

Enhancing Governance Council Through School Head Leadership for Improved School Management

Adonis G. Nuñez¹; Manuel V. Estera Ed. D.²

^{1,2}School of Graduate Studies, St. Louise de Marillac College of Sorsogon, Inc., Sorsogon City, Philippine

Publication Date: 2026/10/26

Abstract: This study examined how school heads strengthened the School Governance Council (SGC) toward improved school management in Gubat South District, Sorsogon. Specifically, it determined the influence of SGC participation and engagement, identified leadership strategies employed by school heads, assessed the level of collaboration between school heads and SGCs, determined the challenges encountered in strengthening the councils, and proposed an intervention plan. The study employed an embedded mixed-methods research design involving twenty (20) elementary school heads selected through total enumeration. Data were gathered through questionnaire and interviews. Quantitative data were analyzed using frequency, rank, and mean, while qualitative data were analyzed thematically to support the quantitative findings. Results showed that SGC participation and engagement were perceived as important in program planning, implementation, and evaluation. Leadership strategies included SGC orientation, involvement in program planning, and the use of understandable information during meetings. The level of collaboration was high, with an overall mean of 4.06. Mutual respect and trust obtained a mean of 4.25, while joint monitoring of school programs and activities obtained a mean of 3.85. The major challenges encountered were unfamiliarity with SGC provisions, passivity of SGC members, and limited resources. Based on the findings, a School Governance Council Caravan was proposed to strengthen governance capacity, stakeholder participation, collaboration, resource mobilization, and monitoring mechanisms toward more effective participatory school governance and school management.

Keywords: School Governance Council, School Head Leadership, Participatory Governance, Stakeholder Participation, School Management.

How to Cite: Adonis G. Nuñez; Manuel V. Estera Ed. D. (2026) Enhancing Governance Council Through School Head Leadership for Improved School Management. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 11(10), 1701-1711. <https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26oct1075>

I. INTRODUCTION

This study examined how school head leadership can strengthen School Governance Councils (SGCs) toward improved school management. The growing complexity of educational systems in the twenty-first century requires strong leadership, effective governance, and collaborative decision-making to ensure the delivery of quality education. As such, the role of the school head extends beyond administrative supervision to strategic leadership, stakeholder engagement, and institutional development. Educational leadership research consistently emphasizes that school heads significantly influence school effectiveness, organizational climate, and student achievement.

School leadership has been identified as a critical factor in school improvement. Leithwood and Jantzi (2005) asserted that leadership is second only to classroom instruction among school-related factors affecting student learning. Effective leaders establish a clear vision, promote professional collaboration, and create supportive conditions for teaching

and learning. Similarly, Sergiovanni (2001) argued that leadership in schools should be grounded in moral authority and shared responsibility rather than bureaucratic control. He emphasized that school's function more effectively when stakeholders develop a sense of ownership and commitment to institutional goals.

Educational change theorists likewise highlight the importance of collaborative leadership. Fullan (2014) emphasized that sustainable school improvement depends on leaders who can mobilize people, build relationships, and foster collective responsibility. Reforms often fail when leadership remains centralized and stakeholders are excluded from decision-making processes. In the field of management, Drucker (1999) also underscored that effective leadership involves aligning organizational objectives with stakeholder needs and creating systems that promote participation, accountability, and results.

The increasing emphasis on participatory governance reflects a broader transformation in educational leadership worldwide. Educational institutions are no longer expected to operate solely through hierarchical management structures but are encouraged to embrace collaborative governance models that actively engage various stakeholders in the planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of school programs. According to the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD, 2025), modern education governance requires effective coordination among schools, teachers, parents, local authorities, and communities to achieve educational goals. Effective governance enables schools to align institutional priorities with community needs while promoting accountability, transparency, and evidence-based decision-making. Governance structures that encourage stakeholder participation likewise strengthen organizational capacity and contribute to continuous school improvement.

International educational reforms have likewise recognized that school leaders must possess competencies beyond instructional supervision. School heads are expected to become instructional leaders, organizational managers, policy implementers, and community builders capable of navigating increasingly complex educational environments. UNESCO (2018) emphasized that school leadership is a critical policy lever for achieving Sustainable Development Goal 4 (Quality Education). Effective leadership promotes inclusive education, strengthens institutional accountability, facilitates stakeholder collaboration, and ensures that schools remain responsive to local educational needs. UNESCO further explained that successful school leaders create environments where teachers, parents, learners, and community members work together toward improving learner outcomes and promoting educational equity.

School governance has also become increasingly associated with the principles of transparency, accountability, and community participation. Rather than limiting governance to school administrators, contemporary educational systems recognize that parents, teachers, local government units, civil society organizations, and other community stakeholders possess valuable knowledge and resources that contribute to school effectiveness. The UNESCO Institute for Statistics (n.d.) defines school management boards or governing councils as governance bodies responsible for guiding the strategic direction of schools, monitoring performance, overseeing policy implementation, and supporting school leaders in achieving educational objectives. Such governance mechanisms enhance institutional legitimacy because decisions are made collectively rather than individually.

In the Philippine educational context, these principles are institutionalized through Republic Act No. 9155, otherwise known as the Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001, which promotes decentralization and shared governance in basic education. The law empowers schools to exercise greater autonomy in managing their operations while ensuring accountability for learner performance and organizational effectiveness. Republic Act No. 9155

recognizes that quality education is achieved through shared responsibility among school administrators, teachers, parents, local government units, and other education stakeholders.

Consistent with the mandate of Republic Act No. 9155, the Department of Education adopted School-Based Management (SBM) as its primary governance framework. SBM institutionalizes decentralization by granting schools greater authority over planning, budgeting, resource management, and program implementation while holding them accountable for educational outcomes. Through School-Based Management, decision-making is brought closer to learners, allowing schools to develop context-responsive programs based on local needs and priorities.

Recognizing the need to strengthen School-Based Management, the Department of Education issued DepEd Order No. 007, s. 2024, entitled *Policy Guidelines on the Implementation of the Revised School-Based Management (SBM) System*. The revised policy reinforces collaborative governance by promoting evidence-based planning, stakeholder engagement, accountability, transparency, and continuous school improvement. It emphasizes that school governance should be learner-centered, inclusive, participatory, and responsive to the changing needs of schools and communities. The policy further recognizes that sustainable school improvement can only be achieved through strong partnerships among school heads, teachers, parents, learners, local government units, and other education stakeholders (Department of Education, 2024).

A major component of the revised School-Based Management system is the strengthening of School Governance Councils (SGCs) as institutional mechanisms for participatory governance. Under DepEd Order No. 007, s. 2024, School Governance Councils are expected to actively participate in developing and implementing the School Improvement Plan (SIP), the Annual Implementation Plan (AIP), resource mobilization initiatives, monitoring and evaluation activities, and other school governance processes. Rather than serving merely as consultative bodies, SGCs are envisioned as functional governance structures that foster transparency, accountability, shared decision-making, and community ownership of educational programs.

The effectiveness of School Governance Council, however, depends largely on the leadership capacity of school heads. While policies establish the framework for participatory governance, successful implementation relies on leaders who can cultivate trust, facilitate collaboration, resolve conflicts, and encourage meaningful stakeholder engagement. Bush (2011) emphasized that participatory leadership structures enhance accountability and responsiveness to community needs, particularly within decentralized education systems. Likewise, Hallinger (2011) argued that effective school leaders improve school performance by developing people, redesigning organizational structures, and strengthening relationships among internal and external stakeholders.

Recent educational reforms likewise recognize that accountability extends beyond financial management to include transparency in decision-making, accessibility of school information, and stakeholder participation in governance. UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning (2021) noted that initiatives promoting open school data improve transparency by enabling communities to monitor school performance, resource utilization, enrollment, facilities, and learner outcomes. Such reforms strengthen public confidence in educational institutions while encouraging greater community participation in school improvement initiatives.

Despite the existence of national policies supporting School Governance Council, variations remain in their functionality across Philippine public schools. Factors such as leadership style, communication practices, stakeholder commitment, organizational culture, and contextual challenges continue to influence the effectiveness of these councils. While some schools have developed highly functional School Governance Council that actively participate in governance and school improvement, others continue to experience limited stakeholder participation, weak collaboration, and insufficient resource mobilization. These disparities suggest that policy implementation alone does not guarantee effective participatory governance. Rather, the leadership of school heads remains a determining factor in strengthening School Governance Councils and improving overall school management.

In Gubat South District, Sorsogon, school heads manage institutions that serve diverse communities with varying socio-economic conditions and educational needs. They are responsible for implementing national education policies while responding to local challenges related to stakeholder participation, resource limitations, and program sustainability. Their capacity to organize, mobilize, and strengthen School Governance Council may significantly influence school management effectiveness, particularly in planning, program implementation, monitoring and evaluation, transparency, accountability, and organizational performance.

Hence, this study examined the role of school heads in strengthening the School Governance Council (SGC) toward improved school management in Gubat South District, Sorsogon. It explored the leadership practices, strategies, and challenges encountered by the twenty (20) school heads in strengthening the SGC. The findings provided valuable insights into enhancing stakeholder participation and engagement, strengthening collaborative and participatory governance, and supporting continuous school improvement in public elementary schools.

➤ *Research Objectives*

This study adopted the following objectives:

- To determine the school heads perceived influences of the participation of School Governance Council in school management.

- To identify the specific leadership strategies employed by school heads in strengthening the effectiveness of the School Governance Council.
- To assess the level of collaboration between school heads and the School Governance Council in the implementation of school programs.
- To identify the challenges encountered by school heads that hinder the actualization of their roles in strengthening the School Governance Council.
- To propose an enhancement plan that may support school heads' leadership in strengthening the School Governance Council toward effective school management.

II. METHODOLOGY

The study employed an embedded mixed-methods research design, with the quantitative component serving as the primary method and the qualitative component embedded to support and enrich the interpretation of the quantitative findings. This design was appropriate because the study sought to quantify the major variables related to school head leadership in strengthening the School Governing Council (SGC), while also obtaining qualitative information that provided deeper explanations of the respondents' experiences and practices. The study involved twenty (20) elementary school heads in Gubat South District, Sorsogon, selected through total enumeration.

By including all 20 elementary school heads, the study captured a holistic view of leadership practices, strategies, and issues related to strengthening the SGC across the entire Gubat South District. Their responses served as the primary source of data in analyzing the role of school heads and in formulating a relevant and responsive learning and development plan. The inclusion of all school heads in the district strengthened the validity and credibility of the study and ensured that the findings accurately reflected the realities of school governance and management within the research setting.

III. RESULTS

This chapter presented the discussion and interpretation of the findings on school heads' leadership in strengthening the School Governance Council (SGC) toward improved school management in Gubat South District, Sorsogon. The findings were discussed according to the research questions and were interpreted in relation to the relevant theories, literature, and previous studies. The discussion focused on SGC participation and engagement in program planning, implementation, and evaluation; leadership strategies employed by school heads; the level of collaboration between school heads and SGC members; and the challenges encountered in strengthening the SGC.

➤ *Perceived Influences of the School Heads on the Participation and Engagement of Governing Council in School Management*

Managing the school, which is primarily the responsibility of the school head, becomes meaningful and productive once the participation of stakeholders is clearly

evident. The participation of the School Governance Council is considered a vital factor in school operations.

Table 1 presents data on school heads' perceptions of the influence of the SGC's participation and engagement in program planning. The indicator stated that providing the opportunity for the SGC to be involved in school program, project, and activity planning results in comprehensive plans obtained the highest frequency and ranked first. This finding

shows that the majority of respondents recognized the positive influence of the Council in producing comprehensive plans required for program implementation. In fact, based on the statement of Participant 1, a school head of a large school, the SGC plays a significant role in designing comprehensive plans, as she remarked, "The members of the Council had good ideas that contribute to coming up with very comprehensive plans."

Table 1 School Heads' Perceptions of the Influence of the School Governance Councils
Participation and Engagement in Program Planning

Perceived Influences	Frequency	Rank
Providing the opportunity for the SGC to be involved in school program, project, and activity planning results in comprehensive plan	19	1
Listening to the voice of the SGC yields members' active participation in generating the necessary plan.	18	2
Involving the SGC members in program planning strengthens their commitment to school management decisions.	17	3.5
Inviting the SGC to share insights during program planning strengthens their involvement.	17	3.5

Meanwhile, the indicator, listening to the voice of the SGC yields members' active participation in generating the necessary plan achieves a frequency of 18 and ranked 2nd. This is followed by two indicators: involving SGC members in program planning strengthens their commitment to school

management decisions and inviting the SGC to share insights during program planning strengthens their involvement. Both of these indicators obtain a frequency of 17 and tied for rank 3.5.

Table 2 School Heads' Perceptions of the Influence of the School Governance Council's
Participation and Engagement in Program Implementation

Perceived Influences	Frequency	Rank
Continuous collaboration between school heads and SGC members ensure effective implementation of school programs and projects.	19	1.5
Giving the SGC responsibility for programs promotes their active involvement.	19	1.5
Allowing the SGC to spearhead certain programs results in their active participation.	18	3
Delegating tasks to SGC members during program execution strengthens their engagement in school management.	17	4

Table 2 presents the school heads' perceptions of the influence of the School Governance Council's participation and engagement in program implementation. Continuous collaboration between school heads and SGC members to ensure effective implementation of school programs and projects and giving the SGC responsibility for programs to promote their active involvement both obtained a frequency of 19 and tied for rank 1.5. Allowing the SGC to spearhead certain programs resulting in their active participation obtained a frequency of 18 and ranked third. Meanwhile,

delegating tasks to SGC members during program execution to strengthen their engagement in school management obtained a frequency of 17 and ranked fourth.

This result is supported by the statement of Participant 17, who stated, "continuous collaboration with the SGC helps us implement our school programs effectively because members are given responsibilities and opportunities to participate in the actual implementation."

Table 3 School Heads' Perceptions of the Influence of the School Governance Council's
Participation and Engagement in Program Evaluation

Perceived Influences	Frequency	Rank
Providing the SGC with opportunities to participate in program monitoring and evaluation foster a sense of co-ownership in school management.	18	2
Engaging the SGC in program evaluation contributes to identifying strengths and areas for improvement in school management.	18	2
Conducting collaborative evaluation between school heads and SGC members lead to more effective decision-making for future programs.	18	2
Active involvement of the SGC in evaluating program and activity outcomes provide valuable feedback	17	4

Table 3 presents the school heads' perceptions of the influence of the School Governance Council's participation and engagement in program evaluation. Three indicators obtain the same frequency of 18 and ranked second. These include providing the SGC with opportunities to participate in program monitoring and evaluation, engaging the SGC in program evaluation to identify strengths and areas for improvement, and conducting collaborative evaluation between school heads and SGC members for future programs. Meanwhile, active involvement of the SGC in evaluating program and activity outcomes to provide valuable feedback obtained a frequency of 17 and ranked fourth.

This result was supported by the statement of participant 10, who remarked, "When we involve the SGC in evaluating our programs, they are able to share their

observations and suggestions that can help us improve our future activities."

➤ *Specific Leadership Strategies Employed by School Heads to Strengthen the Effectiveness of the School Governance Council*

The effectiveness of the School Governing Council depends on the leadership strategies employed by school heads in engaging and strengthening the participation of its members. Different strategies are used to encourage stakeholder involvement and support the effective functioning of the Council. Table 4 presents the specific leadership strategies employed by school heads to strengthen the effectiveness of the School Governance Council, particularly in terms of inclusive SGC engagement, capacity-building, and transparent data-driven practices.

Table 4 Inclusive SCC Engagement Strategy

Specific Action Steps	Frequency	Rank
Involving the SGC in the program planning	18	1
Encouraging open communication and feedback channels between school heads and SGC members to strengthen collaboration	15	2.5
Conducting regular consultation meetings with SGC members to gather their insights and recommendations	15	2.5
Allowing the SGC to lead certain program, project and activity	13	4.5
Delegating tasks to perform to the SGC	13	4.5

Table 4 presents the specific action steps employ by school heads under the Inclusive SGC Engagement Strategy. Involving the SGC in program planning obtained the highest frequency of 18 and ranked first. Encouraging open communication and feedback channels between school heads and SGC members to strengthen collaboration and conducting regular consultation meetings with SGC members to gather their insights and recommendations both obtained a frequency of 15 and tied for rank 2.5. Meanwhile, allowing

the SGC to lead certain programs, projects, and activities and delegating tasks to the SGC both obtained a frequency of 13 and tied for rank 4.5.

This result is supported by the statement of a participant 3, who remarked, "when we involve the SGC in planning our programs, they are able to share their ideas and suggestions, which help us come up with better plans for the school."

Table 5 Capacity-Building Strategy

Specific Action Steps	Frequency	Rank
Conducting orientation to SGC	19	1
Encouraging peer learning among SGC members through sharing of best practices and experiences in school governance.	13	2
Providing informational materials and guides to help SGC members better understand school programs and governance processes.	12	3
Inviting SGC members to participate in school-based activities and related professional development activities.	10	4

Table 5 presents the specific action steps under the Capacity-Building Strategy. Participant 20 remarked, "Conducting an orientation helps SGC members understand their roles and responsibilities, making them more prepared to participate in school programs and governance activities." Conducting orientation to the SGC obtained the highest frequency of 19 and ranked first. Encouraging peer learning among SGC members through sharing of best practices and

experiences in school governance obtained a frequency of 13 and ranked second. Providing informational materials and guides to help SGC members better understand school programs and governance processes obtained a frequency of 12 and ranked third. Meanwhile, inviting SGC members to participate in school-based activities and related professional development activities obtained the lowest frequency of 10 and ranked fourth.

Table 6 Transparent Data-Driven Strategy

Specific Action Steps	Frequency	Rank
Presenting clear and understandable information during SGC meetings to promote transparency	19	1
Providing the SGC with the data needed	17	2
Ensuring that relevant school reports are shared with SGC Members for informed decision-making	15	3
Data and reports are openly discussed with SGC members to support collaborative planning and evaluation	14	4

Table 6 presents the specific action steps under the Transparent Data-Driven Strategy. Participant 16 remarked, “When we present clear and understandable information during SGC meetings, the members become more informed and can participate better in making decisions for the school.” Presenting clear and understandable information during SGC meetings to promote transparency obtained the highest frequency of 19 and ranked first.

Providing the SGC with the data needed obtained a frequency of 17 and ranked second. Ensuring that relevant school reports are shared with SGC members for informed decision-making obtained a frequency of 15 and ranked third.

Meanwhile, data and reports being openly discussed with SGC members to support collaborative planning and evaluation obtained the lowest frequency of 14 and ranked fourth.

➤ *Level of Collaboration Among School Heads and Governing Councils*

The collaboration between school heads and the School Governance Council is an important aspect of effective school management. Strong collaboration allowed both parties to work together in carrying out school programs and activities.

Table 7 Level of Collaboration Among School Heads and the Governance Council

Indicators	Mean	Description
School heads and the SGC demonstrate mutual respect and trust in carrying out school programs and activities.	4.25	High
Both school heads and the SGC share accountability in achieving program goals and outcomes.	4.20	High
School heads and the SGC actively support each other in mobilizing stakeholders for effective program implementation.	4.15	High
School heads and the SGC coordinate in ensuring proper utilization of resources during program implementation.	4.15	High
School heads and the SGC work together in addressing issues and challenges encountered during program implementation.	4.10	High
School heads and the SGC perform their specific roles attuned 4.0 High to the program.	4.05	High
School heads and the SGC maintain regular communication to ensure smooth coordination during program implementation.	4.00	High
School heads and the SGC provide equitably the resources in program implementation	3.95	High
Decision-making regarding program implementation is done collaboratively between school heads and the SGC.	3.95	High
School heads and the SGC jointly monitor the progress of school programs and activities.	3.85	High
Average	4.06	High

Table 7 presents the level of collaboration among school heads and School Governance Council (SGC) in the implementation of school programs. All ten indicators are rated High, with an overall mean of 4.06. Mutual respect and trust obtained the highest mean of 4.25, followed by shared accountability in achieving program goals and outcomes with 4.20. Active support in mobilizing stakeholders and coordination in the utilization of resources both obtained 4.15. Working together in addressing issues and challenges obtained 4.10, while performing specific roles attuned to the program obtained 4.05. Regular communication obtained 4.00. Providing resources equitably and collaborative decision-making both obtained 3.95. Jointly monitoring the progress of school programs and activities obtained the lowest mean of 3.85, although it was still rated High.

The interview responses described the participants' experiences of collaboration during the implementation of school programs. Participant 11 reported that school heads and SGC members worked together in carrying out program activities, shared responsibilities, communicated regarding program activities, mobilized stakeholders, coordinated available resources, and addressed issues encountered during implementation. Participant 4 also reported the involvement of SGC members in monitoring school programs and activities.

Participant 19 said, “SGC members participate in carrying out school activities by sharing responsibilities with the school head.” Another participant described regular communication between the school head and SGC members during program implementation. A participant also reported that SGC members provided support in mobilizing stakeholders and resources for school activities. Other

participants mentioned jointly addressing concerns encountered during program implementation and monitoring the progress of school programs and activities.

The responses further showed that the extent of participation in monitoring varied among the participants. This was consistent with the quantitative result in which joint monitoring of school programs and activities obtained the lowest mean of 3.85 among the collaboration indicators.

➤ *Challenges that Hindered the Actualization of the Roles of the School Heads in School Governance Councils*

The effective functioning of the School Governance Council depends on the ability of school heads to provide appropriate leadership and facilitate the active participation of SGC members. However, the actualization of their roles may be affected by various challenges encountered in the implementation of school governance practices. This section presents the findings on the challenges encountered by school heads in strengthening the School Governance Council, particularly in terms of unfamiliarity with SGC provisions, passivity of SGC members, and limited resources. The results are presented according to the specific issues identified and their corresponding frequency and rank.

Table 8 School Heads Unfamiliarity of SGC Provisions as a Challenge

Specific Issues	Frequency	Rank
Limited familiarity with the scope of SGC authority and decision-making	11	1
Limited knowledge of SGC policies and guidelines	10	2
Insufficient awareness of SGC procedures	7	3

Table 8 presents the specific issues related to school heads' unfamiliarity with SGC provisions as a challenge. Limited familiarity with the scope of SGC authority and decision-making obtained the highest frequency of 11, ranking first. Limited knowledge of SGC policies and guidelines obtained a frequency of 10, ranking second. Meanwhile, insufficient awareness of SGC procedures obtained a frequency of 7, ranking third.

This result is supported by the statement of participant 8, who remarked, "Sometimes, we are not fully familiar with the specific authority and decision-making responsibilities of the SGC, so it becomes difficult to determine what decisions should be handled by the council."

Table 9 Passivity of the SGC Members as a Challenge

Specific Issues	Frequency	Rank
Irregular attendance in meetings and school governance activities	16	1
Limited understanding of roles and responsibilities	11	2
Lack of interest in school governance matters	7	3

Table 9 presented the specific issues related to the passivity of SGC members as a challenge encountered by school heads. Irregular attendance in meetings and school governance activities obtained the highest frequency of 16, ranking first. Limited understanding of roles and responsibilities obtained a frequency of 11, ranking second. Meanwhile, lack of interest in school governance matters obtained a frequency of 7, ranking third.

This result was supported by the statement of participant 12 who remarked, "Some SGC members do not regularly attend meetings and school governance activities, which makes it difficult to involve them consistently in the programs and decisions of the school."

Table 10 Limited Resources as a Challenge

Specific Issues	Frequency	Rank
Limited familiarity with the scope of SGC authority and decision-making	14	1
Limited knowledge of SGC policies and guidelines	13	2
Insufficient awareness of SGC procedures	8	3

Table 10 presents the specific issues related to limited resources as a challenge encountered by school heads in strengthening the School Governing Council. Insufficient budget allocation for SGC programs and activities obtained the highest frequency of 14, ranking first. Lack of financial support from stakeholders for SGC-related projects and programs obtained a frequency of 13, ranking second. Meanwhile, limited availability of communication tools and

technology or channels for coordination with SGC members obtained a frequency of 8, ranking third.

This result is supported by the statement of participant 4, who remarked, "One of the challenges we encounter is the limited budget for SGC programs and activities, since some planned activities cannot be fully implemented without sufficient financial resources."

➤ *Proposed Intervention to Support School Heads' Leadership in Strengthening School Governance Council*
School Governance Council Caravan: Strengthening Stakeholder Awareness and Participation in Shared School Leadership.

• *Introduction:*

Effective school governance requires the active participation and collaboration of school leaders, parents, teachers, learners, and community stakeholders. The School Governance Council (SGC) Caravan is proposed as an intervention to strengthen stakeholder awareness, participation, and shared responsibility in school governance. Through a series of orientations, capacity-building activities, collaborative planning sessions, and partnership-building initiatives, the program brings governance closer to stakeholders and provides opportunities for meaningful engagement. The intervention aims to develop capable and active SGC members, strengthen school-community partnerships, and promote sustainable participatory governance that contributes to improved school management.

• *Rationale:*

The School Governance Council (SGC) serves as a vital mechanism for participatory school leadership, ensuring that decision-making processes reflect the voices of teachers, learners, parents, and community partners. However, many stakeholders remain unaware of the SGC's mandate, resulting in limited engagement and underutilized collaborative potential.

The SGC Caravan is conceptualized as a strategic intervention to mobilize awareness, build capacities, and consolidate partnerships across schools and communities. By bringing governance discussions directly to stakeholders through a series of structured activities, the caravan fosters transparency, inclusivity, and collective responsibility. This initiative aligns with the principle that education thrives when governance is shared, participatory, and community-driven.

• *Program Goal:*

To increase awareness, strengthen capacities, and institutionalize stakeholder participation in school governance through a three-phased caravan intervention, thereby enhancing collaborative leadership and sustainable school-community partnerships.

• *General Objectives:*

Specifically, the program aims to:

- ✓ Increase stakeholders' awareness and understanding of the roles, functions, and responsibilities of the School Governance Council (SGC) in participatory school leadership and management.
- ✓ Strengthen the knowledge, skills, and active participation of SGC members and stakeholders through capacity-building activities, collaborative planning, and engagement in school governance.
- ✓ Establish and strengthen sustainable partnerships among the school, parents, community, LGUs, NGOs, and other

stakeholders to support effective and participatory school governance.

• *Technical Description:*

The School Governance Council (SGC) Caravan is a three-phase intervention that promotes stakeholder awareness, capacity building, active participation, and sustainable partnerships in school governance through orientations, workshops, collaborative planning, and partnership activities.

The program is organized into three implementation phases:

✓ *Phase 1: SGC Orientation, Awareness, and Advocacy*

- Conduct SGC orientations and stakeholder forums
- Explain SGC roles, functions, policies, and responsibilities
- Distribute IEC materials such as brochures, posters, and videos
- Promote awareness of participatory school governance

✓ *Phase 2: Capacity Building and Collaborative Engagement*

- Conduct training workshops and governance simulations
- Develop skills in planning, decision-making, monitoring, and resource mobilization
- Facilitate collaborative planning and problem-solving sessions
- Strengthen active participation and shared accountability

✓ *Phase 3: Partnership Building, Institutionalization, and Sustainability*

- Establish partnerships with LGUs, NGOs, parents, and community organizations
- Develop agreements and joint school-support initiatives
- Establish monitoring, feedback, and documentation mechanisms
- Recognize stakeholder contributions and sustain successful partnerships

This framing positions the SGC Caravan not just as an event, but as a systematic intervention that transforms awareness into action and embeds governance practices into the school-community culture.

IV. CONCLUSION

- The School Governing Council's participation and engagement across the planning, implementation, and evaluation phases of school program management foster collaborative leadership, strengthen school management practices, and enhance decision-making processes.
- The leadership strategies that the school heads employ to strengthen the effectiveness of the School Governing Council include, the inclusive SGC engagement strategy, the capacity-building strategy, and the transparent data-driven strategy.

- The collaboration between school heads and the SGC is high, contributing to effective program implementation through shared responsibility, coordination, and stakeholder participation.
- The challenges encounter by school heads in actualizing their roles within school governing councils stemmed from gaps in familiarity with provisions, passive member participation, and limited resources.
- The School Governance Council Caravan: Strengthening School Stakeholder Awareness and Participation in Shared School Leadership is proposed as an intervention to support school heads' leadership and enhance the effectiveness of the School Governance Council.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Regular capacity-building workshops for SGC members, aimed at equipping them with skills in collaborative planning, program implementation, and participatory evaluation, be conducted by the school and district so that their engagement translates into sustained improvements in school management practices.
- Inclusive engagement, capacity-building, and transparent data-driven strategies be consistently implemented to further strengthen the effectiveness of the School Governance Council.
- Nurturing the collaboration by sustaining open communication, shared decision-making, and joint initiatives be made evident to further enhance school governance.
- The School Governance Council members be provided with targeted orientation to ensure active participation initiatives, and adequate resource support to overcome identified challenges and ensure the council's effective functioning.
- The proposed School Governance Council Caravan: Strengthening School Stakeholder Awareness and Participation in Shared School Leadership be adopted.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Almagro, A. M., Bacang, A. G. B., & Calumpang, E. N. (2025). Reflections on school governance: The lived experiences of school heads. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 3(6). <https://ejournals.ph/article.php?id=26487>
- [2]. Anand, G., Atluri, A., Crawford, L., Pugatch, T., & Sheth, K. (2023). Improving school management in low and middle income countries: A systematic review. *Economics of Education Review*, 97, 102464. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2023.102464>
- [3]. Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. Free Press.
- [4]. Biñas, J. P., Siason, N., & Paulino, R. (2023). Quality micro-decision-making at selected Philippine public secondary schools: An iterative process of planning and implementing the curriculum. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Studies*, 5(5), 44–54. <https://doi.org/10.32996/jhsss.2023.5.5.6>
- [5]. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- [6]. Bryk, A. S., & Schneider, B. (2002). *Trust in schools: A core resource for improvement*. Russell Sage Foundation.
- [7]. Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. Harper & Row.
- [8]. Bush, T. (2011). *Theories of educational leadership and management* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- [9]. Bush, T., & Glover, D. (2014). School leadership models: What do we know? *School Leadership & Management*, 34(5), 553–571. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2014.928680>
- [10]. Cabardo, J. R. O. (2016). Levels of participation of the school stakeholders to the different school-initiated activities and the implementation of School-Based Management. *Journal of Inquiry and Action in Education*, 8(1), 81–94.
- [11]. Coates, H. (2010). Engaging with governance: School councils and stakeholder involvement. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 38(2), 181–196.
- [12]. Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2007). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. SAGE Publications.
- [13]. Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). *Effective teacher professional development*. Learning Policy Institute.
- [14]. Dela Cruz, K. G. A. (2024). Perception of the school administrators on the participation of the stakeholders to the implementation of School-Based Management in the Schools Division of Zambales. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 27(4), 413–417. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14020509>
- [15]. Dela Cruz, M. (2017). Ethical and value-based leadership in Philippine schools. *Asian Journal of School Leadership*, 6(2), 10–25.
- [16]. Dela Cruz, M., & Mendoza, R. (2021). Capacity-building initiatives for effective school governance. *Philippine Educational Leadership Journal*, 5(1), 20–35.
- [17]. Dela Cruz, R. (2017). Ethical leadership and school governance in Philippine public schools. *Philippine Journal of Education*, 96(2), 45–59.
- [18]. Dela Cruz, R., & Villanueva, M. (2020). Collaborative leadership and participatory school governance. *Asian Journal of Education*, 12(1), 23–38.
- [19]. Department of Education. (2001). *Republic Act No. 9155: Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001*. Government of the Philippines.
- [20]. Department of Education. (2012). *DepEd Order No. 83, s. 2012: Implementing guidelines on the revised School-Based Management (SBM) framework, assessment process and tool (APAT)*. Department of Education.
- [21]. Department of Education. (2015). *Guidelines on the enhanced school improvement planning (SIP) process and the school report card (SRC)* (DepEd Order No. 44, s. 2015).

- [22]. Department of Education. (2016). *School-Based Management (SBM) assessment process and tool (revised manual)*. Department of Education.
- [23]. Department of Education. (2019). *In-service training programs for school heads: Policies and guidelines*. Department of Education.
- [24]. Department of Education. (2022). *DepEd Order No. 26, s. 2022: Implementing guidelines on the establishment of School Governance Council*. Department of Education.
- [25]. Department of Education. (2024). *DepEd Order No. 007, s. 2024: Policy guidelines on the implementation of the revised School-Based Management (SBM) system*. Department of Education.
- [26]. Drucker, P. F. (1999). *Management challenges for the 21st century*. HarperBusiness.
- [27]. Epstein, J. L. (1995). School/family/community partnerships: Caring for the children we share. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 76(9), 701–712.
- [28]. Epstein, J. L. (2010). School/family/community partnerships: Caring for the children we share. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 92(3), 81–96. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003172171009200326>
- [29]. Epstein, J. L. (2018). *School, family, and community partnerships: Preparing educators and improving schools* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- [30]. Epstein, J. L., Sanders, M. G., Sheldon, S. B., Simon, B. S., Salinas, K. C., Jansorn, N. R., Van Voorhis, F. L., Martin, C. S., Thomas, B. G., Greenfeld, M. D., Hutchins, D. J., & Williams, K. J. (2010). *School, family, and community partnerships: Your handbook for action* (3rd ed.). Corwin Press.
- [31]. Fayol, H. (1916). *Administration industrielle et générale*. Dunod et Pinat.
- [32]. Fiedler, F. E. (1964). A contingency model of leadership effectiveness. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 1, 149–190.
- [33]. Fullan, M. (2001a). *Leading in a culture of change*. Jossey-Bass.
- [34]. Fullan, M. (2001b). *The new meaning of educational change* (3rd ed.). Teachers College Press.
- [35]. Fullan, M. (2014). *The principal: Three keys to maximizing impact*. Jossey-Bass.
- [36]. Guzman, J. C. (2022). Stakeholders' participation in school improvement plan and school performance of secondary schools. *International Journal of Arts, Sciences and Education*, 3(July Special Issue), 51–66.
- [37]. Hallinger, P. (2011). Leadership for learning: Lessons from 40 years of empirical research. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 49(2), 125–142. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578231111116699>
- [38]. Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (1998). Exploring the principal's contribution to school effectiveness: 1980–1995. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 9(2), 157–191.
- [39]. Henderson, A. T., & Mapp, K. L. (2002). *A new wave of evidence: The impact of school, family, and community connections on student achievement*. Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.
- [40]. Leithwood, K. A., & Riehl, C. (2003). *What we know about successful school leadership*. Laboratory for Student Success, Temple University.
- [41]. Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2005a). A review of transformational school leadership research 1996–2005. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 4(3), 177–199. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15700760500244769>
- [42]. Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2005b). Transformational leadership. In B. Davies (Ed.), *The essentials of school leadership* (pp. 31–43). SAGE Publications.
- [43]. 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>
- [44]. Leithwood, K., Louis, K. S., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *How leadership influences student learning*. The Wallace Foundation.
- [45]. Maca, M. N. (2019). 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>
- [46]. Mayo, E. (1933). *The human problems of an industrial civilization*. Macmillan.
- [47]. Mendoza, J. (2015). Participatory and transformational leadership practices among Philippine school heads. *Philippine Journal of Educational Leadership*, 7(1), 33–50.
- [48]. Mendoza, J., & Cruz, R. (2018). Stakeholder engagement in School Governing Councils. *Philippine Educational Management Journal*, 11(1), 40–55.
- [49]. Mendoza, J., & Santos, P. (2016). School-based management and council functionality in Philippine public schools. *Journal of Educational Policy and Management*, 8(2), 65–78.
- [50]. Mifsud, D., & Wilkins, A. W. (2025). A systematic review of school governance literature between 2000 and 2023. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15700763.2025.2539791>
- [51]. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2019a). *Education policy outlook 2019: Working together to help students achieve their potential*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/2b8ad56e-en>
- [52]. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2019b). *School leadership for learning: Insights from TALIS 2018*. OECD Publishing.
- [53]. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2025). *Education policy outlook 2025: Nurturing engaged and resilient lifelong learners in a world of digital transformation*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/c3f402ba-en>
- [54]. Ouchi, W. G. (1979a). A conceptual framework for the design of organizational control mechanisms. *Management Science*, 25(9), 833–848. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.25.9.833>
- [55]. Ouchi, W. G. (1979b). *Theory Z: How American business can meet the Japanese challenge*. Addison-Wesley.

- [56]. Ramos, L. (2020). Strategic planning and leadership development in Philippine public schools. *Philippine Journal of School Leadership*, 8(1), 30–48.
- [57]. Ramos, M. (2018). Monitoring and evaluation in school management. *Philippine School Administration Journal*, 5(1), 22–35.
- [58]. Ramos, M., & Salazar, A. (2018). Mentoring and coaching for effective school leadership. *Asian Journal of Educational Leadership*, 10(2), 15–30.
- [59]. Ramos, R. B., & Bauyot, M. M. (2024). Exploring the impact of school leadership on professional development in Panabo City Division, Philippines: A mixed-method explanatory research study. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies*, 50(7), 467–485. <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajess/2024/v50i71477>
- [60]. Republic of the Philippines. (2001). *Republic Act No. 9155: Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001*. Congress of the Philippines.
- [61]. Reyes, C., & Santos, J. (2019). Teacher participation in school governance and its impact on school management. *Philippine Educational Review*, 14(2), 80–95.
- [62]. Reyes, L. (2018). Transformational leadership and school climate in Philippine public schools. *Philippine Journal of Education*, 97(2), 21–38.
- [63]. Reyes, V. C., Hamid, O., & Hardy, I. (2021). When reforms make things worse: School leadership responses to poverty, disasters, and cultures of crises in the Philippine education system. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 27(2), 331–344. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2021.2009038>
- [64]. Reyes, Y. D. (2018). Teachers' and school administrators' perception on the strategic leadership practices of school administrators. *The Educational Review, USA*, 2(8). <https://doi.org/10.26855/er.2018.08.004>
- [65]. Rivera, M. (2017). Community engagement and school governance: Evidence from local public schools. *Philippine Journal of Educational Administration*, 11(1), 15–28.
- [66]. Salazar, T. (2019). Leadership styles and the functionality of school governing councils. *Philippine Educational Management Review*, 10(1), 40–55.
- [67]. Schildkamp, K. (2019). Data-based decision-making for school improvement: Research insights and gaps. *Educational Research*, 61(3), 257–273. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131881.2019.1625716>
- [68]. Sergiovanni, T. J. (2001). *Leadership: What's in it for schools?* RoutledgeFalmer.
- [69]. Taylor, F. W. (1911). *The principles of scientific management*. Harper & Brothers.
- [70]. Tyack, D., & Cuban, L. (1995). *Tinkering toward utopia: A century of public-school reform*. Harvard University Press.
- [71]. UNESCO Institute for Educational Planning. (2021). *Developing open school data policies: Basic principles*. UNESCO IIEP.
- [72]. UNESCO Institute for Statistics. (n.d.). *National strategy development for education statistics: Guidelines*. UNESCO Institute for Statistics.
- [73]. UNESCO. (2018). *Activating policy levers for Education 2030: The untapped potential of governance, school leadership, and monitoring and evaluation policies*. UNESCO.
- [74]. UNESCO. (2021a). *Global education monitoring report 2021/2: Non-state actors in education: Who chooses? Who loses?* UNESCO.
- [75]. UNESCO. (2021b). *Reimagining our futures together: A new social contract for education*. UNESCO.
- [76]. Villanueva, J. S., & Cruz, R. A. O.-D. (2024). The praxis of School-Based Management on curriculum and learning in the Philippines. *International Journal of Social Sciences & Educational Studies*, 6(2), 89–101. <https://doi.org/10.23918/ijsses.v6i2p89>
- [77]. Villanueva, P. (2019). Contextual challenges in school management: Capacity-building approaches. *Philippine Journal of School Administration*, 7(2), 90–105.
- [78]. Weber, M. (1922). *Economy and society: An outline of interpretive sociology*. University of California Press.