Adaptive Leadership and Governance, Data-Driven Decision-Making Practices, and School Performance of Public Secondary Schools in the Division of San Juan City: Basis for a Sustainable Development Program

Dr. John Joshua V. Insigne

Graduate School, Eulogio "Amang" Rodriguez Institute of Science and Technology, Manila, Philippines

DOI: https://doi.org/10.51584/IJRIAS.2026.11090142

Received: 30 September 2026; Accepted: 05 October 2026; Published: 22 October 2026

ABSTRACT

This study examined adaptive leadership and governance, data-driven decision-making (DDDM) practices, and school performance in public secondary schools in the Division of San Juan City, Philippines. It also examined differences among respondent groups, facilitating and hindering factors, predictive relationships among the major variables, and the suitability, acceptability, and feasibility of a proposed Sustainable Development Program. Using a quantitative descriptive-comparative-correlational design, the study involved 399 supervisors, school administrators, teachers, and non-teaching personnel. Data were collected through a researcher-made questionnaire and documentary analysis of OPCRF ratings for School Years 2023–2024 and 2024–2025. Adaptive leadership and governance were highly evident, while DDDM practices were highly practiced. School performance was rated Outstanding overall based on OPCRF records. Regression analyses showed significant predictive relationships involving adaptive leadership, DDDM, and school performance, whereas school performance did not significantly predict adaptive leadership or DDDM. Key hindering conditions included slow alignment with new directives, rigid procedural adherence, inconsistent data-entry practices, fragmented data gathering, and limited opportunities to revisit decisions. The proposed Sustainable Development Program was evaluated as highly suitable, highly acceptable, and highly feasible. The findings provide an empirical basis for strengthening adaptive leadership, collaborative governance, data literacy, evidence-informed decision-making, and continuous school improvement.

Keywords: adaptive leadership; governance; data-driven decision-making; school performance; sustainable development program; public secondary schools

INTRODUCTION

Public secondary schools operate in environments shaped by policy reform, technological change, diverse learner needs, accountability requirements, and pressure for continuous improvement. In this setting, leadership and governance extend beyond administrative compliance to include responsiveness, stakeholder participation, transparent decision-making, resource management, innovation, and organizational learning. Data-driven decision-making complements these functions by enabling school personnel to use assessment results, performance records, feedback, and other evidence to identify needs and guide action.

In the Philippine basic-education system, Republic Act No. 9155 establishes school-based management and accountability for learning outcomes, while DepEd policies on professional standards, school improvement, performance management, and monitoring reinforce the responsibilities of school leaders. Adaptive Leadership Theory emphasizes responding to complex and evolving conditions through flexibility, mobilization of stakeholders, shared responsibility, and organizational learning (Heifetz et al., 2020). The Data-Informed Decision-Making Framework highlights systematic data collection, analysis, interpretation, and use in planning and evaluation (Chandía, 2026). The Theory of School Effectiveness emphasizes

leadership quality, instructional effectiveness, school climate, collaboration, clear goals, and continuous monitoring (Kim & Park, 2025).

Recent literature has similarly emphasized adaptive leadership, distributed leadership, data literacy, collaborative analysis, data culture, and evidence-based planning. Famero (2024) reported adaptive leadership practices among Philippine public-school principals, while Schildkamp (2019) and Mandinach and Gummer (2025) highlighted the opportunities and challenges associated with data-based decision-making. However, limited localized research has jointly examined adaptive leadership and governance, DDDM, and school performance in the public secondary-school context of San Juan City.

Accordingly, this study addressed a contextual and empirical gap by examining adaptive leadership and governance, DDDM practices, and school performance within the same public-secondary-school setting. Rather than treating leadership and data use as isolated administrative practices, the study examined how they are assessed across organizational roles, how they relate statistically to documented school performance, and what contextual conditions facilitate or hinder their implementation. This integrated approach provides evidence from a Philippine public-school context that can inform broader discussions of adaptive educational leadership, evidence-informed governance, and continuous school improvement.

METHODOLOGY

This study employed a quantitative descriptive-comparative-correlational research design. The descriptive component assessed adaptive leadership and governance, DDDM practices, facilitating and hindering factors, school performance, and program evaluation. The comparative component examined differences among supervisors, school administrators, teachers, and non-teaching personnel, while the correlational and predictive components examined statistical relationships among the major variables under naturally occurring conditions.

The study covered 439 personnel from public secondary schools in the Division of San Juan City: 11 supervisors, 7 school administrators, 313 teachers, and 108 non-teaching personnel. A total of 399 respondents participated: all 11 supervisors and 7 school administrators, 295 teachers, and 86 non-teaching personnel. Total enumeration was used for supervisors and school administrators, while stratified random sampling was used for teachers and non-teaching personnel. The reported sample size was calculated using the Raosoft Sample Size Calculator.

Data were collected using a researcher-made questionnaire covering adaptive leadership and governance, DDDM practices, facilitating and hindering factors, and evaluation of the proposed program. Adaptive leadership and governance included adaptive leadership competency, decision-making flexibility, stakeholder engagement, responsiveness to change, distributed leadership, governance transparency, innovation, conflict management, trust in leadership, and organizational learning culture.

DDDM included data collection, quality and integrity, analysis, integration and management, goal setting, data literacy, data culture, ethics and privacy, and outcomes assessment. School performance was obtained from OPCRF ratings for School Years 2023–2024 and 2024–2025.

The instrument underwent expert validation and pilot testing outside the study sample, and data gathering followed institutional permission and respondent-protection procedures. Percentage and weighted mean were used for descriptive analysis; one-way ANOVA and Tukey-Kramer pairwise comparisons were used for group comparisons; and regression analysis was used to examine predictive relationships. Statistical decisions used $\alpha = .05$. Because the design was nonexperimental and cross-sectional, regression results were interpreted as statistical prediction or association rather than evidence of causal effects.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Adaptive Leadership and Governance

Table 1. Assessment of Adaptive Leadership and Governance

Dimension	Supervisors	Administrators	Teachers	Non-Teaching	Composite WM	VI
Adaptive Leadership Competency	4.45	4.91	4.51	4.56	4.61	Highly Evident
Decision-Making Flexibility	4.40	4.83	4.42	4.49	4.53	Highly Evident
Stakeholder Engagement in Governance	4.40	4.84	4.39	4.38	4.5	Highly Evident
Responsiveness to Change	4.46	4.76	4.41	4.45	4.52	Highly Evident
Distributed Leadership Practices	4.66	4.96	4.38	4.45	4.61	Highly Evident
School Governance Transparency	4.57	4.84	4.37	4.43	4.55	Highly Evident
Innovation in School Programs	4.43	4.77	4.39	4.43	4.50	Highly Evident
Conflict Management Strategies	4.55	4.76	4.34	4.37	4.50	Highly Evident
Trust in Leadership	4.55	4.93	4.37	4.45	4.58	Highly Evident
Organizational Learning Culture	4.51	4.86	4.40	4.43	4.55	Highly Evident
Overall Weighted Mean	**4.50**	**4.85**	**4.40**	**4.44**	**4.55**	**Highly Evident**

Adaptive leadership and governance were highly evident overall (WM = 4.55). Adaptive leadership competency and distributed leadership practices shared the highest composite mean (4.61), followed by trust in leadership (4.58). Stakeholder engagement, innovation, and conflict management had the lowest composite means (4.50 each), although all remained within the Highly Evident range. The pattern indicates strong perceptions of leadership adaptability and shared governance while pointing to continued attention to stakeholder participation and organizational innovation. This is consistent with the emphasis of adaptive leadership on mobilizing people and responding to changing conditions (Heifetz et al., 2020).

Data-Driven Decision-Making Practices

Table 2. Assessment of Data-Driven Decision-Making Practices

Dimension	Supervisors	Administrators	Teachers	Non-Teaching	Composite WM	VI
Data Collection Methods	4.55	4.84	4.43	4.46	4.57	Highly Practiced
Data Quality and Integrity	4.45	4.81	4.40	4.48	4.53	Highly Practiced
Data Analysis Techniques	4.38	4.74	4.38	4.45	4.49	Highly Practiced
Data Integration and Management	4.47	4.77	4.36	4.39	4.50	Highly Practiced

Data-Driven Goal Setting	4.46	4.76	4.38	4.41	4.50	Highly Practiced
Data Literacy and Capacity Building	4.44	4.81	4.35	4.38	4.49	Highly Practiced
Data Culture and Organizational Norms	4.39	4.77	4.36	4.41	4.48	Highly Practiced
Ethical Considerations and Data Privacy	4.56	4.81	4.37	4.41	4.54	Highly Practiced
Impact and Outcomes Assessment	4.53	4.70	4.37	4.40	4.50	Highly Practiced
Overall Weighted Mean	**4.50**	**4.80**	**4.40**	**4.40**	**4.50**	**Highly Practiced**

DDDM practices were highly practiced overall (WM = 4.50). Data collection methods had the highest composite mean (4.57), followed by ethical considerations and data privacy (4.54) and data quality and integrity (4.53). Data culture and organizational norms recorded the lowest composite mean (4.48), but remained highly practiced. The findings indicate established systems for collecting and managing evidence, with further opportunities to strengthen data culture, analytical capacity, and the translation of evidence into improvement decisions.

Differences in Respondent-Group Assessments

Table 3. Summary of Group-Difference Tests

Domain	Test Result	Range / Key Result	Interpretation
Adaptive leadership and governance	One-way ANOVA	All 10 indicators significant; F = 18.0698–98.0690; p < .001	Significant differences
DDDM practices	One-way ANOVA	All 9 indicators significant; F = 33.0051–48.7632; p < .001	Significant differences
Adaptive leadership post hoc	Tukey-Kramer	Multiple pairwise differences; administrator perceptions frequently differed from other groups	Group perceptions not uniform
DDDM post hoc	Tukey-Kramer	Multiple pairwise differences; administrator perceptions frequently differed from other groups	Group perceptions not uniform

The reported ANOVA results showed statistically significant differences among the four respondent groups across all adaptive-leadership and DDDM dimensions. For adaptive leadership, F-values ranged from 18.0698 for responsiveness to change to 98.0690 for distributed leadership practices.

For DDDM, F-values ranged from 33.0051 for data-driven goal setting to 48.7632 for data collection methods. Tukey-Kramer comparisons further showed multiple significant pairwise differences, with school-administrator assessments frequently differing from the assessments of supervisors, teachers, and non-teaching personnel.

The coexistence of high overall ratings and significant role differences suggests that organizational practices may be experienced differently depending on personnel responsibilities and proximity to decision-making processes. This finding supports role-sensitive professional learning, clearer communication, and participatory mechanisms through which different personnel groups can review and interpret organizational evidence.

School Performance

Table 4. School Performance Based on OPCRF Ratings

School	2023–2024	2024–2025	Two-Year Average	VI
Kabayanan Integrated School	4.73	4.66	4.70	Outstanding
Salapan Integrated School	4.69	4.50	4.60	Outstanding
San Juan City Academic Senior High School	4.11	4.23	4.17	Very Satisfactory
San Juan City Integrated School	4.89	4.64	4.77	Outstanding
San Juan City Science High School	4.19	4.50	4.35	Very Satisfactory
San Juan City TVL Senior High School	4.89	4.83	4.86	Outstanding
San Juan National High School	4.92	4.66	4.79	Outstanding
Overall Average	**4.63**	**4.57**	**4.61**	**Outstanding**

School performance based on OPCRF ratings was Outstanding overall, with a two-year average of 4.61. The overall rating was 4.63 in School Year 2023–2024 and 4.57 in 2024–2025. Five schools recorded Outstanding two-year averages, while two recorded Very Satisfactory averages. These documentary indicators provide an institutional outcome measure that complements stakeholder perceptions of leadership and DDDM practices.

Predictive Relationships among the Major Variables

Table 5. Regression Analysis among Adaptive Leadership, DDDM, and School Performance

Predictor → Outcome	R	R^2	F	p	Result
Adaptive Leadership → DDDM	0.983	0.967	117.288	0.0004	Significant
Adaptive Leadership → School Performance	0.986	0.972	52.036	0.0047	Significant
DDDM → Adaptive Leadership	0.992	0.984	41.45	0.0237	Significant
DDDM → School Performance	0.958	0.918	16.79	0.0235	Significant
School Performance → Adaptive Leadership	0.275	0.076	0.327	0.5979	Not significant
School Performance → DDDM	0.267	0.071	0.306	0.61	Not significant

The reported models indicate that adaptive leadership and governance and data-driven decision-making (DDDM) are statistically associated, with each demonstrating a significant predictive relationship with the other. Both constructs also significantly predicted school performance. However, school performance did not significantly predict either adaptive leadership and governance or DDDM. Given the nonexperimental, cross-sectional design, these findings indicate statistical associations and predictive relationships but do not establish causality or reciprocal effects.

The regression analysis showed statistically significant predictive relationships in four of the six models. Adaptive leadership and governance predicted DDDM ($R = 0.983$, $R^2 = 0.967$, adjusted $R^2 = 0.959$, $F = 117.288$, $p = .0004$), while adaptive leadership and governance also predicted school performance ($R = 0.986$, $R^2 = 0.972$, adjusted $R^2 = 0.953$, $F = 52.036$, $p = .0047$). DDDM likewise predicted adaptive leadership and governance ($R = 0.992$, $R^2 = 0.984$, adjusted $R^2 = 0.960$, $F = 41.450$, $p = .0237$) and school performance ($R = 0.958$, $R^2 = 0.918$, adjusted $R^2 = 0.863$, $F = 16.790$, $p = .0235$). In contrast, school performance did not significantly predict adaptive leadership and governance ($R = 0.275$, $R^2 = 0.076$, adjusted $R^2 = -0.1556$, $F = 0.327$, $p = .5979$) or DDDM ($R = 0.267$, $R^2 = 0.071$, adjusted $R^2 = -0.161$, $F = 0.306$, $p = .6100$). The large explanatory proportions in the significant models should be interpreted in relation to the study's measurement structure and unit of analysis. They indicate statistical prediction within the reported models, not experimental causation or proof that one construct causes another.

ISSN No. 2454-6194 | DOI: 10.51584/IJRIAS |Volume XI Issue IX September 2026

Facilitating and Hindering Factors

Table 6. Selected Facilitating and Hindering Factors

Area	Key indicator	Composite WM	VI
Adaptive leadership—facilitating	Decision-making processes are adjusted to changing school priorities.	4.54	Highly Facilitating
Adaptive leadership—facilitating	School adapts operations to evolving learner and community needs.	4.52	Highly Facilitating
DDDM—facilitating	Standardized tools are used to gather academic and operational data systematically.	4.48	Highly Facilitating
Adaptive leadership—hindering	Slow alignment of school initiatives with new educational directives.	3.79	Hindering
Adaptive leadership—hindering	Decision-making constrained by rigid procedural adherence.	3.78	Hindering
DDDM—hindering	Variations in data-entry practices affect data consistency.	3.78	Hindering
DDDM—hindering	Fragmented data gathering due to multiple reporting requirements.	3.71	Hindering

Facilitating factors were generally highly facilitating. Adaptive leadership was supported by adjustment of decision-making to changing priorities (WM = 4.54) and operational adaptation to evolving learner and community needs (WM = 4.52). DDDM was facilitated by standardized data-collection tools (WM = 4.48). At the same time, hindering conditions remained evident. The leading adaptive-leadership hindrance was slow alignment of school initiatives with new educational directives (WM = 3.79), followed by rigid procedural adherence (WM = 3.78). For DDDM, variations in data-entry practices (WM = 3.78), fragmented data gathering (WM = 3.71), and limited verification procedures (WM = 3.71) were prominent. The findings point to a need for faster policy translation, clearer decision pathways, data-quality protocols, and continuing data-use capacity building.

Proposed Sustainable Development Program

Based on the findings, the Proposed Sustainable Development Program is designed to sustain existing strengths in adaptive leadership, governance, and data-driven decision-making while addressing the identified areas requiring further development. In particular, the program responds to concerns regarding slow alignment with new educational directives, rigid procedural adherence, limited opportunities to revisit and refine decisions, and limited structures for shared leadership. It also reinforces the facilitating conditions identified for adaptive leadership and data-driven decision-making through leadership capacity development, collaborative governance, evidence-informed planning, continuous monitoring, and structured feedback. Rather than functioning as a stand-alone initiative, the program is intended to be integrated into existing school improvement, professional development, planning, performance management, and monitoring mechanisms.

The proposed Sustainable Development Program was developed in direct response to the empirical findings on adaptive leadership and governance, data-driven decision-making (DDDM), and school performance. The significant predictive relationship between adaptive leadership and governance and DDDM ($R = 0.983$, $p = .0004$) supports the inclusion of Adaptive Leadership Capacity-Building Sessions and School Data Review and Decision Cycles, which aim to strengthen the integration of leadership responsiveness and evidence-informed planning. Similarly, the significant predictive relationships of adaptive leadership and

governance with school performance (R = 0.986, p = .0047) and of DDDM with school performance (R = 0.958, p = .0235) provide a statistical basis for incorporating policy alignment, collaborative governance, continuous monitoring, and performance review into school improvement processes. The identified hindering factors, particularly slow alignment with new educational directives (WM = 3.79), rigid procedural adherence (WM = 3.78), inconsistent data-entry practices (WM = 3.78), and fragmented data gathering (WM = 3.71), further justify the inclusion of Policy Alignment and Governance Review, Decision Refinement and Feedback Sessions, and Leadership Coaching and Peer-Learning Networks. Moreover, the significant differences in respondent assessments across leadership and DDDM dimensions support the establishment of Shared Leadership and Participatory Governance mechanisms to ensure that the perspectives of supervisors, school administrators, teachers, and non-teaching personnel are considered in planning and decision-making. Collectively, these findings provide an empirical basis for the program's seven components, while the high ratings for suitability (WM = 4.83), acceptability (WM = 4.84), and feasibility (WM = 4.84) indicate favorable stakeholder perceptions of its proposed implementation.

Table 7. Proposed Sustainable Development Program

Key Result Area	Illustrative Activity	Implementation Strategy	Performance Evidence
Adaptive Leadership and Governance	Adaptive Leadership Capacity-Building Sessions	Conduct focused learning sessions on adaptive leadership, problem-solving, responsiveness to emerging educational concerns, and flexible leadership strategies.	Training records; learning outputs; leadership action plans
Policy Alignment and Governance Responsiveness	Policy Alignment and Governance Review	Periodically review school initiatives and procedures against new educational directives and identify areas requiring timely adjustment.	Policy-alignment matrix; review records; updated school action plans
Shared Leadership and Participatory Governance	Collaborative Decision-Making Forum	Establish structured opportunities for school personnel to participate in planning, decision review, problem-solving, and school improvement discussions.	Consultation records; meeting outputs; documented decisions; participation records
Data-Driven Decision-Making	School Data Review and Decision Cycle	Use available school performance and monitoring data to identify priorities, formulate evidence-informed actions, and review implementation results.	Data-review reports; action plans; monitoring records; decision logs
Decision Review and Continuous Improvement	Decision Refinement and Feedback Sessions	Provide regular opportunities to revisit decisions, assess implementation experiences, gather feedback, and refine strategies when necessary.	Review minutes; feedback summaries; revised action plans; corrective-action records
Leadership Coaching and Professional Learning	Leadership Coaching and Peer-Learning Network	Provide mentoring, coaching, peer sharing, and technical assistance on adaptive leadership, governance, data use, and school improvement.	Coaching records; peer-learning outputs; mentoring logs; participant feedback
Sustainability and Performance Monitoring	Quarterly Governance and Performance Review	Conduct periodic monitoring of leadership, governance, data-driven decision-making, implementation barriers, and school performance to support continuous improvement.	Quarterly monitoring reports; progress dashboard; implementation records; improvement actions

ISSN No. 2454-6194 | DOI: 10.51584/IJRIAS |Volume XI Issue IX September 2026

Each component of the Proposed Sustainable Development Program corresponds to a specific finding of the study. The Adaptive Leadership Capacity-Building Sessions address the need to sustain leadership adaptability while strengthening problem-solving and responsiveness to emerging educational concerns. The Policy Alignment and Governance Review responds to delays in aligning school initiatives with new educational directives and to constraints associated with rigid procedural adherence. The Shared Leadership and Participatory Governance component addresses significant differences in respondent assessments and promotes broader participation in school planning, decision review, and problem-solving. The School Data Review and Decision Cycle reinforces the established practice of systematic data collection while strengthening the use of evidence in identifying priorities and formulating improvement actions. Decision Refinement and Feedback Sessions respond to the need for regular opportunities to revisit decisions, examine implementation experiences, and introduce corrective measures. Leadership Coaching and Peer-Learning Networks reinforce professional learning, data literacy, and collaborative problem-solving, while Sustainability and Performance Monitoring provides a structured mechanism for tracking implementation progress and reviewing school improvement outcomes. These components translate the study's findings into actionable strategies that can be integrated into existing school improvement and performance management processes. Although the program received high ratings for suitability, acceptability, and feasibility, its actual effectiveness should be established through implementation monitoring and subsequent evaluation.

Evaluation of the Proposed Program

Table 8. Suitability, Acceptability, and Feasibility of the Proposed Sustainable Development Program

Criterion	Supervisors	Administrators	Teachers	Non-Teaching	Overall WM	VI
Suitability	4.84	4.91	4.93	4.65	4.83	Highly Suitable
Acceptability	4.8	4.89	4.92	4.75	4.84	Highly Acceptable
Feasibility	4.87	4.86	4.94	4.71	4.84	Highly Feasible

The proposed program received high evaluations across the three criteria. Suitability obtained an overall WM of 4.83, with the highest-rated criterion indicating that the program addresses identified gaps in adaptive leadership and DDDM. Acceptability obtained an overall WM of 4.84, with practicality for adoption and implementation receiving the highest indicator rating (4.91).

Feasibility also obtained an overall WM of 4.84, with implementation using current staff, facilities, and budget allocations rated 4.88. These results indicate strong stakeholder perceptions of the program’s contextual fit and implementability; they should not be interpreted as evidence of actual program effectiveness before implementation and evaluation.

Study Limitations. The findings should be interpreted within the boundaries of the study design and data sources. The study was conducted in public secondary schools in one Philippine school division and used a nonexperimental, cross-sectional design. The leadership and DDDM measures were based on respondent assessments using a researcher-made instrument, while school performance was represented by OPCRF ratings for two school years. The regression analyses therefore identify statistical predictive relationships within the observed data but cannot establish temporal or causal effects. Future studies may use longitudinal, mixed-methods, or multi-division designs and incorporate additional objective indicators of school performance.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Adaptive leadership and governance in public secondary schools in the Division of San Juan City reflect strong institutional integration, where leadership practices are consistently exercised and supported across different school personnel.

2. Data-driven decision-making is firmly embedded in school operations, indicating that school processes are increasingly guided by systematic use of evidence to support planning, instruction, and monitoring.
3. There are variations in how school practices are experienced and implemented, particularly in areas involving leadership distribution, trust, transparency, and responsiveness.
4. School performance over the past two school years indicates sustained institutional effectiveness, indicating that existing leadership and management systems support stable organizational outcomes.
5. The relationships among adaptive leadership, governance, and data-driven decision-making demonstrate a mutually reinforcing system, where leadership and data use strengthen each other and collectively contribute to school effectiveness, while school performance does not influence these practices in return.
6. Facilitating conditions strongly support the implementation of adaptive leadership and data-driven decision-making, although persistent constraints still limit the full optimization of these practices within schools.
7. The Sustainable Development Program is grounded on identified gaps and strengths, serving as a strategic mechanism to enhance leadership, governance, and data-driven practices in public secondary schools.
8. The evaluation of the Sustainable Development Program indicates strong readiness for implementation, suggesting that it is well-aligned with school needs and capable of supporting continuous improvement in leadership, governance, and data-informed decision-making.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The school head, together with supervisors, teachers, and non-teaching personnel, may first implement the Sustainable Development Program in San Juan National High School as a pilot site, before adopting it in other schools, subject to necessary adjustments and refinements based on implementation results.
2. The school head may strengthen governance and leadership practices by promoting participatory decision-making, data-informed innovation, and continuous monitoring through collaborative planning and targeted capacity-building initiatives.
3. Supervisors may provide continuous technical assistance and guidance to school heads in strengthening adaptive leadership, governance systems, and data-driven decision-making through coaching, monitoring, and feedback mechanisms.
4. Department heads and planning coordinators may assist in aligning school programs with data-driven priorities by actively participating in planning, monitoring, and performance review activities to ensure consistency in implementation.
5. Teachers may strengthen instructional quality and school improvement efforts by actively engaging in collaborative planning, applying evidence-based strategies, and supporting data-informed decision-making in classroom practice.
6. Non-teaching personnel may support school improvement by enhancing administrative efficiency, assisting in data management, and contributing to the effective implementation of school policies and support systems.
7. The School Performance Management Team may sustain effective practices by regularly reviewing accomplishments, reinforcing successful strategies, and providing continuous support to maintain high performance outcomes.
8. Program committees, in coordination with the Division Office, may conduct regular monitoring and evaluation of the Proposed Sustainable Development Program to ensure effective implementation, identify gaps, and support continuous improvement.
9. All school personnel may integrate monitoring and evaluation feedback into school development plans to strengthen alignment, responsiveness, and sustainability of leadership, governance, and data-driven practices.
10. Future researchers may replicate and expand the study across different school levels and contexts to validate findings and explore additional variables related to leadership, governance, and data-driven decision-making.

Ethical Considerations

Data collection was conducted in accordance with institutional permissions and established procedures for the protection of respondents. Participation was voluntary, and confidentiality was maintained throughout the research process. The findings were reported in aggregated form to protect the identities of the respondents. Documentary data from the Office Performance Commitment and Review Form (OPCRF) and respondents' assessments were utilized and handled in accordance with applicable institutional policies, data privacy requirements, and ethical research standards.

REFERENCES

1. Chandía, R. (2026). Data-informed decision-making framework in educational institutions: Guidelines for evidence-based leadership. Educational Research Press.
2. Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.
3. Cruz, R., & Alonzo, M. (2025). Facilitating professional development and continuous learning among school personnel in Quezon City, Philippines. Philippine Journal of Educational Leadership and Management.
4. Datnow, A., & Hubbard, L. (2023). Perceptions of data-driven practices across school roles: Challenges and implications for international education contexts. Educational Policy Analysis Archives, 31(4).
5. Department of Education. (2015a). DepEd Order No. 2, s. 2015: Office Performance Commitment and Review Form guidelines.
6. Department of Education. (2015b). DepEd Order No. 44, s. 2015: Guidelines on innovation, monitoring, and performance evaluation.
7. Department of Education. (2020). DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020: Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads.
8. Famero, A. M. (2024). Emergence of an adaptive leadership model from the collective practices of public secondary school principals during COVID-19 education crisis. Romblon State University Research Journal, 6(1). https://doi.org/10.58780/rsurj.v6i1.171
9. Heifetz, R. A., Grashow, A., & Linsky, M. (2020). The practice of adaptive leadership: Tools and tactics for changing your organization and the world (2nd ed.). Harvard Business Review Press.
10. Kim, J., & Park, S. (2025). Theory of school effectiveness: Leadership, instructional quality, and student outcomes in secondary education. Korean Educational Development Institute.
11. Lee, C., Camburn, E. M., & Sebastian, J. (2025). School context, school leaders' data-informed decision making, and student achievement: Evidence from Florida. School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 36(1), 45–70. https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2024.2436889
12. Mandinach, E. B., & Gummer, E. S. (2025). Shining light on ethical uses of data in education: Emerging importance. Teachers College Record, 127(2), 141–162. https://doi.org/10.1177/01614681251334784
13. Omoso, E., & Nakitare, J. (2026). Data-driven decision making in Kenyan secondary schools: Enablers and barriers. Journal of Educational Administration. https://doi.org/10.1177/10526846261429303
14. Popham, J. W., & Bailey, C. L. (2024). Barriers to effective data use in U.S. public schools: Inconsistencies, coordination, and training. Journal of School Data and Assessment, 15(1), 33–52.
15. Republic of the Philippines. (2001). Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001 (Republic Act No. 9155). Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines.
16. Schildkamp, K. (2019). Data-based decision making in education: Challenges and opportunities. Journal of Educational Change, 20(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-018-9322-2
17. Sumbilon, M. R., & Escarlos, G. S. (2026). Data-driven decision making, resource allocation management, and professional development on the curriculum implementation practices of school administrators. International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science, 10(26), 2753–2773. https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.1026EDU0223