

Role of school governance council: Its influence on school leaders' leadership practices

Michelle V. Gapoy, LPT^a, Anicia S. Madarang, EdD^b

^a*michellegapoy@mabinicolleges.edu.ph, michellegapoy@gmail.com*

^b*aniciamadarang@mabinicollege.edu.ph*

*Mabini Colleges, Inc., Governor Panotes Avenue,
Daet, Camarines Norte, 4600, Philippines*

Abstract

This quantitative descriptive-correlational study determined the influence of the School Governance Council (SGC) on leadership practices among two hundred sixty-four respondents in Labo East District, Schools Division of Camarines Norte. Utilizing total enumeration and purposive sampling methods, data were gathered via a validated questionnaire and analyzed using weighted mean and Spearman's rho. The findings revealed that the SGC exerts a highly influential impact on leadership practices, particularly in decision-making and building linkages (weighted mean of 3.51). Furthermore, SGC roles are always implemented, with linkage-building obtaining the highest overall rating (3.57). A strong, positive, and statistically significant relationship exists between SGC role implementation and leadership effectiveness, demonstrating the strongest correlations in decision-making ($\rho=.825$) and resource generation ($\rho=.824$). The primary challenges hindering effective governance include insufficient training, severe time constraints, and low stakeholder participation, while coordination issues were the least encountered. Consequently, the study concludes that the SGC serves as a pivotal strategic partner that promotes inclusive administration, excelling in consultative and legislative roles rather than in technical operational execution. Although participatory governance is effectively institutionalized, structural and technical barriers restrict optimal functionality, indicating a willing but under-equipped council. To sustain governance effectiveness, the study recommends prioritizing high-level legislative roles, utilizing simplified visual data dashboards, and integrating SGC engagement metrics into formal leadership evaluations. Most notably, the Division Office should implement flexible digital modules, and school heads must institutionalize the proposed Project SGC-LEAD to systematically overcome capacity limitations through adaptive micro-learning protocols and blended governance frameworks. Future researchers may conduct parallel studies.

Keywords: School Governance Council (SGC), leadership practices, school-based management, stakeholder engagement, Project SGC-LEAD

1. Introduction

Globally, school governance structures are pivotal in shaping educational policies, fostering community engagement, and ensuring accountability to strengthen participatory decision-making (OECD, 2019). Consequently, strong governance structures in schools directly correlate with enhanced leadership practices, effective decision-making, and better overall student performance (World Bank, 2021).

Effective school governance enables school heads to efficiently implement policies, mobilize resources, and establish partnerships that support student learning and teacher development (Leithwood and Jantzi, 2000). Accordingly, these governance structures contribute to leadership efficiency by ensuring that

decision-making processes are well-informed, inclusive, and strictly aligned with educational goals (Hallinger, 2011).

In the Philippines, the Department of Education institutionalized the School Governance Council (SGC) through DepEd Order No. 26, s. 2022, providing a legal basis for stakeholder involvement in planning and resource generation. Furthermore, the DepEd School-Based Management (SBM) framework emphasizes strengthening these structures to ensure transparency, accountability, and inclusive decision-making at the school level (DepEd Order No. 7, s. 2024).

Despite these legal foundations, SGC implementation across Philippine schools remains uneven, with some struggling from limited stakeholder participation, unclear governance structures, and a lack of capacity-building for council members (Brillantes and Fernandez, 2011). Similarly, many school leaders encounter significant barriers in engaging SGC members, such as low participation, lack of capacity, and limited resources (Bush, 2020).

This study is driven by the demand for stronger school leadership aligned with the Philippine Development Plan (PDP) 2023–2028 and Education 2030 Framework for Action, which advocates for models promoting shared accountability and capacity-building. Because actual SGC effectiveness varies widely, the Labo East District of the Schools Division of Camarines Norte provides an ideal context to investigate the extent to which SGC roles genuinely influence school leaders' leadership practices.

1.1. Objective of the Study

This study determined the role and influence of the School Governance Council (SGC) on school leaders' leadership practices in the Labo East District, Schools Division of Camarines Norte, specifically examining SGC functions regarding school planning and monitoring, decision-making and policy recommendation, resource generation, and linkage building. Furthermore, it assessed the local implementation level of these roles, analyzed their significant relationship with the implementation of leadership practices, and identified the challenges encountered by the council to propose targeted interventions aimed at strengthening SGC functionality and improving overall school leadership.

2. Methodology

This study utilized a quantitative descriptive-correlational research design to objectively evaluate the influence of School Governance Council (SGC) functions on school leaders' leadership practices in the Labo East District. Descriptive statistics, specifically weighted mean, were employed to systematically assess the natural implementation levels of SGC roles in school planning, decision-making, policy implementation, resource mobilization, stakeholder collaboration, and communication without manipulating variables. Concurrently, Spearman's rank-order correlation (ρ) was utilized to determine the strength, direction, and significance of the relationship between SGC role implementation and leadership practices. Ultimately, this combined dual approach provided a holistic, statistically supported analysis to yield evidence-based recommendations for improving school governance and leadership effectiveness.

2.1. Population, Sample Size, and Sampling Technique

The study involved 264 respondents from 21 public elementary schools in the Labo East District, Schools Division of Camarines Norte, comprising 21 school heads and 243 School Governance Council (SGC) voting members, including teachers, parents, and community leaders. To ensure a comprehensive, multi-perspective assessment of how SGC roles influence leadership practices, two distinct sampling techniques were employed. Total enumeration was utilized to include all 21 school heads as the primary administrators, while purposive sampling was applied to select the 243 actively engaged SGC members. These SGC respondents

were proportionally distributed based on school size, drawing 30 members from two large schools, 150 from ten medium schools, and 63 from nine small schools. This combined approach guaranteed that the data gathered regarding grassroots participatory governance and leadership dynamics were accurate, reliable, and highly relevant.

2.2. Data Gathering Procedures

Following formal approval from division authorities and 21 principals, data were ethically collected via physical and digital formats using a researcher-made structured survey to ensure comparable, statistically analyzable quantitative responses (Creswell and Creswell, 2022). The instrument comprised three parts: Part I measured SGC influence on leadership across four domains (school planning and monitoring, decision-making and policy recommendation, generating resources, and building linkages) using a 20-item, 4-point Likert scale; Part II assessed the implementation frequency of these roles via a parallel 20-item scale; and Part III identified governance challenges using a 15-item checklist. Following expert validation by educational leaders and a 20-respondent pilot test to refine clarity, the survey demonstrated high internal consistency using Cronbach's alpha (α) (Tavakol and Dennick, 2011). Specifically, Part I yielded alpha coefficients of 0.895, 0.865, 0.873, and 0.881, while Part II scored 0.884, 0.892, 0.854, and 0.879 across the four respective domains, verifying its strong reliability for the study.

2.3. Statistical Treatment of Data

To ensure rigorous quantitative analysis using SPSS version 21, Weighted Mean was employed for SOP 1 and SOP 2 to evaluate the influence and local implementation levels of SGC roles across the four key domains (Creswell and Creswell, 2022). For SOP 3, Spearman's Rank-Order Correlation, calculated using the formula

$$r_s = 1 - \frac{6\sum d_i^2}{n(n^2 - 1)}$$

was utilized at the 0.05 alpha level to determine the significant relationship between SGC roles and leadership practices, as this non-parametric test is suitable for ordinal Likert scale data (Field, 2024). Finally, for SOP 4, Frequency Count and Ranking were applied to systematically organize the challenges encountered by the SGC from most to least frequent, highlighting the primary areas requiring intervention (Babbie, 2020).

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Roles of the School Governance Council (SGC) That Influence School Leaders' Leadership Practices

The School Governance Council (SGC) significantly influences leadership practices in school planning and monitoring with an overall weighted mean of 3.48 (Highly Influential), demonstrating that school heads utilize participatory leadership to collaboratively bridge school administration and the community (Supriadi et al., 2021; Amin et al., 2024). Specifically, the SGC's strongest impact lies in formulating the strategic School Improvement Plan (SIP) (WM=3.52) by actively aligning the school's vision with community needs (Saro et al., 2022). Conversely, their participation in monitoring the day-to-day progress of the Annual Implementation Plan (AIP) garnered the lowest rating in this domain (WM=3.44), indicating that while strategic planning is thorough, continuous operational monitoring is often hindered by members' time constraints, thereby complicating the dynamics of sustained shared accountability (Unda et al., 2023).

Table 1. Roles of SGC That Influence School Leaders' Leadership Practices Along School Planning and Monitoring

Indicators		Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
1.	The SGC contributes to the formulation of the School Improvement Plan (SIP).	3.52	Highly Influential
2.	The SGC participates in monitoring the progress of the Annual Implementation Plan (AIP).	3.44	Highly Influential
3.	The SGC collaborates with the school head in identifying performance gaps.	3.48	Highly Influential
4.	The SGC assists in setting priorities for school development.	3.50	Highly Influential
5.	The SGC helps evaluate the outcomes of school initiatives.	3.47	Highly Influential
Overall Weighted Mean		3.48	Highly Influential
<i>Rating Scale</i>	<i>Verbal Interpretation</i>		
3.26 – 4.00	Highly Influential		
2.51 – 3.25	Often Influential		
1.76 – 2.50	Minimal Influence		
1.00 – 1.75	No Influence		

Functioning as a highly influential legislative partner in decision-making and policy recommendation (overall WM=3.51), the SGC actively shapes inclusive school guidelines, such as localized child protection, SDRRM protocols, and canteen regulations (DepEd Order No. 13, s. 2017), by participating in discussions and formulating rules, which both obtained the highest rating (WM=3.56). This participatory approach incorporates diverse perspectives to improve principals' decision-making (Supriadi et al., 2021) and ensures policies are developed through necessary collective effort (Ghamrawi, 2023). Conversely, the promotion of shared accountability obtained the lowest rating (WM=3.46), revealing a practical gap where stakeholders eagerly suggest policies but hesitate to assume the enforcement burdens and risks associated with those decisions (Unda et al., 2023). Ultimately, this democratic, distributed leadership style legitimizes administrative decisions and minimizes implementation resistance, fostering a supportive governance environment that significantly impacts Philippine educational outcomes (Torres, 2024) while aligning with global policy reforms that advocate shared decision-making to enhance school responsiveness and effectiveness (Pont, 2020).

Table 2. Roles of SGC That Influence School Leaders' Leadership Practices Along Decision-Making and Policy Recommendation

Indicators		Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
1.	The SGC participates in discussions on school policies.	3.56	Highly Influential
2.	The SGC recommends policy adjustments based on stakeholder needs.	3.48	Highly Influential
3.	The SGC is consulted in decisions involving major school activities.	3.48	Highly Influential
4.	The SGC contributes to the formulation of school rules and regulations.	3.56	Highly Influential
5.	The SGC promotes shared accountability in governance decisions.	3.46	Highly Influential
Overall Weighted Mean		3.51	Highly Influential
<i>Rating Scale</i>	<i>Verbal Interpretation</i>		
3.26 – 4.00	Highly Influential		
2.51 – 3.25	Often Influential		
1.76 – 2.50	Minimal Influence		
1.00 – 1.75	No Influence		

Functioning as an indispensable strategic partner in generating resources beyond the standard Maintenance and Other Operating Expenses (MOOE), the SGC shifts the burden of sustainability to a shared responsibility with an overall weighted mean of 3.45 (Highly Influential). The council excels in bridging the school and community through holistic collaboration rather than direct solicitation, with stakeholder collaboration obtaining the highest rating (WM=3.59) to address targeted needs like feeding programs and classroom repairs. This collaborative utilization of limited assets significantly bolsters school quality and learning environments (Ondong, 2024; Sentosa et al., 2024). Conversely, organizing complex fund-generating activities received the lowest rating (WM=3.36), as technical logistics are often delegated to teachers due to members' capacity limitations and risk aversion in practical financial execution (Unda et al., 2023). Ultimately,

this shared approach empowers local stakeholders to innovatively fund public education (Maca, 2020) and demonstrates that successful school leadership effectively mobilizes the wider community to build the necessary social and economic capital for continuous improvement (Leithwood et al., 2020).

Table 3. Roles of SGC That Influence School Leaders' Leadership Practices Along Generating Resources

Indicators		Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
1.	The SGC initiates efforts to secure financial support for the school.	3.41	Highly Influential
2.	The SGC identifies external partners for resource mobilization.	3.47	Highly Influential
3.	The SGC organizes fund-generating activities.	3.36	Highly Influential
4.	The SGC assists in mobilizing in-kind donations and services.	3.42	Highly Influential
5.	The SGC collaborates with stakeholders to support school needs.	3.59	Highly Influential
Overall Weighted Mean		3.45	Highly Influential
<i>Rating Scale</i>	<i>Verbal Interpretation</i>		
3.26 – 4.00	Highly Influential		
2.51 – 3.25	Ofentimes Influential		
1.76 – 2.50	Minimal Influence		
1.00 – 1.75	No Influence		

Functioning as a vital mechanism to expand the school's social capital, the SGC significantly influences leadership practices by shifting focus toward an external, network-based approach to secure support from local government units and NGOs, obtaining an overall weighted mean of 3.51 (Highly Influential) (Leithwood et al., 2020; Torres, 2024). The SGC excels as a public relations bridge to resolve minor conflicts and promote advocacies, while maintaining strong school-community relations, achieving the highest rating (WM=3.56) to support school operations and foundational academic achievement (Maca, 2020; Sentosa et al., 2024). Conversely, strengthening specific parent and alumni involvement received the lowest rating (WM=3.46), as economic pressures on rural parents and the transience of elementary alumni hinder sustained engagement, demonstrating that mobilizing these specific groups often falls short due to conflicting priorities and the voluntary nature of participation (Unda et al., 2023).

Table 4. Roles of SGC That Influence School Leaders' Leadership Practices Along Building Linkages

Indicators		Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
1.	The SGC fosters partnerships with community stakeholders.	3.53	Highly Influential
2.	The SGC builds linkages with local government units.	3.50	Highly Influential
3.	The SGC strengthens parent and alumni involvement.	3.46	Highly Influential
4.	The SGC coordinates with NGOs for educational projects.	3.48	Highly Influential
5.	The SGC helps maintain strong school-community relations.	3.56	Highly Influential
Overall Weighted Mean		3.51	Highly Influential
<i>Rating Scale</i>	<i>Verbal Interpretation</i>		
3.26 – 4.00	Highly Influential		
2.51 – 3.25	Ofentimes Influential		
1.76 – 2.50	Minimal Influence		
1.00 – 1.75	No Influence		

3.2. Level of Implementation of SGC Roles

Successfully institutionalized within the daily operational planning cycle, the implementation of SGC roles in school planning and monitoring obtained an overall weighted mean of 3.48 (Always Implemented), demonstrating a mature distributed leadership model where setting the school's direction is a collective community effort (Amin et al., 2024; Maca, 2020). The SGC functions as an active administrative partner, with monitoring program implementation and identifying improvement areas based on performance data, both receiving the highest rating (WM=3.50); this practical engagement alongside Division SMEA personnel ensures

that interventions align with strategic goals to refine school quality (Saro et al., 2022; Sentosa et al., 2024). Conversely, participation in formulating and reviewing the Annual Implementation Plan (AIP) received the lowest rating (WM=3.45), as the rigid technicalities of budget codes, auditing rules, and procurement timelines default to school professionals, positioning the SGC primarily as a reviewing body rather than a drafting one due to the specialized knowledge required for practical execution (Unda et al., 2023).

Table 5. Level of Implementation of SGC Roles Along School Planning and Monitoring

Indicators		Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
1.	The SGC is regularly involved in the preparation of the School Improvement Plan (SIP).	3.48	Always Implemented
2.	The SGC participates in the formulation and review of the Annual Implementation Plan (AIP).	3.45	Always Implemented
3.	The SGC monitors the implementation of planned programs and projects.	3.50	Always Implemented
4.	The SGC helps identify areas needing improvement based on school performance data.	3.50	Always Implemented
5.	The SGC provides feedback on the progress of school targets and priorities.	3.47	Always Implemented
Overall Weighted Mean		3.48	Always Implemented

<i>Rating Scale</i>	<i>Verbal Interpretation</i>
3.26 – 4.00	Always Implemented
2.51 – 3.25	Often Implemented
1.76 – 2.50	Rarely Implemented
1.00 – 1.75	Never Implemented

Effectively democratizing governance by shifting from unilateral principal leadership to a shared, inclusive responsibility, the implementation of SGC roles in decision-making and policy recommendation achieved an overall weighted mean of 3.51 (Always Implemented) (Torres, 2024; Pont, 2020). The SGC demonstrates its strongest operational engagement by actively participating in school planning meetings and consultative assemblies with the highest rating (WM=3.55); their vocal presence in SIP workshops ensures real-time community representation and prevents top-down management (Amin et al., 2024; Supriadi et al., 2021). Conversely, promoting consensus-building in major decisions received the lowest rating (WM=3.44), highlighting the practical challenges school heads face in mediating conflicting stakeholder interests, such as balancing parent financial concerns with teacher facility needs, during complex governance negotiations (Unda et al., 2023).

Table 6. Level of Implementation of SGC Roles Along Decision-Making and Policy Recommendation

Indicators		Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
1.	The SGC is consulted on important school policy matters.	3.52	Always Implemented
2.	The SGC submits recommendations for school rules and governance decisions.	3.50	Always Implemented
3.	The SGC is involved in resolving school-related issues that require community input.	3.54	Always Implemented
4.	The SGC actively participates in school planning meetings and consultative assemblies.	3.55	Always Implemented
5.	The SGC promotes consensus-building in major school decisions.	3.44	Always Implemented
Overall Weighted Mean		3.51	Always Implemented

<i>Rating Scale</i>	<i>Verbal Interpretation</i>
3.26 – 4.00	<i>Always Implemented</i>
2.51 – 3.25	<i>Oftentimes Implemented</i>
1.76 – 2.50	<i>Rarely Implemented</i>
1.00 – 1.75	<i>Never Implemented</i>

Successfully integrating the SGC into financial management strategies to share the funding burden beyond the school head, the implementation of roles in generating resources achieved an overall weighted mean of 3.48 (Always Implemented), fostering transparency and empowering stakeholders to build sustained school capacity (Maca, 2020; Leithwood et al., 2020). Operating primarily as proactive linkage builders rather than simple fundraising committees, the SGC excels at initiating partnerships with external organizations, such as securing MOAs and sponsorships from local businesses and civic groups, which obtained the highest rating (WM=3.55) and significantly augments basic education funds to improve the learning environment (Ondong, 2024; Sentosa et al., 2024). Conversely, organizing labor-intensive fundraising activities and identifying local resources tied for the lowest rating (WM=3.44), as the practical execution of complex events like bingos or fun runs is frequently hampered by community financial fatigue and the time constraints of voluntary members (Unda et al., 2023).

Table 7. Level of Implementation of SGC Roles Along Generating Resources

Indicators		Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
1.	The SGC helps organize fundraising activities to support school programs.	3.44	Always Implemented
2.	The SGC initiates partnerships with external organizations for resource support.	3.55	Always Implemented
3.	The SGC contributes to identifying and mobilizing local resources (financial or in-kind).	3.44	Always Implemented
4.	The SGC coordinates with LGUs or NGOs for school infrastructure or learning materials.	3.49	Always Implemented
5.	The SGC documents and monitors the utilization of external resources it helped generate.	3.47	Always Implemented
Overall Weighted Mean		3.48	Always Implemented

<i>Rating Scale</i>	<i>Verbal Interpretation</i>
3.26 – 4.00	<i>Always Implemented</i>
2.51 – 3.25	<i>Oftentimes Implemented</i>
1.76 – 2.50	<i>Rarely Implemented</i>
1.00 – 1.75	<i>Never Implemented</i>

As the strongest and most consistently practiced domain, the implementation of SGC roles in building linkages achieved an overall weighted mean of 3.57 (Always Implemented), demonstrating that school leaders successfully distribute networking responsibilities to leverage external support systems (Leithwood et al., 2020). Operating as the primary facilitator for community interaction, the SGC excels at supporting stakeholder involvement and conducting community dialogues, which both obtained the highest rating (WM=3.59) through proactive initiatives like Brigada Eskwela kick-offs, State of the School Address (SOSA) assemblies, and parent "Kumustahan" sessions that maintain a community-centered institution (Maca, 2020). Conversely, building formal partnerships with local government units received the lowest rating (WM=3.53), because navigating formal political bureaucracy to secure Special Education Fund allocations demands complex procedural steps and official resolutions that naturally occur less frequently than informal, daily community engagement (Ondong, 2024).

Table 8. Level of Implementation of SGC Roles Along Building Linkages

Indicators		Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
1.	The SGC builds partnerships with local government units to support school initiatives.	3.53	Always Implemented
2.	The SGC collaborates with parents and alumni to strengthen school-community relationships.	3.55	Always Implemented
3.	The SGC facilitates linkages with civic groups and NGOs for project support.	3.57	Always Implemented
4.	The SGC supports initiatives to increase stakeholder involvement in school programs.	3.59	Always Implemented
5.	The SGC conducts dialogues or fora to promote engagement between the school and the community.	3.59	Always Implemented
Overall Weighted Mean		3.57	Always Implemented
<i>Rating Scale</i>			<i>Verbal Interpretation</i>
3.26 – 4.00			Always Implemented
2.51 – 3.25			Oftentimes Implemented
1.76 – 2.50			Rarely Implemented
1.00 – 1.75			Never Implemented

3.3. Relationship Between the Roles of the School Governance Council and Their Level of Implementation of Leadership Practices

Following a Shapiro-Wilk test indicating non-normal data distribution, Spearman's rank-order correlation revealed strong, positive, and statistically significant relationships ($p=.000$) across all domains, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis. Decision-making and policy exhibited the strongest correlation ($\rho=.825$), followed closely by generating resources ($\rho=.824$), school planning and monitoring ($\rho=.745$), and building linkages ($\rho=.742$), proving that higher SGC involvement directly enhances the implementation of leadership practices. By actively participating in policy formulation, resource solicitation, and community dialogues, the SGC functions as an indispensable equal partner that unburdens school heads from administrative saturation, allowing principals to focus on instructional supervision. Consequently, these results confirm that leadership quality is inextricably linked to the functionality of governance bodies (Supriadi et al., 2021) and that effective public-school management heavily depends on distributed leadership practices where responsibilities are actively shared among stakeholders to achieve stronger educational goals (Amin et al., 2024).

Table 9. Test for Significant Relationship Between the Roles of the School Governance Council and their Level of Implementation of Leadership Practices

Roles of the SGC	Leadership Practices		Interpretation	Decision
	ρ	p -value		
School Planning and Monitoring	.745**	.000	Significant	Reject H_0
Decision-Making and Policy	.825**	.000	Significant	
Generating Resources	.824**	.000	Significant	
Building Linkages	.742**	.000	Significant	

**Correlation is significant @ 0.01 level

3.4. Challenges Encountered by the SGC in Performing Their Roles

The most pressing challenges hindering SGC functionality are insufficient training ($f=172$, rank 1), time constraints ($f=127$, rank 2), and low stakeholder participation ($f=112$, rank 3), primarily because voluntary members often lack technical expertise and the time for capacity-building; this creates a gap in shared accountability that prevents them from executing their mandates (Unda et al., 2023) and turns decentralized

power into a burden (Pont, 2020). Conversely, the least encountered difficulties are a lack of coordination with school leadership ($f=23$, rank 15), unclear communication channels ($f=33$, rank 14), and a tie between weak partnerships and bureaucratic delays ($f=37$, rank 12.5). These low frequencies indicate a healthy, collaborative relationship where school heads utilize online platforms to maintain open access, proving that distributed leadership successfully fosters strong cohesion and coordination between stakeholders even when members struggle with technical tasks or external pressures (Amin et al., 2024; Harris, 2020).

Table 10. Challenges Encountered by the School Governance Council in Performing Their Roles

Challenges		Frequency	Rank
1.	Low participation of stakeholders in SGC activities	112	3
2.	Limited understanding of SGC roles and responsibilities	96	5
3.	Insufficient training or capacity-building for SGC members	172	1
4.	Inconsistent attendance of members in meetings	70	7.5
5.	Lack of coordination between SGC and school leadership	23	15
6.	Minimal involvement in decision-making processes	61	10
7.	Limited access to school-related data for planning and monitoring	70	7.5
8.	Difficulty in mobilizing financial and material resources	105	4
9.	Weak partnerships with external stakeholders and LGUs	37	12.5
10.	Unclear communication channels between the SGC and school community	33	14
11.	Bureaucratic or administrative delays affecting SGC initiatives	37	12.5
12.	Lack of recognition or support for SGC initiatives from higher authorities	57	11
13.	Time constraints among SGC members due to other obligations	127	2
14.	Conflicting interests among SGC members and stakeholders	62	9
15.	Limited sustainability of programs initiated by the SGC	93	6

3.5. Proposed Intervention to Strengthen the Implementation of the Roles of SGC to Improve School Leaders' Leadership Practices

To address the critical operational barriers of insufficient training (Rank 1), time constraints (Rank 2), and low stakeholder participation (Rank 3) identified in Table 10, the study proposes Project SGC-LEAD (Sustaining Governance through Learning, Engagement, and Adaptive Development) (Appendix G). This intervention shifts from time-intensive models to an adaptive framework featuring "Governance Learning Capsules" that deliver 5-minute digital micro-learning materials on essential topics like SIP monitoring and financial transparency to ensure continuous, accessible capacity-building. Furthermore, it implements a "Blended Governance Protocol" that categorizes engagement into four mandatory face-to-face "Major Summits" annually and asynchronous digital "Quick Consultations" to maintain full participation without demanding frequent physical attendance. To combat waning volunteerism and limited resource mobilization, the "Partner-Salamat" Recognition Program institutionalizes tiered public appreciation to build social capital, while a newly installed "Data-at-a-Glance Dashboard" resolves limited data access by providing transparent views of literacy rates, project statuses, and financial utilization for informed, data-driven decision-making.

4. Conclusion and Recommendations

Based on the findings, the study concludes that the SGC serves as a pivotal strategic partner that democratizes administration, functioning optimally as a consultative and legislative bridge-builder rather than a technical operational workforce. With participatory governance institutionalized across all domains, the SGC prioritizes community engagement and external networking over labor-intensive administrative tasks. Furthermore, the strong, positive, and statistically significant relationships observed across all domains confirm that SGC functionality is a critical determinant of effective, symbiotic leadership, underscoring that a distributed governance model is essential for superior institutional performance. However, while the relational partnership

between the council and school leadership remains fundamentally sound, effective governance is hindered by structural and technical barriers, specifically deficits in training and time, revealing a willing but under-equipped council. Consequently, to sustain effectiveness and overcome these practical limitations, the study proposes Project SGC-LEAD, advocating a strategic pivot toward adaptive frameworks that integrate flexible learning modalities and digital collaboration tools to ensure the continuous, meaningful participation of volunteer stakeholders.

Based on the findings, it is recommended that School Heads optimize the School Governance Council (SGC) by delegating labor-intensive operational activities to specific committees while focusing SGC involvement on high-level consultative and legislative tasks, supported by School Administrators providing simplified templates and visual data dashboards to facilitate technical contributions like Annual Implementation Plan monitoring. Furthermore, Public Schools District Supervisors should reinforce this distributed leadership model by integrating SGC engagement metrics into the performance evaluations of School Heads, while the Schools Governance and Operations Division implements flexible, bite-sized digital capacity-building programs to accommodate members' limited time and technical competencies. Locally, Labo East District School Heads are encouraged to institutionalize the proposed Project SGC-LEAD to systematically resolve training, attendance, and participation gaps through blended strategies, and future researchers may conduct parallel studies in secondary schools or diverse districts to explore the impact of SGC involvement on student academic achievement and broaden the understanding of school governance dynamics.

Acknowledgment

The researcher extends her deepest gratitude to Almighty God for His guidance, and expresses profound thanks to Sonia S. Carbonell, PhD, Dean of the Graduate School; Shirly C. Dioneda, EdD, Thesis Committee Chairperson; panel members Daryl I. Quinto, PhD, and Jennifer S. Rubio, PhD (who also served as the study's statistician); and panel secretary Jamila M. Macapundag, MAEd, MLL, for their invaluable insights, constructive critique, and administrative support. Sincere appreciation is extended to research adviser Anicia S. Madarang, EdD, for her steadfast mentorship; Melissa M. Barbosa, EdD, PSDS of Labo East District, for her approval; and Teacher-in-Charge Mary Joy B. Maiwat for her encouraging guidance. The researcher is likewise deeply thankful to the School Heads, Teachers, and School Governance Council Members of Labo East District for their essential cooperation and participation. Finally, heartfelt appreciation goes to her family, close friends, co-teachers, and everyone who directly or indirectly contributed their unconditional love, prayers, and moral support throughout this academic journey.

References

- Amin, S. N., Musah, M. B., Tahir, L. M., Farah, A. M., Al-Hudawi, S. H. V., Issah, M., & Abdallah, A. K. (2024). Practices of distributed leadership in two Islamic secondary schools. *Int J Eval & Res Educ*, 13(5), 3379-3392. <http://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v13i5.27423>
- Babbie, E. R. (2020). *The practice of social research*. Cengage Au. <https://faculty.cengage.com/works/9780357360767>
- Brillantes, A. B., & Fernandez, M. T. F. T. (2011). Restoring trust and building integrity in government: Issues and concerns in the Philippines and areas for reform. *International Public Management Review*, 12(2), 55-80. <https://ipmr.net/index.php/ipmr/article/view/102>
- Bush, T. (2020). *Theories of educational leadership and management* (5th ed.). SAGE. <https://www.perlego.com/book/4267447/theories-of-educational-leadership-and-management-pdf>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2022). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications. <https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/research-design/book270550>
- DepEd Order No. 026, s. 2022: *Implementing Guidelines on the Establishment of School Governance Council*. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/DO_s2022_026.pdf
- DepEd Order No. 13, s. 2017. *Policy and Guidelines on Healthy Food and Beverage Choices in Schools and in DepEd Offices*.

- https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/DO_s2017_013.pdf
- DepEd Order No. 7, s. 2024: *Policy Guidelines on the Implementation of the Revised School-Based Management (SBM) System*. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/DO_s2024_007.pdf
- Field, A. (2024). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics*. Sage publications limited. <https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/discovering-statistics-using-ibm-spss-statistics/book285130>
- Ghamrawi, N. (2023). Toward agenda 2030 in education: policies and practices for effective school leadership. *Educational Research for Policy and Practice*, 22(2), 325-347. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10671-023-09341-8?urlappend=%3Futm_source%3Dresearchgate.net%26utm_medium%3Darticle
- Hallinger, P. (2011). Leadership for learning: Lessons from 40 years of empirical research. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 49(2), 125-142. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09578231111116699>
- Harris, A. (2020). COVID-19—school leadership in crisis?. *Journal of professional capital and community*, 5(3/4), 321-326. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JPC-06-2020-0045>
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2000). The effects of transformational leadership on organizational conditions and student engagement. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 38(2), 112-129. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578230010320064>
- Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. *School leadership & management*, 40(1), 5-22. https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2019.1596077?urlappend=%3Futm_source%3Dresearchgate.net%26utm_medium%3Darticle
- Maca, M. N. (2020). School-based management in the Philippines: Fostering innovations in the public education system. *Romblon State University Research Journal*, 2(1), 35-59. <https://doi.org/10.58780/rsurj.v2i1.10>
- OECD. (2019). *Education Policy Outlook 2019: Working Together to Help Students Achieve their Potential*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1782/b8ad56e-en>
- Ondong, J. (2024). Utilization of School Resources in Basic Education: A Multiple Case Study. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 16(10), 1-1. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10601769>
- Philippine Development Plan. (2023). *Philippine Development Plan 2023-2028*. <https://pdp.neda.gov.ph/philippine-development-plan-2023-2028/>
- Pont, B. (2020). A literature review of school leadership policy reforms. *European Journal of Education*, 55(2), 154-168. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12398>
- Saro, J., Silabay, A., Lumbanon, J., Pepugal, E., & Pareja, M. (2022). School-Based Management: Reevaluating and Innovating Learning Outcomes to Refine Schools' Performances and Practices. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 4(5), 439-448. <https://10.5281/zenodo.7087798>
- Sentosa, B. M., Khusaini, K., Latuconsina, H., Kamil, M., & Dahlan, J. A. (2024). The Role of School Quality and Students' Health on Academic Achievement: A Binary Probit Regression Study. *Jurnal Pendidikan Progresif*, 14(2), 1023-1044. <http://dx.doi.org/10.23960/jpp.v14.i2.202475>
- Supriadi, D., Usman, H., & Jabar, C. (2021). Good school governance: An approach to principal's decision-making quality in Indonesian vocational school. *Research in Educational Administration and Leadership*, 6(4), 796-831. <https://doi.org/10.30828/real/2021.4.2>
- Tavakol, M., & Dennick, R. (2011). Making sense of Cronbach's alpha. *International Journal of Medical Education*, 2, 53-55. <https://doi.org/10.5116/ijme.4dfb.8dfd>
- Torres, J. L. (2024). Leadership styles and their impact on educational outcomes in the Philippines. *ResearchGate*. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14172311>
- Unda, L. A., Gong, Z., Benati, K., & Loh, C. M. (2023). Role expectations and shared accountability: A framework for school governance. *Financial Accountability & Management*, 39(4), 790-808. <https://doi.org/10.1111/faam.12322>
- World Bank. (2021). *The State of the Global Education Crisis: A Path to Recovery*. World Bank Group. <https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/education/publication/the-state-of-the-global-education-crisis-a-path-to-recovery>