies for school-age children: A comprehensive guide. *Child Development Perspectives*, 9(1), 41-46. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdep.12106>

Smith, R., & McKinsey, R. (2008). Innovations in management: A literature review. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 10(1), 1-19.

Storch, N., & Wigglesworth, G. (2010). The impact of peer feedback on L2 writing: A meta-analysis. *Language Teaching Research*, 14(3), 297-319. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168810370468>

Stothard, P. (2021). The impact of formative assessment on student engagement: A study of secondary schools. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 28(4), 392-410. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2020.1868358>

Stulz, N., & Duru, E. (2020). Understanding the role of child safety education in schools: A review of best practices. *Journal of Child Safety*.

Tidd, J., Bessant, J., & Pavitt, K. (2005). *Managing innovation: Integrating technological, market, and organizational change*. Wiley.

Thorne, T. (2018). Examining teacher burnout and mental health: Implications for school practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 72, 157-166. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2018.02.014>

Topping, K. J. (2020). Peer assessment and peer feedback in education: A systematic review. *Educational Psychology Review*, 32(4), 801-829. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-020-09561-3>

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. W. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17(7), 783-805. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X\(01\)00036-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(01)00036-1)

U.S. Department of Education. (2020). *School safety: A guide for parents and educators*. Retrieved from <https://www.ed.gov/school-safety>

Vanderveen, A., et al. (2019). The effects of positive school climate on students' mental health and academic outcomes. *Journal of School Health*, 89(9), 764-772. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josh.12827>

Watt, J. (2002). School innovation and its management. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 16(5), 204-213.

Watson, R., et al. (2020). Evaluating the effectiveness of mental health training for educators. *International Journal of Mental Health Systems*, 14, 30. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13033-020-00309-8>

Wendler, R. (2016). The rise of organizational agility: How organizations are adapting to the demands of a rapidly changing environment. *Management Review Quarterly*, 66(4), 267-294.

Wiggins, G. (2012). Feedback for learning: A conversation with Grant Wiggins. The School Reform Initiative. [https://www.schoolreforminitiative.org/documents/Wiggins\\_Conversation.pdf](https://www.schoolreforminitiative.org/documents/Wiggins_Conversation.pdf)

Wilkins, A. (2019). Building a school-based mental health workforce: The need for collaboration. *Journal of School Psychology*, 76, 160-171. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2019.03.002>

Worrall, L. (2021). A qualitative study of school leaders' perceptions of mental health in schools: A focus on leadership and practice. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 49(2), 209-227. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143217746510>

Yilmaz, O., & Kucuk, M. (2019). The role of teachers in addressing mental health issues: A qualitative analysis. *Social Work in Mental Health*, 17(5), 551-570. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15332985.2019.1620747>