Proactive Leadership and Shared Governance: Basis for Enhancing School Management Practices

Emily S. Monton, Alicia I. Quinito, PhD

Mabini Colleges, Incorporated, Daet, Camarines Norte

DOI: https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100900689

Received: 02 October 2026; Accepted: 07 October 2026; Published: 21 October 2026

ABSTRACT

This study determined the relationship between proactive leadership and shared governance as a basis for enhancing school management practices in public secondary schools in the Schools Division Office of Camarines Norte. Specifically, it assessed proactive leadership in terms of vision, mission and core values; school planning and implementation; policy implementation and review; research and innovation; program design and implementation; learner voice; and monitoring and evaluation processes. It also examined shared governance in terms of curriculum and teaching, learning environment, leadership, governance and accountability, human resource and team development, and finance and resource management and mobilization. The study employed a quantitative method using a descriptive-correlational research design. Public secondary school teachers in Labo West District served as respondents through total enumeration. Data were gathered using instruments adopted and adapted from the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads and the School-Based Management framework of the Department of Education. Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient was used to determine the relationshi between proactive leadership and shared governance. Findings revealed that school heads demonstrated a very high level of proactive leadership across all dimensions, while shared governance was consistently manifested in the schools. The results further showed that most dimensions of proactive leadership had significant positive relationships with the dimensions of shared governance. However, monitoring and evaluation processes were not significantly related to finance and resource management and mobilization. These findings indicate that stronger proactive leadership is generally associated with greater manifestation of shared governance in school management. The study concluded that proactive leadership and shared governance are evident in school management practices and are generally significantly related. Based on the findings, Project LINK: Linking Information, Needs, and Key Resources for Effective School Management was proposed for integration into regular School Learning Action Cell sessions. The study recommends sustaining proactive leadership and participatory governance while strengthening the use of monitoring and evaluation results in resource planning, prioritization, and management.

Keywords: Proactive leadership, shared governance, school management practices, vision, mission and core values, school planning and implementation, policy implementation and review, program design and implementation, learner voice, and monitoring and evaluation processes.

INTRODUCTION

Educational leadership plays an important role in improving school management and creating effective learning environments. School leaders guide teachers, staff, and stakeholders in achieving school goals through planning, policy implementation, program monitoring, and collaborative decision-making. Among the leadership approaches that contribute to effective school management are proactive leadership and shared governance, which emphasize strategic direction, collaboration, participation, and shared responsibility.

According to Leithwood et al. (2019), successful school leaders contribute to school improvement by setting directions, developing people, and strengthening organizational conditions that support teaching and learning. Proactive leadership enables school leaders to anticipate challenges, establish long-term directions, monitor programs, and encourage continuous improvement. Through these practices, school leaders can create a more

organized and responsive environment while encouraging teachers to collaborate and innovate in addressing school concerns.

Similarly, Harris et al. (2022) explained that collaborative leadership and shared decision-making strengthen professional relationships and school management practices. When teachers and stakeholders participate in decision-making, shared accountability, commitment, and ownership of school programs are strengthened. Such participation can also promote transparency and trust among school leaders, teachers, and stakeholders, contributing to more sustainable school improvement initiatives.

In the Philippine context, the leadership practices of school heads are guided by DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020, or the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH). Particularly, Domain 1: Leading Strategically emphasizes the responsibility of school heads to provide direction through vision, mission and core values; school planning and implementation; policy implementation and review; research and innovation; program design and implementation; learner voice; and monitoring and evaluation processes. These areas provide a framework for examining proactive leadership in school management.

Likewise, DepEd Order No. 007, s. 2024 strengthens School-Based Management (SBM) by promoting participatory school governance and stakeholder engagement. SBM encourages teachers, parents, community members, and other stakeholders to participate in planning, implementing, monitoring, and improving school programs. It promotes shared responsibility, transparency, accountability, and effective management of school resources.

The principles of SBM provide a relevant framework for examining proactive leadership and shared governance together. Proactive leadership emphasizes strategic planning, program implementation, and monitoring, while shared governance focuses on participation and collective responsibility. Through SBM, school heads provide strategic direction while stakeholders contribute to decisions and initiatives that support school improvement.

In Labo West District, schools operate within policies that promote strategic leadership and participatory governance. However, schools may differ in the implementation and monitoring of plans and programs, stakeholder participation, and alignment between planning and actual implementation. The multiple responsibilities of school heads may likewise influence how leadership and governance practices are carried out. These conditions highlight the need to examine proactive leadership and shared governance within the school context.

Thus, this study determines the level of proactive leadership of school heads and the degree of manifestation of shared governance in public secondary schools in Labo West District, Schools Division Office of Camarines Norte. It further examines the relationship between these variables and proposes an intervention to strengthen proactive leadership and shared governance toward enhanced school management practices.

METHODOLOGY

The study employed a quantitative method using a descriptive-correlational research design to determine the level of proactive leadership, the degree of manifestation of shared governance, and the relationship between these variables. The respondents were 179 public secondary school teachers in Labo West District, Schools Division Office of Camarines Norte, selected through total enumeration. The study utilized a survey questionnaire based on Domain 1 of the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH) for proactive leadership and the School-Based Management (SBM) framework for shared governance. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize the respondents' assessments, while the Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient (ρ) was employed to determine the significant relationship between proactive leadership and shared governance.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Level of Proactive Leadership of School Heads as Assessed by Teachers. Proactive leadership reflects the ability of school heads to anticipate needs, take initiative, plan ahead, and respond effectively to school concerns. In this study, the level of proactive leadership of school heads was assessed by teachers in terms of vision, mission and core values, school planning and implementation, policy implementation and review, research and innovation, program design and implementation, learner voice, and monitoring and evaluation processes. The results provide an understanding of how proactive leadership is practiced in the management of public secondary schools.

Vision, Mission and Core Values. This provides direction for the school and serve as a guide in decision-making and school practices. In this study, this area focuses on how well school heads communicate and integrate the school's vision, mission, and core values into school activities and practices, as assessed by teachers. Table 1 shows that the highest weighted mean of 3.75, interpreted as Very High Level, was obtained by the indicator demonstrate knowledge of the DepEd vision, mission, and core values to foster shared understanding and alignment of school policies, programs, projects, and activities. Meanwhile, the lowest weighted mean of 3.70, also interpreted as Very High Level, was obtained by the indicator collaborate with school personnel in communicating the DepEd vision, mission, and core values to the wider school community to strengthen shared understanding and alignment of school policies, programs, projects, and activities. The overall weighted mean of 3.72, interpreted as Very High Level, indicates that school heads strongly demonstrate proactive leadership in terms of vision, mission, and core values. The finding was corroborated by Selda (2025), who found that school leaders who clearly communicate the vision and core values gain stronger support from teachers and stakeholders and provide clearer direction for school improvement. A clear communication of the school vision, mission, goals, and objectives improves the alignment of school programs with stakeholder expectations and strengthens community participation. This related study supports the present finding that clear direction, communication, and collaboration are important practices of proactive school leadership.

Table 1Level of Proactive Leadership of School Heads along Vision, Mission and Core Values

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1. Demonstrate knowledge of the DepEd vision, mission, and core values to foster shared understanding and alignment of school policies, programs, projects, and activities.	3.75	VHL
2. Communicate 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.	3.72	VHL
3. Collaborate with school personnel in communicating the DepEd vision, mission, and core values to the wider school community to strengthen shared understanding and alignment of school policies, programs, projects, and activities.	3.70	VHL
4. Serve as a role model in the school and the wider school community in embodying the DepEd vision, mission, and core values to sustain shared understanding and alignment of school policies, programs, projects, and activities.	3.72	VHL
Overall Weighted Mean	3.72	VHL

Rating Scale:		Descriptive Interpretation:
3.25 – 4.00	-	Very High Level (VHL)
2.50 – 3.24	-	High Level (HL)
1.75 – 2.49	-	Low Level (LL)
1.00 – 1.74	-	Very Low Level (VLL)

School Planning and Implementation. Providing a clear direction for achieving school goals and improving learner outcomes is important. In this study, this area focuses on how school heads develop, communicate, and carry out school plans effectively, as assessed by teachers. Table 2 presents the level of proactive leadership of school heads in terms of school planning and implementation. The highest weighted mean of 3.65, interpreted as Very High Level, was obtained by the indicator, demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the phases of development and implementation of school plans aligned with institutional goals and policies. Meanwhile, the lowest weighted mean of 3.53, also interpreted as Very High Level, was obtained by the indicator share with fellow school heads best practices in the development and implementation of school plans aligned with institutional goals and policies. The overall weighted mean of 3.60, interpreted as Very High Level, shows that school heads demonstrate a strong level of proactive leadership in school planning and implementation. This finding was corroborated by Selda (2025) who found that proactive school leadership supports systematic planning and allows schools to make informed adjustments based on monitoring data. That the long-term planning and continuous monitoring help schools maintain progress even during challenging situations. He also found that school heads demonstrate strong leadership in planning, organizing, and directing school activities. These support the present finding that effective school planning requires clear direction, regular assessment, and continuous improvement of school programs and activities.

Table 2Level of Proactive Leadership of School Heads along SchoolPlanning and Implementation

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1. Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the phases of development and implementation of school plans aligned with institutional goals and policies.	3.65	VHL
2. Develop and implement with the planning team school plans aligned with institutional goals and policies.	3.59	VHL
3. Engage the school community in the development and implementation of school plans aligned with institutional goals and policies.	3.64	VHL
4. Share with fellow school heads best practices in the development and implementation of school plans aligned with institutional goals and policies.	3.53	VHL
Overall Weighted Mean	3.60	VHL

Rating Scale:		Descriptive Interpretation:
3.25 – 4.00	-	Very High Level (VHL)
2.50 – 3.24	-	High Level (HL)
1.75 – 2.49	-	Low Level (LL)
1.00 – 1.74	-	Very Low Level (VLL)

Policy Implementation and Review. Policy implementation and review focus on carrying out established policies and continuously assessing them to ensure their effectiveness and relevance. In this study, this refers to the extent to which school policies are effectively implemented, monitored, and reviewed based on the assessment of teachers. Table 3 presents the level of proactive leadership of school heads in terms of policy implementation and review. The highest weighted mean of 3.64, interpreted as Very High Level, was obtained by the indicator demonstrate knowledge and understanding of policy implementation and review to ensure that school operations are consistent with national and local laws, regulations, and issuances. Meanwhile, the lowest weighted mean of 3.54, which was still interpreted as Very High Level, was obtained by the indicator recommend to higher authorities the enhancement of policies relevant to school operations based on implementation and review.The overall weighted

mean of 3.58, interpreted as Very High Level, shows that school heads strongly demonstrate proactive leadership in policy implementation and review.The finding was corroborated by Bush and Ng (2023) who found that policy implementation becomes more effective when policies are reviewed collaboratively, allowing schools to adjust to changing conditions. They found that policy review becomes more effective when the views of teachers are considered and school practices remain aligned with their goals. They also emphasized proactive leadership in planning and policy review as schools respond to changing conditions. These support the present finding that regular policy implementation and review allow school heads to make needed adjustments and continuously improve school operations.

Table 3 Level of Proactive Leadership of School Heads along Policy Implementation and Review

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1. Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of policy implementation and review to ensure that school operations are consistent with national and local laws, regulations, and issuances.	3.64	VHL
2. Undertake policy implementation and review in the school to ensure that operations are consistent with national and local laws, regulations, and issuances.	3.56	VHL
3. Engage stakeholders in improving the implementation of reviewed policies to ensure consistency of school operations with national and local laws, regulations, and issuances.	3.59	VHL
4. Recommend to higher authorities the enhancement of policies relevant to school operations based on implementation and review.	3.54	VHL
Overall Weighted Mean	3.58	VHL

Rating Scale:		Descriptive Interpretation:
3.25 – 4.00	-	Very High Level (VHL)
2.50 – 3.24	-	High Level (HL)
1.75 – 2.49	-	Low Level (LL)
1.00 – 1.74	-	Very Low Level (VLL)

Research and Innovation. This refers to the use of systematic inquiry and creative approaches to improve educational practices and introduce new strategies in school management. In this study, this area focuses on the extent to which research activities and innovative practices are encouraged and implemented in the school, as assessed by teachers. The highest weighted mean of 3.45, interpreted as Very High Level, was obtained by the indicator collaborate with school personnel in the conduct of research and utilization of findings in facilitating data driven and evidence-based innovations to improve school performance. Meanwhile, the lowest weighted mean of 3.38, also interpreted as Very High Level, was obtained by two indicators: identify relevant research findings from reliable sources in facilitating data driven and evidence-based innovations to improve school performance and utilize relevant research findings from reliable sources in facilitating data driven and evidence-based innovations to improve school performance. The overall weighted mean of 3.41, interpreted as Very High Level, shows that school heads strongly demonstrate proactive leadership in research and innovation. The finding was corroborated by Bush and Ng (2023) who found that research and innovation help school leaders respond to changing educational needs and develop programs that are more responsive to learners. Similarly, Day and Sammons (2021) found that policy and program innovation becomes more effective when it is supported by research and learner input. They found that innovation contributes to improvements in school management, while proactive leadership supports effective program design and learner engagement. These studies support the present finding that the use of research and evidence can help school heads develop better programs and make informed decisions for school improvement.

Table 4Level of Proactive Leadership of School Heads along Research and Innovation

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1.Identify relevant research findings from reliable sources in facilitating data-driven and evidence-based innovations to improve school performance.	3.38	VHL
2.Utilize relevant research findings from reliable sources in facilitating data-driven and evidence-based innovations to improve school performance.	3.38	VHL
3.Collaborate with school personnel in the conduct of research and utilization of findings in facilitating data-driven and evidence-based innovations to improve school performance.	3.45	VHL
4.Promote a culture of research to facilitate data-driven and evidence-based innovations to improve school performance and foster continuous improvement.	3.44	VHL
Overall Weighted Mean	3.41	VHL

Rating Scale:		Descriptive Interpretation:
3.25 – 4.00	-	Very High Level (VHL)
2.50 – 3.24	-	High Level (HL)
1.75 – 2.49	-	Low Level (LL)
1.00 – 1.74	-	Very Low Level (VLL)

Program Design and Implementation. Program design and implementation refer to the development, organization, and implementation of programs that address identified needs and achieve desired educational outcomes. In this study, this refers to how school programs are planned, implemented, and managed, as assessed by teachers. Table 5 presents the level of proactive leadership of school heads in terms of program design and implementation. The highest weighted mean of 3.65, interpreted as Very High Level, was shared by two indicators, display understanding of the implementation of programs in the school that support the development of learners, and implement programs in the school that support the development of learners. Meanwhile, the lowest weighted mean of 3.53, also interpreted as Very High Level, was obtained by the indicator design and implement needs-based programs in the school that support the development of learners. The overall weighted mean of 3.59, interpreted as Very High Level, shows that school heads demonstrate a strong level of proactive leadership in program design and implementation. The finding was corroborated by Bush and Ng (2023) who found that program development becomes more responsive when learner feedback is considered and when school leaders adjust programs according to changing conditions. They emphasized that planning and innovation support the development of learner driven programs and contribute to improved learner outcomes. Proactive leadership supports effective program design and learner engagement, while stakeholder involvement contributes to effective implementation. This supports the present finding that effective program design and implementation allow school heads to respond to identified needs and provide programs that contribute to learner development.

Table 5Level of Proactive Leadership of School Heads along Program Design and Implementation

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1. Display understanding of the implementation of programs in the school that support the development of learners.	3.65	VHL
2. Implement programs in the school that support the development of learners.	3.65	VHL

3. Design and implement needs-based programs in the school that support the development of learners.	3.53	VHL
4. Lead and empower school personnel in designing and implementing needs-based programs in the school that support the development of learners.	3.54	VHL
Overall Weighted Mean	3.59	VHL

Rating Scale: Descriptive Interpretation:

3.25 – 4.00 - Very High Level (VHL)

2.50 – 3.24 - High Level (HL)

1.75 – 2.49 - Low Level (LL)

1.00 – 1.74 - Very Low Level (VLL)

Learner Voice. Learner voice refers to the active and meaningful participation of learners in expressing their views and contributing to decisions that affect their education. In this study, it focuses on the opportunities given to learners to express their opinions, provide feedback, and participate in school decisions, as assessed by teachers. Table 6 presents the level of proactive leadership of school heads in terms of learner voice. The highest weighted mean of 3.58, interpreted as Very High Level, was obtained by the indicator demonstrate knowledge and understanding of utilizing learner voice to inform policy development and decision making towards school improvement. Meanwhile, the lowest weighted mean of 3.49, also interpreted as Very High Level, was obtained by the indicator design and apply effective strategies in utilizing learner voice, such as feelings, views, and opinions to inform policy development and decision making towards school improvement. The overall weighted mean of 3.53, interpreted as Very High Level, shows that learner voice is strongly recognized in the proactive leadership practices of school heads. The finding was corroborated by Walker (2022) who found that learner voice contributes to program evaluation when school planning and policies are developed collaboratively. He found that learner voice plays an important role in monitoring and program development and contributes to inclusive school practices.

Table 6Level of Proactive Leadership of School Heads along Learner Voice

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1. Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of utilizing learner voice to inform policy development and decision-making towards school improvement.	3.58	VHL
2. Utilize learner voice, such as feelings, views, and/or opinions to inform policy development and decision-making towards school improvement.	3.54	VHL
3. Design and apply effective strategies in utilizing learner voice, such as feelings, views, and/or opinions to inform policy development and decision-making towards school improvement. 4.	3.49	VHL
5. Systematize processes in utilizing learner voice, such as feelings, views, and/or opinions to inform policy development and decision-making towards school improvement.	3.51	VHL
Overall Weighted Mean	3.53	VHL

Rating Scale: Descriptive Interpretation:

3.25 – 4.00 - Very High Level (VHL)

2.50 – 3.24 - High Level (HL)

1.75 – 2.49 - Low Level (LL)

1.00 – 1.74 - Very Low Level (VLL)

Monitoring and Evaluation Processes. Monitoring and evaluation processes refer to systematic procedures used to track, assess, and improve the implementation and results of school programs and initiatives. In this study, this area focuses on the implementation of monitoring tools, evaluation practices, and feedback systems in the school, as assessed by teachers. Table 7 presents the level of proactive leadership of school heads in terms of monitoring and evaluation processes. The highest weighted mean of 3.60, interpreted as Very High Level, was obtained by the indicator display knowledge and understanding of monitoring and evaluation processes and tools to promote learner achievement. Meanwhile, the lowest weighted mean of 3.56, also interpreted as Very High Level, was obtained by the indicator design supplemental monitoring and evaluation tools following standard processes to promote learner achievement. The overall weighted mean of 3.59, interpreted as Very High Level, shows that school heads demonstrate a strong level of proactive leadership in monitoring and evaluation. The finding was corroborated by Day and Sammons (2021) who found that the use of data strengthens monitoring and allows schools to make informed adjustments and improve their practices over time. They found that continuous monitoring supports sustained school progress and helps schools respond to changing conditions. These findings support the present result that effective monitoring and evaluation provide school heads with important information for understanding school performance and supporting learner achievement.

Table 7Level of Proactive Leadership of School Heads along Monitoring and Evaluation Processes

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1. Display knowledge and understanding of monitoring and evaluation processes and tools to promote learner achievement.	3.60	VHL
2. Utilize available monitoring and evaluation processes and tools to promote learner achievement.	3.59	VHL
3. Design supplemental monitoring and evaluation tools following standard processes to promote learner achievement.	3.56	VHL
4. Lead in the institutionalization of effective monitoring and evaluation processes and tools to promote learner achievement.	3.58	VHL
Overall Weighted Mean	3.59	VHL

Rating Scale: Descriptive Interpretation:

3.25 – 4.00 - Very High Level (VHL)

2.50 – 3.24 - High Level (HL)

1.75 – 2.49 - Low Level (LL)

1.00 – 1.74 - Very Low Level (VLL)

Degree of Manifestation of Shared Governance in the School. Shared governance involves the active participation of school personnel and other stakeholders in school decisions and management. In this study, the degree of manifestation of shared governance is assessed in terms of curriculum and teaching, learning environment, leadership, governance and accountability, human resource and team development, and finance and resource management and mobilization. It reflects how responsibilities and decisions are shared among members of the school community in achieving school goals and improving learner outcomes.

Curriculum and Teaching. Curriculum and teaching refer to the planning, implementation, and improvement of learning programs and teaching practices that respond to the needs of learners. This area focuses on the participation of teachers and other stakeholders in curriculum planning, teaching practices, and decisions that support effective learning. Table 8 presents the degree of manifestation of shared governance in terms of curriculum and teaching. The highest weighted mean of 3.69, interpreted as Always Manifested, was obtained by the indicator school programs are aligned with learners' needs through teacher collaboration. Meanwhile, the

lowest weighted mean of 3.56, also interpreted as Always Manifested, was obtained by the indicator teachers are consulted in selecting instructional materials and resources. The overall weighted mean of 3.63, interpreted as Always Manifested, shows that shared governance is strongly practiced in curriculum and teaching. The finding was corroborated by Baylon (2025) who found that collaborative governance strengthens curriculum development and instructional improvement because teachers are given opportunities to participate in planning and decision making. Teacher involvement in curriculum planning contributes to better instructional practices and stronger teacher commitment. It was also found that shared governance supports curriculum implementation when teachers and school leaders work together in making decisions related to teaching and learning. This supports the present finding that teacher participation and collaboration are important in making curriculum and teaching practices more responsive to the needs of the learners.

Table 8Degree of Manifestation of Shared Governance in the Schoolalong Curriculum and Teaching

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1. Teachers are involved in the planning of curriculum and instructional programs.	3.60	AM
2. Teachers participate in reviewing and improving teaching strategies.	3.65	AM
3. School programs are aligned with learners' needs through teacher collaboration.	3.69	AM
4. Teachers are consulted in selecting instructional materials and resources.	3.56	AM
5. Curriculum implementation is discussed collaboratively among teachers and school heads.	3.63	AM
6. Teachers contribute ideas in developing school-based learning programs.	3.65	AM
7. There is shared decision-making in addressing learning gaps of students.	3.65	AM
8. Teachers are involved in evaluating the effectiveness of teaching practices.	3.64	AM
9. Collaboration among teachers is encouraged in lesson planning and delivery.	3.60	AM
10. Teachers actively participate in school initiatives related to curriculum improvement.	3.63	AM
Overall Weighted Mean	3.63	AM

Rating Scale: Descriptive Interpretation:

3.25 – 4.00 - Always Manifested (AM)

2.50 – 3.24 - Frequently Manifested (FM)

1.75 – 2.49 - Rarely Manifested (RM)

1.00 – 1.74 - Not Manifested (NM)

Learning Environment. Learning environment refers to the physical, social, and emotional conditions that support effective teaching and learning. In this study, it focuses on the participation of school personnel and stakeholders in creating a safe, inclusive, and supportive environment for learners.Table 9 presents the degree of manifestation of shared governance in the school in terms of learning environment. The highest weighted mean of 3.76, interpreted as Always Manifested, was obtained by the indicator teachers are involved in creating a safe and supportive learning environment. Meanwhile, the lowest weighted mean of 3.58, also interpreted as Always Manifested, was obtained by the indicator feedback from teachers is considered in improving school climate. The overall weighted mean of 3.69, interpreted as Always Manifested, indicates that shared governance is strongly practiced in maintaining the learning environment.The finding was corroborated by Garcia (2024) who found that shared governance contributes to a more positive school climate when teachers are actively involved in school processes and decisions. Shared decision making and stakeholder participation support improvements in the learning environment and school performance. Shared leadership also encourages collaboration among school personnel and strengthens participation in addressing school concerns. These

support the present finding that the participation of teachers and other stakeholders contributes to a safe and supportive learning environment.

Table 9Degree of Manifestation of Shared Governance in the Schoolalong Learning Environment

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1. Teachers are involved in creating a safe and supportive learning environment.	3.76	AM
2. School policies on discipline and safety are discussed with teachers.	3.72	AM
3. Teachers participate in programs that promote inclusive education.	3.71	AM
4. The school encourages collaboration in maintaining a positive classroom environment.	3.74	AM
5. Teachers are consulted in decisions affecting student welfare.	3.66	AM
6. There is shared responsibility in implementing school-wide activities.	3.65	AM
7. Teachers are involved in addressing issues related to student behavior.	3.74	AM
8. The school promotes teamwork in maintaining a conducive learning environment.	3.67	AM
9. Teachers participate in planning co-curricular and extra-curricular activities.	3.71	AM
10. Feedback from teachers is considered in improving school climate.	3.58	AM
Overall Weighted Mean	3.69	AM

Rating Scale: Descriptive Interpretation:

3.25 – 4.00 - Always Manifested (AM)

2.50 – 3.24 - Frequently Manifested (FM)

1.75 – 2.49 - Rarely Manifested (RM)

1.00 – 1.74 - Not Manifested (NM)

Leadership. Leadership refers to the process of guiding, influencing, and supporting school personnel in achieving common school goals. In this study, it focuses on the sharing of leadership roles and responsibilities and the participation of teachers and other stakeholders in school decision making and management. Table 10 presents the degree of manifestation of shared governance in the school in terms of leadership. The highest weighted mean of 3.69, interpreted as Always Manifested, was shared by two indicators: teachers are given opportunities to lead school programs and activities, and teachers are encouraged to take part in leadership training and development. Meanwhile, the lowest weighted mean of 3.55, which was still interpreted as Always Manifested, was obtained by the indicator school heads encourage teachers to participate in decision making. The overall weighted mean of 3.61, interpreted as Always Manifested, indicates that shared leadership is strongly practiced in the schools. The finding was corroborated by Ramos (2023) who found that shared leadership improves school governance when responsibilities are distributed among teachers and other stakeholders and when they participate in decision making. That teacher involvement in school governance strengthens professional commitment and contributes to a positive school climate. He found that shared governance strengthens teacher leadership and participation in school decisions. These studies support the present finding that providing teachers with leadership opportunities and involving them in school decisions strengthens shared governance and promotes collective responsibility for school improvement.

Table 10Degree of Manifestation of Shared Governance in the School along Leadership

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1. School heads encourage teachers to participate in decision-making.	3.55	AM
2. Teachers are given opportunities to lead school programs and	3.69	AM

activities.		
3. Leadership roles are shared among teachers and school personnel.	3.61	AM
4. Teachers are involved in planning school improvement initiatives.	3.57	AM
5. School heads value the ideas and suggestions of teachers.	3.56	AM
6. Teachers are encouraged to take part in leadership training and development.	3.69	AM
7. There is open communication between school heads and teachers.	3.59	AM
8. Teachers participate in setting school goals and priorities.	3.60	AM
9. Leadership responsibilities are distributed among qualified staff.	3.60	AM
10. Teachers are recognized for their contributions to school leadership.	3.60	AM
Overall Weighted Mean	3.61	AM

Rating Scale: Descriptive Interpretation:

3.25 – 4.00 - Always Manifested (AM)

2.50 – 3.24 - Frequently Manifested (FM)

1.75 – 2.49 - Rarely Manifested (RM)

1.00 – 1.74 - Not Manifested (NM)

Governance and Accountability. These refer to the processes that ensure transparency, responsibility, participation, and proper decision making in school management. In this study, this area focuses on how teachers and other stakeholders participate in school decisions, monitoring, reporting, and ensuring that school policies and responsibilities are properly carried out. Table 11 presents the degree of manifestation of shared governance in the school in terms of governance and accountability. The highest weighted mean of 3.67, interpreted as Always Manifested, was obtained by the indicator teachers are informed about school policies and guidelines. Meanwhile, the lowest weighted mean of 3.48, also interpreted as Always Manifested, was obtained by the indicator school decisions are communicated clearly to teachers. The overall weighted mean of 3.59, interpreted as Always Manifested, indicates that governance and accountability are strongly practiced in the schools. The finding was corroborated by Lopez (2024) who found that shared governance strengthens accountability when teachers and stakeholders actively participate in school decisions and responsibilities. Transparency and shared decision making contribute to stronger accountability and improved school management.

Table 11Degree of Manifestation of Shared Governance in the School along Governance and Accountability

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1. Teachers are involved in monitoring school programs and activities.	3.63	AM
2. School decisions are communicated clearly to teachers.	3.48	AM
3. Teachers participate in evaluating school performance.	3.58	AM
4. Accountability measures are shared among school stakeholders.	3.60	AM
5. Teachers are informed about school policies and guidelines.	3.67	AM
6. Transparency is observed in school decision-making processes.	3.51	AM
7. Teachers contribute to reporting and documentation of school activities.	3.66	AM
8. Feedback from teachers is considered in school governance.	3.50	AM
9. Teachers are involved in ensuring compliance with school policies.	3.63	AM
10. There is shared responsibility in achieving school targets and goals.	3.62	AM
Overall Weighted Mean	3.59	AM

Rating Scale: Descriptive Interpretation:

3.25 – 4.00 - Always Manifested (AM)

2.50 – 3.24 - Frequently Manifested (FM)

1.75 – 2.49 - Rarely Manifested (RM)

1.00 – 1.74 - Not Manifested (NM)

Human Resource and Team Development. Human resource and team development refer to the continuous improvement of the knowledge, skills, and performance of school personnel through professional development, collaboration, mentoring, and teamwork. In this study, this focuses on the participation of teachers in professional learning and collaborative activities that support their growth and improve school performance. Table 12 presents the degree of manifestation of shared governance in the school in terms of human resource and team development. The highest weighted mean of 3.77, interpreted as Always Manifested, was obtained by the indicator teachers participate in school-based Learning Action Cells. They also adopt strategies shared by fellow teachers when these are appropriate to the needs and learning levels of their own students. In this way, professional learning becomes a shared process where teachers learn from one another and apply their learning to improve classroom instruction. Meanwhile, the lowest weighted mean of 3.63, also interpreted as Always Manifested, was obtained by the indicator teachers participate in mentoring and coaching activities. The overall weighted mean of 3.67, interpreted as Always Manifested, indicates that shared governance is strongly practiced in human resource and team development. The finding was corroborated by Ramos (2023) who found that school heads support professional growth through collaborative practices and the development of school personnel. He found that shared governance strengthens teacher participation and professional commitment. He emphasized that shared leadership promotes collaboration and collective responsibility among school personnel. These findings support the present result that professional development becomes a shared process when teachers are provided with opportunities to learn, collaborate, mentor, and support one another.

Table 12Degree of Manifestation of Shared Governance in the School along Human Resource and Team Development

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1. Teachers are involved in planning professional development activities.	3.67	AM
2. Collaboration among teachers is encouraged in school programs.	3.67	AM
3. Teachers support each other in improving teaching practices.	3.65	AM
4. Teamwork is promoted in accomplishing school tasks.	3.66	AM
5. Teachers participate in mentoring and coaching activities.	3.63	AM
6. School heads provide opportunities for teachers to develop their skills.	3.65	AM
7. Teachers are involved in identifying training needs.	3.65	AM
8. There is shared responsibility in improving teacher performance.	3.68	AM
9. Teachers participate in school-based learning action cells (LAC).	3.77	AM
10. Professional growth is supported through collaborative efforts.	3.67	AM
Overall Weighted Mean	3.67	AM

Rating Scale: Descriptive Interpretation:

3.25 – 4.00 - Always Manifested (AM)

2.50 – 3.24 - Frequently Manifested (FM)

1.75 – 2.49 - Rarely Manifested (RM)

1.00 – 1.74 - Not Manifested (NM)

Finance and Resource Management and Mobilization. These refer to the proper planning, use, management, and generation of financial and material resources to support school programs and operations. In this study, it focuses on the participation of teachers and stakeholders in managing, generating, and using school resources while

promoting transparency and accountability. Table 13 presents the degree of manifestation of shared governance in terms of finance and resource management and mobilization. The highest weighted mean of 3.51, interpreted as Always Manifested, was shared by three indicators: teachers contribute to programs for resource generation; stakeholders, including teachers, participate in resource mobilization activities; and accountability is observed in the use of financial and material resources. Meanwhile, the lowest weighted mean of 3.40, also interpreted as Always Manifested, was obtained by the indicator there is transparency in financial transactions in the school. The overall weighted mean of 3.46, interpreted as Always Manifested, shows that shared governance is strongly practiced in finance and resource management and mobilization. The finding was corroborated by Espartero and Bautista (2024) who found that shared governance promotes transparency and accountability when stakeholders participate in school decisions and resource management. Stakeholder participation strengthens shared responsibility and accountability in school governance. These findings support the present result that the participation of teachers and other stakeholders in resource generation, utilization, and accountability contributes to the practice of shared governance in schools.

Table 13Degree of Manifestation of Shared Governance in the School along Finance and Resource Management and Mobilization

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1. Teachers are informed about the allocation of school funds.	3.41	AM
2. Teachers participate in planning the use of school resources.	3.45	AM
3. There is transparency in financial transactions in the school.	3.40	AM
4. Teachers are involved in identifying resource needs.	3.47	AM
5. School resources are managed through shared decision-making.	3.45	AM
6. Teachers contribute to programs for resource generation.	3.51	AM
7. There is proper coordination in the use of school facilities.	3.50	AM
8. Teachers are consulted in prioritizing school expenditures.	3.42	AM
9. Stakeholders, including teachers, participate in resource mobilization activities.	3.51	AM
10. Accountability is observed in the use of financial and material resources.	3.51	AM
Overall Weighted Mean	3.46	AM

Rating Scale: Descriptive Interpretation:

3.25 – 4.00 - Always Manifested (AM)

2.50 – 3.24 - Frequently Manifested (FM)

1.75 – 2.49 - Rarely Manifested (RM)

1.00 – 1.74 - Not Manifested (NM)

Relationship between the Level of Proactive Leadership and the Degree of Manifestation of Shared Governance in School. The results in Table 14 can be interpreted using Spearman Rank-Order Correlation (Spearman's ρ) because the variables did not satisfy the assumption of normality. Table 14 presents the test of the significant relationship between the level of proactive leadership and the degree of manifestation of shared governance in school across six areas: curriculum and teaching, learning environment, leadership, governance and accountability, human resource and team development, and finance and resource management and mobilization. The findings indicate that most variables of proactive leadership have statistically significant positive relationships with the variables of shared governance. The Spearman correlation coefficients range from $\rho = .140$ to $\rho = .376$, indicating generally weak to moderate positive relationships. This means that higher levels of proactive leadership tend to be associated with higher degrees of manifestation of shared governance.

Vision, mission and core values demonstrate the strongest and most consistent relationships with shared governance. Significant positive correlations were found with curriculum and teaching (ρ = .376, p-value < .001), learning environment (ρ = .359, p-value < .001), leadership (ρ = .369, p-value < .001), Governance and Accountability (ρ = .353, p-value < .001), human resource and team development (ρ = .327, p-value < .001), and finance and resource management and mobilization (ρ = .305, p-value < .001). These findings suggest that when school leaders proactively communicate, uphold, and translate the school's vision, mission, and core values into practice, there tends to be a corresponding increase in the manifestation of shared governance. The strongest relationship is with Curriculum and Teaching, while the weakest, although still statistically significant, is with Finance and Resource Management and Mobilization. This finding was corroborated by Selda (2025), which found that proactive school heads who clearly communicate the vision and core values promote systematic planning and stakeholder participation. The study further showed that these leadership practices are linked with stronger shared governance, particularly in curriculum implementation and resource management.

School planning and implementation also has significant positive relationships with all areas of shared governance. The coefficients range from ρ = .265 to .322, with all relationships statistically significant. The strongest relationship is with curriculum and teaching (ρ = .322, p-value < .001), followed by leadership (ρ = .309, p-value < .001) and learning environment (ρ = .307, p-value < .001). The weakest relationship is with human resource and team development (ρ = .265, p -value= .002). This implies that proactive leadership in planning and implementing school programs is associated with greater participation, collaboration, and shared responsibility in school governance. The finding was corroborated Ramos (2023) which found that distributed leadership supports curriculum development and that shared leadership responsibilities strengthen program implementation and monitoring. The study also found that participatory decision making contributes to resource management and expands leadership practices within the school.

Likewise, policy implementation and review show significant positive relationships with all six shared-governance areas, with coefficients ranging from ρ = .212 to .290. The strongest relationship is with curriculum and teaching (ρ = .290, p-value < .001), while the weakest is with finance and resource management and mobilization (ρ = .212, p-value = .011). The results indicate that proactive involvement in policy implementation and review is related to stronger manifestations of shared governance. However, the relatively lower coefficients suggest that the relationship is weak rather than strong, particularly in the financial and resource-management dimension. This finding was corroborated by Bush and Ng (2023), which found that policy implementation becomes more effective when collaborative review processes are practiced. Their study further showed that shared responsibilities in curriculum and resource management strengthen shared governance and accountability.

Table 14Test for Significant Relationship Between the Level of Proactive Leadership and the Degree of Manifestation of Shared Governance in School

Level of Proactive Leadership	Degree of Manifestation of Shared Governance											
	Curriculum and Teaching		Learning Environment		Leadership		Governance and Accountability		Human Resource and Team Development		Finance and Resource Management and Mobilization	
	ρ	p-value	ρ	p-value	ρ	p-value	ρ	p-value	ρ	p-value	ρ	p-value
Vision, Mission and Core Values	.376**	.000	.393**	.000	.356**	.000	.353**	.000	.327**	.000	.305**	.000
School Planning and Implementation	.322**	.000	.307**	.000	.309**	.000	.306**	.000	.265**	.001	.260**	.002
Policy Implementation and Review	.290**	.000	.275**	.001	.274**	.001	.261**	.002	.228**	.006	.212*	.011
Research and Innovation	.230**	.000	.227**	.006	.248**	.003	.239**	.004	.187*	.025	.204*	.014

Program Design and Implementation	.321**	.000	.291**	.000	.292**	.000	.273**	.001	.220**	.008	.193*	.020
Learner Voice	.254**	.002	.224**	.007	.249**	.003	.264**	.001	.176*	.035	.187*	.025
Monitoring and Evaluation Processes	.279**	.001	.244**	.003	.219**	.009	.205*	.014	.188*	.024	.140	.095

**Correlation is Significant @ 0.01 level (2-tailed)

*Correlation is significant @ 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Moreover, research and innovation is significantly and positively related to all areas of shared governance. The coefficients range from ρ = .187 to .248. The strongest relationship occurs with leadership (ρ = .248, p-value = .003), while the weakest is with human resource and team development (ρ = .187, p-value = .025). This suggests that schools where leaders encourage research, innovation, and evidence-based practices tend to demonstrate greater shared governance. Nevertheless, the relatively small correlation coefficients indicate that research and innovation is associated with shared governance to a weak degree. Additionally, program design and implementation has statistically significant positive relationships with all dimensions of shared governance, with coefficients ranging from ρ = .193 to .321. The strongest relationship is with curriculum and teaching (ρ = .321, p-value < .001), followed by leadership (ρ = .292, p-value = .001) and learning environment (ρ = .291, p-value < .001). The weakest relationship is with finance and resource management and mobilization (ρ = .193, p-value= .020). This indicates that proactive leadership in designing and implementing school programs is associated with increased manifestation of shared governance, particularly in curriculum and teaching-related activities. This finding was corroborated by Garcia (2024) which found that proactive leadership supports effective program design and learner engagement. The study further showed that shared accountability and stakeholder involvement strengthen curriculum delivery and the effective implementation of school

Furthermore, learner voice, monitoring and evaluation demonstrates significant positive relationships with the areas of shared governance. The correlation coefficients range from ρ = .176 to .264, with all relationships statistically significant. The strongest relationship is with Governance and Accountability (ρ = .264, p-value = .001), whereas the weakest relationship is with human resource and team development (ρ = .176, p-value = .035). This finding suggests that recognizing learners' voices and systematically monitoring and evaluating programs may contribute to participatory governance and accountability. However, the weak coefficients indicate that the relationships, while statistically significant, are relatively modest. The findings imply that learner voice strengthens shared governance when learners are given opportunities to express their concerns, ideas, and experiences and these are considered in school decisions. This is observed through learner representation in the School Governance Council and School Planning Team, where the SSLG President can communicate the concerns and needs of the student body. Learner feedback is also gathered through consultations, suggestion boxes, and evaluation of school programs. This finding was corroborated by Walker (2022), which found that collaborative school planning allows greater inclusion of learner voice in program evaluation and that learner participation contributes to stronger shared governance and accountability.

Finally, monitoring and evaluation processes shows significant positive relationships with five areas of shared governance: curriculum and teaching (ρ = .279, p-value = .001), learning environment (ρ = .244, p-value = .003), leadership (ρ = .219, p-value = .009), governance and accountability (ρ = .205, p-value = .014), and human resource and team development (ρ = .188, p-value = .024). However, its relationship with finance and resource management and mobilization is not statistically significant (ρ = .140, p-value = .095). Thus, there is insufficient evidence to conclude that monitoring and evaluation processes are significantly associated with the financial and resource-management area of shared governance. This is an important finding because it suggests that while monitoring and evaluation processes are generally associated with shared governance, their connection to financial and resource mobilization may be less direct. The finding was corroborated by Ramos (2023) which found that monitoring becomes more effective when leadership responsibilities are shared among school personnel. The study further showed that participatory decision making contributes to resource management, although these responsibilities may involve different levels of participation among school stakeholders.

Proposed Intervention to Enhance the Level of Proactive Leadership and Degree of Manifestation of Shared Governance in School Management Practices. Based on the findings of the study, the proposed intervention entitled Project LINK: Linking Information, Needs, and Key Resources for Effective School Management (see appendix H) was developed to sustain and further enhance the level of proactive leadership and the degree of manifestation of shared governance. The findings generally revealed a Very High Level of proactive leadership and an Always Manifested degree of shared governance, indicating that the existing school management practices are already strongly demonstrated. Thus, the proposed intervention is not intended to address poor performance but to strengthen the connection between specific areas of proactive leadership and shared governance where the relationship was found to be limited.

The primary basis for Project LINK is the result of the test of significant relationship, which showed that most dimensions of proactive leadership had significant positive relationships with the different dimensions of shared governance. However, monitoring and evaluation processes did not have a statistically significant relationship with finance and resource management and mobilization, as indicated by $\rho = .140$ and a p value of .095. This finding indicates that although monitoring and evaluation practices are highly evident in school management, there is insufficient evidence to establish their relationship with the shared management, utilization, and mobilization of financial and material resources. This identified gap therefore serves as the main focus of the proposed intervention.

Project LINK will be incorporated into the regular School Learning Action Cell or SLAC sessions of Dumagmag Integrated School, involving its 36 teaching personnel. Integrating the intervention into SLAC provides teachers with an existing venue for collaborative learning, reflection, sharing of practices, and discussion of school concerns. It also allows the intervention to become part of the school's continuing professional development activities rather than being implemented as a separate training program. Through the SLAC sessions, teachers will have opportunities to examine actual school information and understand how monitoring and evaluation results can be connected with decisions involving school and learner resource needs.

The intervention will consist of four SLAC sessions that follow a progressive process. The first session, From Information to Needs: Using Monitoring and Evaluation Data, will focus on examining learner assessment results, attendance records, program accomplishment reports, intervention results, and other relevant school information to identify actual school and learner needs. The second session, From Needs to Resources: Setting Resource Priorities, will guide teachers in connecting identified needs with the financial, material, human, and community resources required to address them. These sessions are intended to strengthen the use of monitoring information as a basis for determining and prioritizing resources.

The incorporation of Project LINK into SLAC directly responds to the identified gap in the findings by providing a structured opportunity for teachers to connect monitoring information with identified needs and identified needs with key resources. Through the four sessions, monitoring and evaluation are expected to become more closely integrated with resource planning, prioritization, mobilization, utilization, and accountability. At the same time, the intervention will sustain the collaborative planning, participation, shared responsibility, and accountability that were already highly manifested in the findings of the study.

Overall, Project LINK provides a research-based intervention anchored on the results of the study. Its integration into the regular SLAC establishes a practical process of moving from information to needs, needs to resources, and resources to monitored results. In this manner, the proposed intervention specifically addresses the absence of a significant relationship between monitoring and evaluation processes and finance and resource management and mobilization while further strengthening the integration of proactive leadership and shared governance.

CONCLUSIONS

The study concluded that school heads demonstrate a very high level of proactive leadership, while shared governance is consistently manifested in school management. Proactive leadership is significantly and positively related to shared governance in most areas, except between monitoring and evaluation processes and finance and resource management and mobilization. Based on these findings, Project LINK was proposed to strengthen the connection between monitoring, evaluation, and resource management while sustaining effective leadership and shared governance practices.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The study recommends that school heads sustain proactive leadership and strengthen the use of monitoring and evaluation results in resource planning and management. Teachers and school governance bodies may continue active participation in planning, decision-making, monitoring, and resource mobilization. Project LINK may be implemented through regular School Learning Action Cell sessions to strengthen the alignment of school needs and resources. Future researchers may further examine factors affecting the relationship between proactive leadership and shared governance, particularly in monitoring, evaluation, and resource management.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The researcher expresses her sincere gratitude to everyone whose guidance, support, and encouragement contributed to the completion of this study. Special appreciation is extended to Sonia S. Carbonell, PhD, Dean of the Graduate School, for her leadership and support; to Alicia I. Quinito, PhD, the researcher's adviser, for her valuable guidance, patience, encouragement, and professional expertise; to the members of the Thesis Committee, Anicia S. Madarang, EdD, Jennifer S. Rubio, PhD, and Annie Marmol-Dado, EdD, for their valuable comments and recommendations; and to Jamila M. Macapundag, MAEd, MLL, Panel Secretary, for her assistance throughout the thesis process. Heartfelt thanks are also extended to the teachers and school heads of Labo West District, Schools Division Office of Camarines Norte, for their cooperation and participation; to her husband, Ronel, for his unwavering love, understanding, patience, and encouragement; and above all, to Almighty God, for His wisdom, strength, guidance, and countless blessings that made the completion of this academic journey possible.

REFERENCES

1. Leithwood, K., Harris, A., and Hopkins, D. (2019). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. School Leadership and Management, 40(1), 5–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2019.1596077
2. Harris, A., Jones, M., and Ismail, N. (2022). Distributed leadership: Taking a retrospective and contemporary view of the evidence base. School Leadership and Management, 42(5), 438–456. https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2022.2109620
3. DepEd Order No. 024, s. 2020. National adoption and implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wpcontent/uploads/2020/09/DO_s2020_024.pdf
4. DepEd Order No. 007, 2. 2025. School-Based Management (SBM) policy: Strengthening participatory school governance and stakeholder engagement https://www.deped.gov.ph/category/issuances/deped-orders/
5. Selda, G. D. (2025). Stakeholder engagement in MinSU's vision mission. eJournals.ph. https://ejournals.ph/article.php?id=26126
6. Bush, T., & Ng, A. (2023). Global school leadership development: A systematic review. School Leadership & Management. https://doi.org/10.1080/13 632434.2023.2187456
7. Walker, K., (2022). Ethical leadership in schools: A meta-analysis. Journal of Educational Administration. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-05-2021-0102
8. Baylon, C., (2025). School-Based Management practices and academic performance. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/388825754
9. Ramos, V. (2023). Distributed leadership in school improvement. International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews. https://ijrpr.com/uploads/V6ISSUE8/IJRPR51541.pdf
10. Espartero. C., & Bautista. M., (2024). School heads' supervisory skills and leadership. IMJRISE Journal.https://risejournals.org/index.php/imjrise/article/download/1212/1510/3642
11. Garcia, I. (2024). Distributed leadership in schools. Excellencia Journal. https://multijournals.org/index.php/excellencia-imje/article/view/2231