The Nexus between School Heads' Leadership Practices and Competencies on Stakeholders' Engagement and School Performance

Leslie Ann Corpuz Nacionales[a]

[a]Leslieann.nacionales@deped.gov.ph
Laguna State Polytechnic University Sta. Cruz Laguna 4009 PHILIPPINES

Abstract

The study entitled The Nexus between School heads' Leadership Practices and Competencies on Stakeholders Engagement and School Performance aimed to find the level of school heads' leadership practices in terms of leading strategically, managing school operations and resources, focusing on teaching and learning, developing self and others and building connections; the level of school heads' competencies in terms of visionary, problem solving, conflict management, innovative and initiative; level of stakeholders' engagement in terms of communicating, volunteering, decision making and collaborating and the level of school performance in terms of promotion rate, drop-out rate, graduation rate, cohort-survival rate, SBM level and IPCRF. It also aimed to find if the school heads' leadership practices and competencies are significantly related to stakeholders' engagement and school performance.

The target respondents were secondary school teachers and school heads in the Division of Laguna. The research design employed was descriptive-correlational utilizing survey-questionnaires. The data gathered were treated using descriptive statistics such as weighted mean and standard deviation. Pearson Correlation was used to determine the significant relationship of school heads' leadership practices and competencies with the stakeholders engagement and school performance.

Based on the gathered data, the study found that the leadership practices and competencies of school heads have a significant relationship with stakeholders' engagement. The study also revealed that the level of school performance in terms of promotion rate decreased, while the drop-out rate increased. However, the graduation rate and cohort-survival rate maintained a positive trend. The school-based management (SBM) level is maturing, and the IPCRF was rated outstanding over three years.

The school heads' leadership practices were assessed based on perceptions of leading strategically, managing school operations, focusing on learning, developing self and others, and building connections. The study revealed that leadership practices correlated significantly only with IPCRF, while management of school operation and resources and focus on teaching correlated significantly with cohort survival rate and IPCRF. Developing self and others and building connections correlated significantly with graduation rate, cohort survival rate, and IPCRF.

The competencies of school heads in visionary, problem-solving, and initiative correlated significantly with graduation rate, cohort-survival rate, and IPCRF, while conflict management also showed significant correlations with graduation rate and cohort-survival rate. Innovation exhibited a significant correlation only with cohort survival rate among most school performance indicators. The hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between school heads' leadership practices and competencies to school performance is partially rejected, as not all aspects were found to be significant. However, the results of the study confirm that school heads' leadership practices and competencies do have a significant relationship with stakeholders' engagement.

The study recommends enhancing communication, transparency, professional development, and collaborative leadership while also streamlining monitoring and evaluation processes and emphasizing learner achievement. By establishing regular communication channels, inclusive decision-making processes, and

collaborative projects, school heads can cultivate a culture of engagement that benefits all involved parties and leads to sustained improvement and success in the educational institution.

Keywords: Stakeholders; Engagement; Participation

1. Introduction

School principals play a crucial role in the educational system, bridging the gap between teachers, students, parents, and the community. Their effectiveness is directly linked to their competencies, which include knowledge, skills, and attributes needed to address the complex challenges of educational leadership. These competencies cover a wide range of areas, from instructional leadership and visionary thinking to management, communication, and ethical conduct. As the educational landscape evolves, principals must continually develop and adapt these competencies to meet changing needs. With the right competencies, principals can lead their schools towards excellence and create an environment where students can thrive academically and personally.

International research evidence shows unequivocally that teacher quality is vital in raising learner achievement. However, teachers alone cannot bring about substantive changes without effective leadership. The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD, 2018) states that the "quality of an education system depends on the quality of its teachers; but the quality of teachers cannot exceed the quality of the policies that shape their work environment in school and that guide their selection, recruitment and development." (Organization for Economic Co- operation and Development, 2018).

In line with the commitment of the Department of Education (DepEd) to support school heads so they can better perform their roles in schools, including the improvement of teacher quality, and, through this, learner achievement, the DepEd issues DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020 entitled National Adoption and Implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH). This policy institutionalizes the PPSSH as a public statement of professional accountability for school heads to reflect on and assess their own practice as they aspire for and pursue professional development. (DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020)

The PPSSH defines professional standards that constitute a quality school head. It shall serve as a public statement of professional accountability of school heads. It sets out what school heads are expected to know, be able to do, and value as they progress in their profession. Its framework depicts the synergy between maximizing school effectiveness and ensuring people effectiveness through a broad sphere of instructional and administrative practices stipulated in the five domains of the PPSSH namely; Leading Strategically, Managing School Operations and Resources, Focusing on Teaching and Learning, Developing Self and Others, and Building Connections. The five domains constitute a broad conceptual sphere of leadership practices for all school heads.(Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads)

This leads the researcher to bring to light the relation of school heads' leadership practices and competencies to stakeholder's engagement and school performance. This study aims to provide valuable insights into the leadership practices and competencies employed by school heads to enhance their ability to effectively manage educational institutions, cultivate a positive school culture, inspire and motivate staff, build strong relationships with students and parents, implement strategic planning and innovative initiatives, resolve conflicts, promote collaboration among stakeholders, and ultimately achieve higher academic outcomes and student success.

1.1 Statement of the problem

Specifically, it sought answers to the following questions:

1. What is the level of School heads' Leadership Practices in terms of:

    1.1 Leading Strategically;

    1.2 Managing School Operations and Resources;

    1.3 Focusing on Teaching and Learning;

    1.4 Developing Self and Others; and

    1.5 Building Connections?

2.   What is the level of School heads' competencies in terms of:

    2.1 Visionary;

    2.2 Problem Solving;

    2.3 Conflict management;

    2.4 Innovative; and

    2.5 Initiative?

3. What is the level of stakeholders engagement in terms of:

    3.1 Communicating;

    3.2 Volunteering;

    3.3 Decision making; and

    3.4 Collaborating?

4. What is the level of School performance in terms of:

    4.1 Promotion rate;

    4.2 Drop-out rate;

    4.3 Graduation rate;

    4.4 Cohort-Survival rate;

    4.5 SBM Level; and

    4.6 IPCRF?

5. Does Leadership Practices have significant relationship on stakeholders engagement?

6. Does Leadership Practices have significant relationship on School performance?

7. Does school heads competencies have significant relationship on stakeholders engagement?

8. Does school heads competencies have significant relationship on School performance?

2. Methodology

    This study used the descriptive-quantitative research method being the most commonly used method in educational research. This is the preferred method because it is objective in data collection, quantifies variables and describes phenomena using numbers to characterize them.

    This study focused on public secondary school heads and teachers who are actively teaching within

the districts of Santa Cruz, Pagsanjan, Lumban, Cavinti and Luisiana in the Division of Laguna, regardless of their designation. 11 School heads and 259 teachers, a total of 270 respondents participated in the study and provided honest and timely responses through answering the questionnaire-checklist.

3. *Results and Discussion*

This chapter enumerates the different results and discusses the results that were yielded from the treatment of the data that was gathered in this study. The following tabular presentations and discussions will further characterize School heads' leadership practices and competencies, stakeholders' engagement and school performance in the secondary schools of Division of Laguna.

Level of School Heads' Leadership Practices

Level of School heads' Leadership Practices include leading strategically, managing of school operations and resources, focus on teaching and learning, developing self and others and building connections and was determined by mean and standard deviation.

Level of School heads' Leadership Practices in terms of Leading Strategically

Table 1. *Level of School heads' Leadership Practices in terms of Leading Strategically*

The school head...	Mean	SD	Remarks
1. communicates the DepEd vision, mission and core values to the wider school community to ensure shared understanding and alignment of school policies, programs, projects and activities.	4.49	0.64	Always
2. develops and implements with the planning team school plans aligned with institutional goals and policies.	4.44	0.70	Always
3. undertakes policy implementation and review in the school to ensure that operations are consistent with national and local laws, regulations and issuances.	4.43	0.69	Always
4. implements programs in the school that support the development of learners.	4.46	0.68	Always
5. utilizes available monitoring and evaluation processes and tools to promote learner achievement.	4.43	0.68	Always

Weighted Mean = 4.45

SD = 0.62

Verbal Interpretation = Highly Evident

Table 1 shows the level of school heads' leadership practices in terms of leading strategically. Based on the responses, the school head always communicates the DepEd vision, mission and core values to the wider school community to ensure shared understanding and alignment of school policies, programs, projects and activities (M=4.49, SD=0.64). Additionally, school head undertakes policy implementation and review in the school to ensure that operations are consistent with national and local laws, regulations and issuances and utilizes available monitoring and evaluation processes and tools to promote learner achievement both yielded the lowest mean score (M=4.43, SD=0.69, SD=0.68)

The leadership practices of school heads in terms of leading strategically were highly evident among respondents, as indicated by a weighted mean score of 4.45 and a standard deviation of 0.62. This means that school heads consistently show high level of effectiveness in fulfilling their responsibilities in

strategic leadership.

Level of School Heads' Leadership Practices in terms of Managing School Operations and Resources

Table 2. *Level of School Heads' Leadership Practices in terms of Managing School Operations and Resources*

The School head...	Mean	SD	Remarks
1. manages school data and information using technology, including ICT, to ensure efficient and effective school operations.	4.35	0.68	Always
2. manages finances adhering to policies, guidelines and issuances in allocation, procurement, disbursement and liquidation aligned with the school plan.	4.26	0.74	Always
3. manages school facilities and equipment in adherence to policies, guidelines and issuances on acquisition, recording, utilization, repair and maintenance, storage and disposal.	4.27	0.68	Always
4. manages staffing such as teaching load distribution and grade level and subject area assignment in adherence to laws, policies, guidelines and issuances based on the needs of the school.	4.31	0.73	Always
5. manages emerging opportunities and challenges to encourage equality and equity in addressing the needs of learners, school personnel and other stakeholders.	4.29	0.70	Always

Weighted Mean = 4.29
SD = 0.62
Verbal Interpretation = Highly Evident

Table 2 shows the level of school heads' leadership practices in terms of managing school operations and resources. In light of the responses the school head always manages school data and information using technology, including ICT, to ensure efficient and effective school operations (M=4.35, SD=0.68). Also, the school head manages finances adhering to policies, guidelines and issuances in allocation, procurement, disbursement and liquidation aligned with the school plan received the lowest mean score (M=4.26, SD=0.74).

The leadership practices of school heads' in terms of managing school operations and resources were highly evident among respondents as indicated by a weighted mean score of 4.29 and a standard deviation of 0.62. This means that teachers express strong support for the school head's effective utilization of technology for managing school data and information, while acknowledging perceived effectiveness in financial management, despite areas for potential improvement, reflecting adherence to policies aligned with the school plan.

Table 3. *Level of Leadership Practices in terms of Focusing on Teaching and Learning*

The School head...	Mean	SD	Remarks
1. assists teachers in the review, contextualization and implementation of learning standards to make the curriculum relevant for learners.	4.33	0.68	Always
2. provides technical assistance to teachers on teaching standards and pedagogies within and across learning areas to improve their teaching practice.	4.29	0.73	Always
3. uses validated feedback obtained from learners, parents and other	4.27	0.73	Always

	Mean	SD	
stakeholders to help teachers improve their performance.			
4. manages a learner-friendly, inclusive and healthy learning environment.	4.39	0.69	Always
5. implements learner discipline policies that are developed collaboratively with stakeholders including parents, school personnel and the community.	4.37	0.70	Always

Weighted Mean = 4.33
SD = 0.62
Verbal Interpretation = Highly Evident

Table 3 shows the level of school heads' leadership practices in terms of focusing on teaching and learning. The school head always manages a learner-friendly, inclusive and healthy learning environment (M=4.39, SD=0.69). Moreover, the school head uses validated feedback obtained from learners, parents and other stakeholders to help teachers improve their performance, got the lowest response (M=4.27, SD=0.73).

The leadership practices of school heads in terms of focusing on teaching and learning were highly evident among respondents as indicated by a weighted mean score of 4.33 and a standard deviation of 0.62. The findings demonstrate unanimous agreement on the school head's role in fostering a learner-friendly environment, alongside recognition of the effectiveness of validated feedback for teacher improvement, albeit with potential areas for refinement.

Level of Leadership Practices in terms of Developing Self and Others

Table 4. *Level of Leadership Practices in terms of Developing Self and Others*

The School head…	Mean	SD	Remarks
1. sets personal and professional development goals based on self-assessment aligned with the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads.	4.38	0.74	Always
2. implements the performance management system with a team to support the career advancement of school personnel, and to improve office performance.	4.32	0.75	Always
3. implements professional development initiatives to enhance strengths and address performance gaps among school personnel.	4.28	0.75	Always
4. provides opportunities to individuals and teams in performing leadership roles and responsibilities.	4.30	0.75	Always
5. implements a school rewards system to recognize and motivate learners, school personnel and other stakeholders for exemplary performance and/or continued support.	4.30	0.76	Always

Weighted Mean = 4.31
SD = 0.69
Verbal Interpretation = Highly Evident

Table 4 shows the level of school heads' leadership practices in terms of developing self and others. Based on the responses the school head always sets personal and professional development goals based on self-assessment aligned with the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (M=4.38, SD=0.74). In addition, the school head implements professional development initiatives to enhance strengths and address performance gaps among school personnel, got the lowest response (M=4.28, SD=0.75).

The leadership practices of school heads in terms of developing self and others were highly evident among the respondents, as indicated by a weighted mean score of 4.31 and a standard deviation of 0.69. This means that teachers agree on the alignment of the school principal's personal and professional development

goals with the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads, acknowledging perceived effectiveness in implementing professional development initiatives for school personnel, while recognizing areas for improvement.

Table 5. *Level of Leadership Practices in terms of Building Connections*

The School head...	Mean	SD	Remarks
1. builds constructive relationships with authorities, colleagues, parents and other stakeholders to foster an enabling and supportive environment for learners	4.33	0.71	Always
2. manages school organizations, such as learner organizations, faculty clubs and parent- teacher associations, by applying relevant policies and guidelines to support the attainment of institutional goals.	4.44	0.64	Always
3. exhibits inclusive practices, such as gender sensitivity, physical and mental health awareness and culture responsiveness, to foster awareness, acceptance and respect.	4.35	0.66	Always
4. communicates effectively in speaking and in writing to teachers, learners, parents and other stakeholders, through positive use of communication platforms, to facilitate information sharing, collaboration and support.	4.31	0.73	Always
5. initiates partnerships with the community, such as parents, alumni, authorities, industries and other stakeholders, to strengthen support for learner development, as well as school and community improvement.	4.38	0.71	Always

Weighted Mean = 4.36
SD = 0.62
Verbal Interpretation = Highly Evident

Table 5 shows the level of school heads' leadership practices in terms of building connections. Guided by the responses the school head always manages school organizations, such as learner organizations, faculty clubs and parent- teacher associations, by applying relevant policies and guidelines to support the attainment of institutional goals (M=4.44, SD=0.64). Furthermore, the school head communicates effectively in speaking and in writing to teachers, learners, parents and other stakeholders, through positive use of communication platforms, to facilitate information sharing, collaboration and support, yielded the lowest mean score (M=4.31, SD=0.73).

The leadership practices of school heads in terms of building connections were highly evident among respondents as indicated by a weighted mean score of 4.36 and a standard deviation of 0.62. This shows a strong consensus on the school head's highly effective management of school organizations to support institutional goals, alongside perceived effectiveness in communication through various platforms, with recognition of the school heads' communication skills and room for improvement.

Level of School Heads' Competencies

Table 6. *Level of School Heads' Competencies in terms of Visionary*

The School head...	Mean	SD	Remarks
1. creates an inspiring vision for the future and managing its implementation successfully.	4.31	0.66	Always
2. manages performance by setting the expectations of their	4.27	0.72	Always

3.	shows optimistic about circumstances and anticipates beyond future problems and setbacks.	4.29	0.68	Always
4.	translates visions into specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and time-bound school objectives.	4.28	0.71	Always
5.	shows creativity to improve the school system by suggesting or backing new ways of doing things.	4.28	0.70	Always

Weighted Mean = 4.29
SD = 0.63
Verbal Interpretation = Highly Evident

Table 6 shows the level of school heads' competencies in terms of visionary. Based on the responses, the school head always creates an inspiring vision for the future and managing its implementation successfully (M=4.31, SD=0.66). Similarly, the school head manages performance by setting the expectations of their subordinates clearly and concisely yielded the lowest mean score (M=4.27, SD=0.72).

The school heads' competencies in terms of visionary were highly evident among the respondents, as indicated by a weighted mean score of 4.29 and a standard deviation of 0.63. The assessment highlighted the school principal's strong focus on creating and implementing an inspiring vision for the future, alongside recognized proficiency in managing performance among respondents.

Level of School Heads Competencies in terms of Problem Solving

Table 7. *Level of School Heads Competencies in terms of Problem Solving*

The School head…	Mean	SD	Remarks
1. engages in analytical thinking and data-driven decision-making to identify and address complex challenges within the school environment.	4.23	0.71	Always
2. communicates effectively with stakeholders to understand their perspectives and collaboratively identify and address challenges that impact school performance.	4.26	0.71	Always
3. demonstrates strong problem-solving skills by actively engaging stakeholders in decision-making processes, considering their input, and involving them in implementing strategies to improve school performance.	4.24	0.68	Always
4. utilizes data and feedback from stakeholders to identify areas of improvement, formulate evidence-based strategies, and address obstacles that may affect school performance.	4.25	0.70	Always
5. evaluates continuously on the effectiveness of stakeholders' engagement strategies, using their problem-solving skills to make judgments, adapt to changing circumstances, and ensure that all stakeholders actively contribute to the overall improvement of school performance.	4.29	0.71	Always

Weighted Mean = 4.25
SD = 0.64
Verbal Interpretation = Highly Evident

Table 7 shows the level of school heads' competencies in terms of problem solving. Drawing from the responses the school head always evaluates continuously on the effectiveness of stakeholders' engagement strategies, using their problem-solving skills to make judgments, adapt to changing circumstances, and ensure that all stakeholders actively contribute to the overall improvement of school performance (M=4.29,

SD=0.71). Likewise, the school head engages in analytical thinking and data-driven decision-making to identify and address complex challenges within the school environment yielded the lowest mean score (M=4.23, SD=0.71).

The school heads' competencies in terms of problem solving were highly evident among the respondents, as indicated by a weighted mean score of 4.25 and a standard deviation of 0.64. The evaluation underscored the school principal's strong competencies in continuous assessment of stakeholder engagement, problem-solving, and ensuring active contributions, alongside recognition of their analytical thinking and data-driven decision-making in addressing complex challenges within the school environment.

Level of School Heads' Competencies in terms of Conflict Management

Table 8. *Level of School Heads' Competencies in terms of Conflict Management*

The School head…	Mean	SD	Remarks
1. manages stakeholders' conflicts and maintains a positive environment for achieving school performance goals.	4.24	0.69	Always
2. cultivates trust and collaboration through open communication, reducing conflicts and enhancing stakeholders' engagement in improving school performance.	4.24	0.71	Always
3. utilizes active listening and empathy skills to understand the concerns and perspectives of various stakeholders, facilitating constructive dialogue and mediation to resolve conflicts and ensure a harmonious working relationship among all parties.	4.22	0.75	Always
4. employs problem-solving strategies to identify the root causes of conflicts and engages stakeholders in finding solutions that boost school performance.	4.23	0.74	Always
5. refines conflict management, offers training and resources to improve stakeholders' skills, positively impacting engagement and school performance.	4.22	0.73	Always

Weighted Mean = 4.23
SD = 0.68
Verbal Interpretation = Highly Evident

Table 8 shows the level of school heads' competencies in terms of conflict management. Derived from the responses the school head always manages stakeholders' conflicts and maintains a positive environment for achieving school performance goals and cultivates trust and collaboration through open communication, reducing conflicts and enhancing stakeholders' engagement in improving school performance (M=4.24, SD=0.69, SD=0.71). Although the mean is slightly lower (M=4.22, SD=0.75, SD=0.73) in both statements the school head utilizes active listening and empathy skills to understand the concerns and perspectives of various stakeholders, facilitating constructive dialogue and mediation to resolve conflicts and ensure a harmonious working relationship among all parties and refines conflict management, offers training and resources to improve stakeholders' skills, positively impacting engagement and school performance, it is also remarked as always.

The level of school heads' competencies in terms of conflict management were highly evident among the respondents as indicated by a weighted mean score of 4.23 and a standard deviation of 0.68. The assessment emphasized the school heads' adeptness in conflict management among stakeholders and cultivating a positive environment for goal attainment, while also recognizing their skills in active listening, empathy, conflict resolution, and enhanced stakeholder engagement, all contributing to enhanced school performance.

Table 9. *Level of School Heads' Competencies in terms of Innovative*

The School head...	Mean	SD	Remarks
1. adopts and applies the latest trends in technology.	4.33	0.72	Always
2. seeks new ideas, initiatives, activities, and creative pursuits.	4.32	0.71	Always
3. understands that situations change and is not afraid to change them to adopt new ideas.	4.31	0.72	Always
4. uses the resources that are currently available and makes them work in any situation.	4.29	0.69	Always
5. discovers innovative ways to deal with change and to solve problems most of the time.	4.26	0.72	Always

Weighted Mean = 4.30
SD = 0.65
Verbal Interpretation = Highly Evident

Table 9 shows the level of school heads' competencies in terms of innovative. Considering the responses the school head always adopts and applies the latest trends in technology (M=4.33, SD=0.72). Also, the school head discovers innovative ways to deal with change and to solve problems most of the time, got the lowest response (M=4.26, SD=0.72)

The level of school heads' competencies in terms of innovative were highly evident among the respondents as indicated by a weighted mean score of 4.30 and a standard deviation of 0.65. The data indicates a commendable trend among school heads, with a strong commitment to adopting the latest technology trends and an overall positive acknowledgment of their capabilities in consistently discovering innovative approaches to handling change and problem-solving within the educational context.

Level of School Heads Competencies in terms of Initiative

Table 10. *Level of School Heads Competencies in terms of Initiative*

The School head...	Mean	SD	Remarks
1. seeks opportunities to engage stakeholders, fostering a more robust partnership directly contributing to improve school performance.	4.33	0.70	Always
2. displays initiative for innovative solutions and strategies that enhance stakeholders' engagement and drive positive changes in school performance.	4.28	0.71	Always
3. plays a pivotal role in identifying and addressing challenges, resulting in a more engaged stakeholders' community and improved school performance.	4.30	0.70	Always
4. aligns stakeholders' interests with the school goals, creating a dynamic environment that fuels enhanced engagement and improved school performance.	4.30	0.70	Always
5. initiates a driving force behind the proactive and forward-thinking approaches that lead to increased stakeholders' engagement and, consequently, improved school performance.	4.31	0.67	Always

Weighted Mean = 4.30
SD = 0.64
Verbal Interpretation = Highly Evident

Table 10 shows the level of school heads' competencies in terms of initiative. Based on the responses the school head always seeks opportunities to engage stakeholders, fostering a more robust partnership directly contributing to improve school performance (M=4.33, SD=0.70). Furthermore, the school head displays initiative for innovative solutions and strategies that enhance stakeholders' engagement and drive positive changes in school performance got the lowest response (M=4.28, SD=0.71).

The level of school heads' competencies in terms of initiative were highly evident among the respondents as indicated by a weighted mean score of 4.30 and a standard deviation of 0.64. The data underscores the school heads' strong dedication to stakeholder engagement, coupled with recognition of their evident practice in implementing innovative solutions and strategies, reflecting effective leadership in enhancing school performance.

Level of Stakeholders' Engagement

Level of Stakeholders' Engagement include communicating, volunteering, decision making and collaborating and was determine by a mean and standard deviation.

Table 11. *Level of Stakeholders' Engagement in terms of Communicating*

Stakeholders' engagement through communication...	Mean	SD	Remarks
1. builds trust and fosters a positive partnership between the school and the community.	4.45	0.57	Always
2. ensures that important information, such as policies, events, and academic progress, is shared promptly and comprehensively.	4.46	0.58	Always
3. keeps parents informed about their child's education and provides opportunities for parental engagement and support.	4.46	0.58	Always
4. enables schools to seek and receive feedback from stakeholders, leading to continual improvement in educational quality.	4.40	0.63	Always
5. creates a sense of belonging and shared responsibility for the school's success, benefiting both the institution and the community it serves.	4.42	0.62	Always

Weighted Mean   = 4.44
SD = 0.53
Verbal Interpretation = Highly Evident

Table 11 shows the level of stakeholders' engagement in terms of communicating. Based on the responses stakeholders' engagement through communication always ensures that important information, such as policies, events, and academic progress, is shared promptly and comprehensively and keeps parents informed about their child's education and provides opportunities for parental engagement and support (M=4.46, SD=0.58). While, the statement enables schools to seek and receive feedback from stakeholders, leading to continual improvement in educational quality received the lowest response (M=4.40, SD=0.63).

The level of stakeholders' engagement in terms of communicating were highly evident among the respondents as indicated by a weighted mean score of 4.44 and a standard deviation of 0.53. The data indicates the main importance of stakeholders' engagement through effective communication, alongside recognition of the impactful practice of utilizing feedback for continual improvement, contributing to enhanced educational quality within the school.

Level of Stakeholders' Engagement in terms of Volunteering

Table 12. *Level of Stakeholders' Engagement in terms of Volunteering*

Stakeholders' engagement through volunteering...	Mean	SD	Remarks
1. enhances the sense of community and support within the school.	4.41	0.63	Always
2. provides additional resources and support for various school activities.	4.34	0.66	Always
3. enables parents to become more actively engaged in their child's education, improving students' performance.	4.43	0.61	Always
4. fosters a sense of ownership and shared responsibility for the school's success among stakeholders.	4.35	0.65	Always
5. demonstrates a commitment to the school's mission and the well-being of students	4.39	0.62	Always

Weighted Mean = 4.38
SD = 0.56
Verbal Interpretation = Highly Evident

Table 12 shows the level of stakeholders' engagement in terms of volunteering. Addressing the responses stakeholders' engagement through volunteering always enables parents to become more actively engaged in their child's education, improving students' performance (M=4.43, SD=0.61). The statement regarding providing supplementary resources and support for diverse school activities received the lowest response (M=4.34, SD=0.66).

The level of stakeholders' engagement in terms of volunteering were highly evident among the respondents indicated by a weighted mean score of 4.38 and a standard deviation of 0.56. The data highlights the positive impact of stakeholders' engagement through volunteering on students' performance, alongside recognition of the valuable contribution of providing additional resources and support to various school activities.

Table 13. *Level of Stakeholders' Engagement in terms of Decision Making*

Stakeholders' engagement in decision-making...	Mean	SD	Remarks
1. ensures that policies and initiatives align with the needs and priorities of the community.	4.36	0.64	Always
2. empowers stakeholders to take an active role in shaping the direction of the school and the educational experience.	4.37	0.64	Always
3. fosters a greater sense of ownership and commitment among stakeholders to the school's success.	4.34	0.65	Always
4. leads to a more informed and well-rounded choices that benefit the entire school community.	4.37	0.66	Always
5. contributes to developing effective strategies to address challenges and seize opportunities.	4.33	0.67	Always

Weighted Mean = 4.36
SD = 0.59
Verbal Interpretation = Highly Evident

Table 13 shows the level of stakeholders' engagement in terms of decision making. Based on the responses stakeholders' engagement in decision-making always empowers stakeholders to take an active role in shaping the direction of the school and the educational experience and leads to a more informed and well-rounded choices that benefit the entire school community (M=4.37, SD=0.64, SD=0.66). Moreover, the statement regarding contributing to the development of effective strategies to address challenges and seize opportunities received the lowest response (M=4.33, SD=0.67).

The level of stakeholders' engagement in terms of decision making were highly evident among the respondents indicated by a weighted mean score of 4.36 and a standard deviation of 0.59. This shows the

positive impact of stakeholders' engagement in decision-making, empowering the community to shape the school's direction, while also recognizing the valuable practice of contributing to effective strategies in addressing challenges and seizing opportunities within the school.

Level of Stakeholders' Engagement in terms of Collaborating
Table 14. *Level of Stakeholders' Engagement in terms of Collaborating*

Stakeholders' engagement through collaboration...	Mean	SD	Remarks
1. creates a cohesive and supportive educational environment.	4.39	0.61	Always
2. enriches the educational experience and promotes unity within the school.	4.37	0.65	Always
3. fosters a shared commitment to the school's mission and goals.	4.37	0.64	Always
4. ensures that educational strategies and programs are tailored to meet the diverse needs of the school community.	4.38	0.67	Always
5. facilitates collaborative opportunities that benefit both students and the broader community.	4.34	0.68	Always

Weighted Mean = 4.37
SD = 0.59
Verbal Interpretation = Highly Evident

Table 14 shows the level of stakeholders' engagement in terms of collaborating. Based on the responses stakeholders' engagement through collaboration always creates a cohesive and supportive educational environment (M=4.39, SD=0.61). The statement about facilitates collaborative opportunities that benefit both students and the broader community received the lowest response (M=4.34, SD=0.68).

The level of stakeholders' engagement in terms of collaborating were highly evident among the respondents as indicated by a weighted mean score of 4.37 and a standard deviation of 0.59. The data illustrates strong recognition for the positive impact of stakeholders' engagement through collaboration on creating a cohesive educational environment, alongside acknowledgment of the evident and beneficial practice of providing collaborative opportunities benefiting both students and the broader community.

Level of School Performance

Level of School Performance include promotion rate, drop-out rate, graduation rate, cohort-survival rate, SBM Level and IPCRF and was determine by mean and standard deviation.

Table 15. *Level of School Performance in terms of Promotion Rate*

School year	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD
2020-2021	270	92.58	107.01	99.55	3.60
2021-2022	270	93.23	100.00	99.16	2.00
2022-2023	270	93.28	100.00	97.64	2.15
Average	270	93.03	102.34	98.78	2.58

Table 15 illustrates the level of school performance in terms of promotion rate. Across the three school years, the mean promotion rate fluctuates slightly, with the highest average promotion rate observed in the 2020-2021 school year (99.55%) and the lowest in the 2022-2023 school year (97.64%). Overall, the average promotion rate over the three years is 98.78%, with a standard deviation of 2.58, implicates a moderate level of consistency in promotion rates among schools over this period.

In summary, while the school maintained a typically good academic standard, performance decreased

during the 2022-2023 school year. The promotion rate, as measured by the mean was reasonably stable, indicating consistent overall performance across the specified school years. It may be worthwhile for the school administration to conduct additional research and address any reasons leading to the reduction noticed during the 2022-2023 academic year.

Table 16. *Level of School Performance in terms of Drop-out Rate*

School year	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD
2020-2021	270	0.00	1.60	0.28	0.57
2021-2022	270	0.00	1.85	0.38	0.66
2022-2023	270	0.00	4.00	0.87	1.32
Average	270	0.00	2.48	0.51	0.85

Table 16 illustrates the level of school performance in terms of drop-out rate. Across the three school years, the mean drop-out rate increase slightly, with the lowest average drop-out rate observed in the 2020-2021 school year (0.28%) and the highest in the 2022-2023 school year (0.87%). Overall, the average drop-out rate over the three years is 0.51%, with a standard deviation of 0.85. The increasing trend in dropout rates across three consecutive school years indicates a potential rise in student disengagement or challenges affecting retention. This highlights the importance of implementing strategies to address underlying factors contributing to dropout rates and enhance student support systems to promote academic success and persistence.

Table 17. *Level of School Performance in terms of Graduation Rate*

School year	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD
2020-2021	270	87.36	119.44	98.63	8.54
2021-2022	270	91.32	127.57	101.00	9.32
2022-2023	270	85.86	100.00	97.53	4.31
Average	270	88.18	115.67	99.05	7.39

Table 17 illustrates the level of school performance in terms of graduation rate. The graduation rates for the school years 2020-2021, 2021-2022, and 2022-2023 were 98.63%, 101.00%, and 97.53% respectively. The average mean graduation rate over these three years is 99.05% with the standard deviation of 7.39. This data implies a generally high level of success in student graduation, with a slight decrease in the 2022-2023 school year compared to the previous years. Despite this slight decrease, the overall trend remains positive, indicating effective educational strategies and support systems within the institution. However, the variability in the standard deviation signifies potential factors contributing to fluctuations, highlighting the need for further analysis to pinpoint specific influences on academic performance and graduation rates for targeted interventions.

Table 18. *Level of School Performance in terms of Cohort-Survival Rate*

School year	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD
2020-2021	270	76.92	120.14	93.72	12.23
2021-2022	270	74.00	100.00	94.20	7.50
2022-2023	270	74.85	117.67	94.16	11.03

Average	270	75.26	112.60	94.03	10.25

Table 18 illustrates the level of school performance in terms of cohort survival rate. Across the three school years, the mean cohort-survival rate increase slightly, with the average cohort-survival rate observed in 2021-2022 school year (94.20%) and decrease slightly in 2022-2023 school year (94.16%). Overall, the average cohort-survival rate over the three years is 94.03%, with a standard deviation of 10.25. This indicates a relatively stable trend in cohort survival rates over the specified school years, conveying consistent retention of students within the educational program.

Table 19. *Level of School Performance in terms of SBM*

School year	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
2020-2021	270	1.00	3.00	2.09	0.54	Maturing
2021-2022	270	2.00	3.00	2.45	0.52	Maturing
2022-2023	270	2.00	3.00	2.64	0.50	Maturing
Average	270	1.66	3.00	2.39	0.52	Maturing

Table 19 illustrates the level of school performance in terms of SBM Level. The mean SBM Level indicates a positive trend in school performance over the three years. The SBM (School-Based Management) levels for the school years 2020-2021, 2021-2022, and 2022-2023 were 2.09, 2.45, and 2.64 respectively, with an average mean of 2.39 and interpreted as maturing with a standard deviation of 0.52. This indicates a progressive increase in SBM levels over the specified school years, reflecting potential improvements in the management and autonomy of schools in decision-making processes.

Table 20. *Level of School Performance in terms of IPCRF*

School year	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
2020-2021	270	4.12	4.88	4.44	0.18	Very Satisfactory
2021-2022	270	4.24	4.97	4.53	0.18	Outstanding
2022-2023	270	4.31	4.86	4.61	0.18	Outstanding
Average	270	4.22	4.90	4.53	0.18	Outstanding

Table 20 provides the level of school performance in terms of Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF) across three school year 2020- 2023. The mean IPCRF scores indicates a positive trend in school performance over the three years. In 2020-2021, the mean score of 4.44 was classified as Very Satisfactory, while in the following years 2021-2022 and 2022-2023, the mean scores of 4.53 and 4.61 were deemed Outstanding. This implies a consistent improvement in performance, with schools achieving increasingly higher levels of outstanding in subsequent years.

Table 20 provides the level of school performance in terms of Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF) across three school year 2020- 2023. The mean IPCRF scores indicates a positive trend in school performance over the three years. In 2020-2021, the mean score of 4.44 was classified as Very Satisfactory, while in the following years 2021-2022 and 2022-2023, the mean scores of 4.53 and 4.61 were

deemed Outstanding. This implies a consistent improvement in performance, with schools achieving increasingly higher levels of outstanding in subsequent years.

Significant Relationship between School heads' Leadership Practices and Stakeholders Engagement

Table 21. *Significant Relationship between School heads' Leadership Practices and Stakeholders Engagement*

School Heads' Leadership Practices		Stakeholders' Engagement			
		Communicating	Volunteering	Decision Making	Collaborating
Leading Strategically	Pearson Correlation	.661**	.595**	.665**	.658**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	270	270	270	270
Management of School Operations and Resources	Pearson Correlation	.648**	.605**	.646**	.644**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	270	270	270	270
Focus on Teaching and Learning	Pearson Correlation	.666**	.623**	.667**	.684**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	270	270	270	270
Developing Self and Others	Pearson Correlation	.706**	.644**	.689**	.707**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	270	270	270	270
Building Connections	Pearson Correlation	.744**	.614**	.693**	.686**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	270	270	270	270

Table 21 demonstrates the significant relationship between School heads' leadership practices and stakeholders' engagement. The School heads' leadership practices were observed to have significant relationship to stakeholders' engagement. This is based on the computed r values obtained from the tests that range from 0.595 to 0.744 indicating moderate to strong positive correlations. Furthermore, the p-values obtained were less than the significance alpha 0.05, hence there is a significance.

This implies that fostering effective leadership among school heads can serve as a catalyst for enhancing collaboration, communication, and mutual support among stakeholders. Consequently, prioritizing leadership development initiatives can lead to a more cohesive and engaged school community, ultimately driving positive outcomes for both students and educators.

Significant Relationship between School heads' Leadership Practices and School Performance

Table 22. *Significant Relationship between School heads' Leadership Practices and School Performance*

School Heads' Leadership Practices		School Performance					
		Promotion Rate	Drop-out Rate	Graduation Rate	Cohort-Survival Rate	SBM	IPCRF
Leading Strategically	Pearson Correlation	.041	-.009	-.080	.118	.046	-.151*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.500	.881	.189	.053	.449	.013
	N	270	270	270	270	270	270
Management of School	Pearson Correlation	-.048	.064	-.080	.158**	.057	-.137*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.434	.296	.191	.009	.355	.024

Operations and Resources	N	270	270	270	270	270	270
Focus on Teaching and Learning	Pearson Correlation	.032	-.017	-.115	.160**	.001	-.157**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.602	.781	.059	.008	.981	.010
	N	270	270	270	270	270	270
Developing Self and Others	Pearson Correlation	.021	-.044	-.140*	.148*	.014	-.139*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.733	.467	.022	.015	.820	.023
	N	270	270	270	270	270	270
Building Connections	Pearson Correlation	-.016	-.014	-.165**	.141*	.035	-.150*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.797	.820	.007	.020	.571	.014
	N	270	270	270	270	270	270

Table 22 demonstrates the significant relationship between School heads' leadership practices and school performance. Leading strategically shows no significant correlation with promotion rate, dropout rate, graduation rate, cohort survival rate and School-Based Management (SBM) levels. Management of school operations and focus on teaching and learning did not show significant relationships with promotion rate, dropout rate, graduation rate and SBM levels. Similarly, developing self and others and building connections did not show significant relationships with promotion rate, dropout rate and SBM levels.

The findings shows that in the realm of education, school heads' leadership practices may not be directly linked to key outcomes such as promotion rates, dropout rates, graduation rates, or the effectiveness of School-Based Management (SBM) systems. This indicates that behind educational outcomes are complex and involve more than just leadership and management. Factors like students' background and engagement, curriculum quality, teacher effectiveness, community involvement, resource allocation, data-driven decision-making, and school culture are important. These variables play significant roles and need to be considered to understand and improve educational outcomes.

In line with Gonzales's (2018) research, the findings indicate that the mean level of performance in terms of internal efficiency, specifically the promotion rate, for public elementary schools in CALABARZON is notably high. The respondents displayed an impressive average mean score of 98.18%, accompanied by a standard deviation of 3.53. The results suggest that neither leadership qualities nor school performance are significantly correlated with the promotion rate.

Significant Relationship between School heads' Competencies and Stakeholders' Engagement

Table 23. *Significant Relationship between School heads' Competencies and Stakeholders' Engagement*

School Heads' Competencies		Stakeholders' Engagement			
		Communicating	Volunteering	Decision Making	Collaborating
Visionary	Pearson Correlation	.730**	.672**	.732**	.751**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	270	270	270	270
Problem Solving	Pearson Correlation	.708**	.661**	.703**	.723**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	270	270	270	270
Conflict Management	Pearson Correlation	.721**	.653**	.725**	.746**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	270	270	270	270
Innovation	Pearson Correlation	.677**	.591**	.685**	.676**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	270	270	270	270

Initiative	Pearson Correlation	.739**	.669**	.721**	.741**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	270	270	270	270

Table 23 demonstrates the significant relationship between School heads' competencies and stakeholders' engagement. The School heads' competencies were observed to have significant relationship to stakeholders' engagement. This is based on the computed r values obtained from the tests that range from 0.591 to 0.751 indicating moderate to strong positive correlations. Furthermore, the p-values obtained were less than the significance alpha 0.05, hence there is a significance.

The significant relationship between school heads' competencies and stakeholders' engagement implies that the effectiveness and proficiency of school leaders directly impact the level of involvement and commitment from various stakeholders. This means that investing in the development of school heads' competencies can lead to enhanced engagement and collaboration among stakeholders, ultimately fostering a more supportive and cohesive educational environment. Therefore, educational institutions should prioritize the continuous improvement of school leaders' skills and capabilities to cultivate stronger partnerships with stakeholders and promote overall school success.

Significant Relationship between School heads' Competencies and School Performance

Table 24. *Significant Relationship between School heads' Competencies and School Performance*

School heads' Competencies		School Performance					
		Promotion Rate	Drop-out Rate	Graduation Rate	Cohort-Survival Rate	SBM	IPCRF
Visionary	Pearson Correlation	-.155*	.009	-.032	-.165**	.176**	.015
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.011	.885	.601	.007	.004	.802
	N	270	270	270	270	270	270
Problem Solving	Pearson Correlation	-.141*	.003	-.028	-.167**	.153*	.024
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.021	.958	.647	.006	.012	.698
	N	270	270	270	270	270	270
Conflict Management	Pearson Correlation	-.105	-.038	-.017	-.164**	.217**	.081
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.087	.539	.781	.007	.000	.188
	N	270	270	270	270	270	270
Innovation	Pearson Correlation	-.107	.024	-.025	-.081	.173**	.066
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.081	.699	.679	.188	.004	.284
	N	270	270	270	270	270	270
Initiative	Pearson Correlation	-.154*	-.004	-.010	-.149*	.147*	.008
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.011	.944	.876	.014	.016	.894
	N	270	270	270	270	270	270

Table 24 demonstrates the significant relationship between School heads' competencies and school performance. Visionary, problem-solving, and initiative skills showed no significant correlation with promotion rates, dropout rates and SBM levels. Similarly, conflict management did not exhibit significant relationships with promotion rates, dropout rates, SBM and IPCRF. Additionally, innovation did not show significant relationships with promotion rates, dropout rates, graduation rates, SBM levels and IPCRF.

The absence of significant correlations implies that these leadership attributes may not directly impact key educational outcomes. Educational institutions should consider alternative approaches or focus areas to address promotion rates, dropout rates, and other performance metrics effectively.

When considering the school heads' competencies in terms of visionary, problem solving and initiative, it exhibited a significant correlation with graduation rate, cohort-survival rate and IPCRF. Meanwhile, conflict management exhibited a significant correlation with graduation rate and cohort-survival rate. Lastly, in terms of innovation, no statistically significant relations were observed with most school performance indicator, except for a significant correlation with the cohort survival rate. This is based on the computed r values obtained from the tests that range from -0.167 to 0217 with very weak to weak relationship. Furthermore, the p-values obtained were less than the significance alpha 0.05, hence there is a significance.

4. *Conclusion and Recommendation*

Based on the findings, the following conclusions were drawn.

The following are the conclusions drawn based on the findings of the study.

The null hypothesis posited that there is no significant relationship between Leadership Practices and Stakeholders engagement is rejected in this study. This implies that stakeholder feedback showcased how effective leadership practices, such as strategic initiatives and transparent communication, fostered collaboration and decision-making, while prioritizing personal growth, ultimately demonstrating a significant link between Leadership Practices and Stakeholders engagement in the school environment.

The null hypothesis posited that there is no significant relationship between Leadership Practices and School Performance is partially rejected in this study. This is because certain aspects of leadership practices, such as strategic direction-setting and fostering connections, have shown observable impacts on school performance metrics. However, the complexity of educational systems and the influence of external factors may lead to variability in the extent of this relationship across different indicators, thus partially rejecting the null hypothesis.

The null hypothesis posited that there is no significant relationship between School Heads Competencies and Stakeholders engagement is rejected in this study. It is because when school leaders effectively address conflicts, implement innovative solutions, and demonstrate proactive leadership, stakeholders are more likely to feel motivated and engaged in collaborative efforts, fostering a positive school environment.

The null hypothesis posited that there is no significant relationship between School Heads Competencies and Schools Performance is partially rejected in this study. The partial rejection of the null hypothesis stems from the observation that School Heads displaying strong leadership qualities like vision-setting and effective problem-solving tend to correlate with better graduation rates and improved school management practices. However, variations in the educational landscape and external factors introduce complexity, leading to differing impacts across various performance indicators.

Based on the findings, summary and conclusions drawn, the researcher proposed the following recommendations for consideration.

1. School heads should continue their practices and prioritize enhancing communication, transparency, professional development, and collaborative leadership while streamlining monitoring and evaluation processes and emphasizing learner achievement to ensure exceptional school performance and community engagement while maintaining compliance with laws and regulations.

2. School heads should implement regular feedback mechanisms, tailored training programs, and robust oversight systems to enhance their competencies, address challenges effectively, ensure adherence to financial management policies, optimize resource utilization, and foster a conducive learning environment.

3. School heads should establish structured platforms for ongoing dialogue and involvement. This could involve regular communication channels, volunteer programs, inclusive decision-making processes, and collaborative projects. Strengthening these aspects of engagement will foster a sense of ownership, partnership, and shared responsibility among stakeholders, ultimately contributing to a more vibrant and supportive school community.

References:

DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020. National Adoption and Implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH).

Gonzales, G. (2018). "The Leadership Qualities and Performance of Elementary School Heads in CALABARZON" Laguna State Polytechnic University, Santa Cruz Campus, Santa Cruz, Laguna.