

# Human Resource Management Practices and Organizational Performance in Public Schools in the Schools Division Office of Antipolo City: Basis for a Sustainable Context-Responsive Development Program

Dr. Christopher V. Francisco

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

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100700956>

Received: 05 August 2026; Accepted: 10 August 2026; Published: 18 August 2026

## ABSTRACT

Human resource management (HRM) serves as a strategic mechanism for enhancing workforce capability, accountability, and organizational effectiveness in educational institutions. This study examined HRM practices and organizational performance in the Schools Division Office of Antipolo City, Philippines, including differences in stakeholder assessments, facilitating and hindering factors, and the development of a Sustainable Context-Responsive Development Program. Using a quantitative descriptive-comparative-correlational design, data were gathered from 451 HR personnel, district supervisors, school administrators, and teaching and non-teaching personnel through a validated questionnaire. Data were analyzed using weighted mean, one-way analysis of variance, Tukey HSD post hoc analysis, and regression analysis at the .05 significance level. Results revealed that HRM practices were Highly Implemented overall, with Recruitment, Selection and Placement and Performance Management receiving the highest assessments. Organizational performance was rated Very Satisfactory, particularly in Leadership and Governance and Accountability and Continuous Improvement. Significant differences were identified among respondent groups in selected HRM dimensions. The retained aggregate regression indicated a strong positive association between Recruitment, Selection and Placement and organizational performance; however, the result was interpreted cautiously due to limited degrees of freedom. The proposed Sustainable Context-Responsive Development Program obtained favorable evaluations in terms of suitability (WM = 4.25), acceptability (WM = 4.31), and feasibility (WM = 4.03). The findings highlight the importance of strategically aligned HRM systems in strengthening workforce development and organizational improvement while emphasizing the need for further empirical validation through disaggregated analysis of HRM-performance relationships.

**Keywords:** human resource management, organizational performance, strategic HRM, school effectiveness, educational leadership, sustainable development program

## INTRODUCTION

Human resource management (HRM) has emerged as a strategic driver of organizational sustainability and effectiveness, particularly in educational institutions where personnel competence influences teaching quality, governance, and institutional outcomes. Beyond administrative functions, contemporary HRM emphasizes talent acquisition, professional development, performance management, and employee engagement to develop adaptive and high-performing organizations.

In the Philippine public education sector, HR reforms have been strengthened through the Civil Service Commission's Program to Institutionalize Meritocracy and Excellence in Human Resource Management (PRIME-HRM), which focuses on Recruitment, Selection and Placement; Learning and Development; Performance Management; and Rewards and Recognition. Despite these initiatives, challenges related to

recruitment processes, professional growth opportunities, resource limitations, and personnel retention continue to influence HR implementation. Similarly, the Department of Education's Revised School-Based Management System (DepEd Order No. 007, s. 2024) emphasizes leadership, accountability, continuous improvement, and resource management as essential elements of school effectiveness, highlighting the need for strategically aligned HR practices.

The Schools Division Office of Antipolo City provides a relevant setting for examining these issues as increasing educational demands require effective workforce management and continuous organizational improvement. Although HR systems are guided by national policies and institutional frameworks, variations in implementation and stakeholder experiences may influence organizational outcomes. Understanding how HR practices relate to organizational performance is therefore essential in identifying opportunities for strengthening educational systems.

This study is grounded in Human Resource Development Theory (Swanson, 2022) and the Theory of Performance (Elger, 2007), complemented by the Resource-Based View (RBV) and Social Exchange Theory (SET). Human Resource Development Theory and the Theory of Performance explain how capability development, performance conditions, and organizational support influence effectiveness. The RBV highlights HR practices such as recruitment, development, performance management, and recognition as strategic capabilities that enhance organizational value through competent and difficult-to-replace human resources (Barney, 1991). Meanwhile, SET explains that employees may respond to organizational support, fairness, recognition, and developmental opportunities through increased commitment and positive work behaviors (Blau, 1964; Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005).

Within public education, these theoretical perspectives operate under specific institutional conditions. Unlike private organizations with greater managerial flexibility, public schools implement HR practices within civil-service regulations, PRIME-HRM standards, DepEd policies, budgetary limitations, and accountability requirements. Therefore, the contribution of HRM to organizational performance depends not only on workforce capability but also on effective recruitment, appropriate personnel placement, professional development access, supervisory support, and transparent performance systems. These contextual conditions provide important considerations for understanding HRM effectiveness in regulated public-sector environments.

Despite extensive discussions on HR practices and organizational effectiveness, limited empirical attention has been given to the relationship between multidimensional HRM practices and organizational performance within Philippine public-school settings. Existing studies often focus on individual HR processes or general organizational outcomes, leaving gaps in understanding how integrated HR systems influence school effectiveness from the perspectives of different stakeholders.

Therefore, this study examined HRM practices and organizational performance in the Schools Division Office of Antipolo City, Philippines. Specifically, it assessed HRM implementation, organizational performance, stakeholder differences, facilitating and hindering factors, and developed a Sustainable Context-Responsive Development Program to support strategic HR improvement and sustainable school effectiveness.

## METHODOLOGY

This study employed a quantitative descriptive-comparative-correlational research design. The descriptive component assessed HRM practices, organizational performance, facilitating and hindering factors, and the evaluation of the proposed Sustainable Context-Responsive Development Program. The comparative component examined differences among respondent groups, while the correlational component examined the reported association between HRM practices and organizational performance under non-experimental conditions.

The study involved 451 respondents, comprising seven HR personnel, 10 district supervisors, 60 school administrators, and 374 teachers and non-teaching personnel. Total enumeration was applied to HR personnel, district supervisors, and school administrators due to their direct involvement in HR implementation and school management. Simple random sampling was utilized for teachers and non-teaching personnel.

Data were collected using a structured questionnaire assessing HRM practices, organizational performance, facilitating and hindering factors, and the proposed Sustainable Context-Responsive Development Program. The instrument employed five-point response scales and underwent expert validation and reliability testing prior to administration.

Ethical protocols were observed throughout the research process. Participation was voluntary, informed consent was obtained, confidentiality and anonymity were maintained, and institutional permissions were secured before data collection. Results were presented in aggregated form for academic purposes.

Weighted means and rank ordering were used to summarize the variables, while one-way ANOVA with Tukey HSD post hoc analysis examined differences among respondent groups. Regression analysis was employed to examine the reported relationship between HRM practices and organizational performance at the 0.05 level of significance. A statistical limitation should be acknowledged: the retained ANOVA ( $df = 3, 36$ ) and regression ( $df = 1, 2$ ) outputs represent aggregate-level analyses rather than respondent-level tests; therefore, findings were interpreted with caution. Inconsistencies between some Tukey labels and reported  $p$ -values were addressed using a standardized significance criterion of  $p < .05$ .

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Human Resource Management Practices

**Table 1** Assessment of Human Resource Management Practices

| Criterion                            | District Supervisors | School Administrators | HR Personnel | Teachers/ Non-Teaching | Composite   | VI        | Rank     |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------|------------------------|-------------|-----------|----------|
| Recruitment, Selection and Placement | 4.54                 | 4.31                  | 4.22         | 4.31                   | 4.34        | HP        | 1.5      |
| Learning and Development             | 4.48                 | 4.15                  | 4.11         | 4.21                   | 4.24        | HP        | 3        |
| Performance Management               | 4.48                 | 4.28                  | 4.25         | 4.33                   | 4.34        | HP        | 1.5      |
| Rewards and Recognition              | 4.45                 | 4.16                  | 4.13         | 4.18                   | 4.23        | HP        | 4        |
| <b>Overall weighted mean</b>         | <b>4.49</b>          | <b>4.23</b>           | <b>4.18</b>  | <b>4.26</b>            | <b>4.29</b> | <b>HP</b> | <b>—</b> |

HRM practices were Highly Practiced overall (WM = 4.29). Recruitment, Selection and Placement and Performance Management jointly ranked first (WM = 4.34), followed by Learning and Development (WM = 4.24) and Rewards and Recognition (WM = 4.23). District supervisors consistently provided the highest overall ratings (WM = 4.49), whereas HR personnel reported the lowest overall mean (WM = 4.18). The pattern indicates that staffing quality and performance accountability are the most strongly perceived components of the division's HR system.

The findings are aligned with PRIME-HRM, which positions recruitment and placement, learning and development, performance management, and rewards and recognition as integrated systems for strengthening merit and excellence in government HR practice (Civil Service Commission, 2012). Biron

(2023) likewise emphasized the contribution of these HRM components to employee efficiency in a Philippine educational setting.

### Differences in Respondent-Group Assessments

**Table 2** Aggregate-Level Comparison of Human Resource Management Practices

| Dimension                            | F(3,36) | p      | $\eta^2$ | Decision     | Interpretation |
|--------------------------------------|---------|--------|----------|--------------|----------------|
| Recruitment, Selection and Placement | 12.49   | < .001 | 0.510    | Reject $H_0$ | Significant    |
| Learning and Development             | 27.55   | < .001 | 0.697    | Reject $H_0$ | Significant    |
| Performance Management               | 39.73   | < .001 | 0.768    | Reject $H_0$ | Significant    |
| Rewards and Recognition              | 46.60   | < .001 | 0.795    | Reject $H_0$ | Significant    |

Note. p-values were recalculated from the retained F-statistics;  $\eta^2 = SS_{\text{between}} / SS_{\text{total}}$ . The retained df structure indicates aggregate-level analysis.  $F_{\text{critical}}(3,36)$ ,  $\alpha = .05 \approx 2.87$ .

Significant respondent-group differences were found across all four HRM dimensions (all  $p < .001$ ), with large effect sizes ranging from  $\eta^2 = .510$  to  $.795$ . The largest between-group variation occurred in Rewards and Recognition, followed by Performance Management and Learning and Development. These results indicate that perceptions of HR practice differed meaningfully across organizational roles in the retained aggregate analysis.

**Table 3** Tukey HSD Pairwise Comparisons with Significant Differences

| Dimension                            | Pairwise comparison                  | Q       | p       |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------|---------|
| Recruitment, Selection and Placement | Supervisors - School Administrators  | 6.0088  | .000803 |
| Recruitment, Selection and Placement | Supervisors - HR Personnel           | 8.2392  | < .001  |
| Recruitment, Selection and Placement | Supervisors - Teachers/Non-Teaching  | 5.9826  | .000847 |
| Learning and Development             | Supervisors - School Administrators  | 10.3782 | < .001  |
| Learning and Development             | Supervisors - HR Personnel           | 11.6595 | < .001  |
| Learning and Development             | Supervisors - Teachers/Non-Teaching  | 8.4243  | < .001  |
| Performance Management               | Supervisors - School Administrators  | 12.1691 | < .001  |
| Performance Management               | Supervisors - HR Personnel           | 14.3094 | < .001  |
| Performance Management               | Supervisors - Teachers/Non-Teaching  | 9.0504  | < .001  |
| Performance Management               | HR Personnel - Teachers/Non-Teaching | 5.2590  | .003633 |
| Rewards and Recognition              | Supervisors - School Administrators  | 13.2196 | < .001  |
| Rewards and Recognition              | Supervisors - HR Personnel           | 14.8603 | < .001  |
| Rewards and Recognition              | Supervisors - Teachers/Non-Teaching  | 12.4226 | < .001  |

Note. Only comparisons with source-reported  $p < .05$  are presented as significant; comparisons with  $p \geq .05$  are interpreted as not significant.

The post hoc pattern shows that district supervisors differed from the other three groups across every HRM dimension. In Performance Management, HR personnel also differed from teachers/non-teaching personnel based on the reported p-value.

By contrast, most comparisons among school administrators, HR personnel, and teachers/non-teaching personnel were not significant. The pattern suggests that supervisory oversight may produce a broader or more favorable view of HR implementation than direct operational experience. Roman et al. (2025)

similarly showed that HRM components can be experienced differently across employees and can shape satisfaction and organizational outcomes.

## Organizational Performance

**Table 4** Assessment of Organizational Performance

| Criterion                                 |     | District Supervisors | School Administrators | HR Personnel | Teachers/Non-Teaching | Composite   | VI        | Rank     |
|-------------------------------------------|-----|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------|-----------------------|-------------|-----------|----------|
| Leadership and Governance                 | and | 4.37                 | 4.16                  | 4.13         | 4.15                  | 4.21        | O         | 1.5      |
| Curriculum and Instruction                | and | 4.33                 | 4.10                  | 4.04         | 4.12                  | 4.15        | VS        | 3        |
| Accountability and Continuous Improvement | and | 4.41                 | 4.20                  | 4.12         | 4.12                  | 4.21        | O         | 1.5      |
| Management of Resources                   | of  | 4.27                 | 4.07                  | 3.98         | 4.04                  | 4.09        | VS        | 4        |
| <b>Overall weighted mean</b>              |     | <b>4.35</b>          | <b>4.13</b>           | <b>4.07</b>  | <b>4.11</b>           | <b>4.17</b> | <b>VS</b> | <b>—</b> |

Organizational performance was Very Satisfactory overall (WM = 4.17). Leadership and Governance and Accountability and Continuous Improvement jointly ranked first (WM = 4.21), followed by Curriculum and Instruction (WM = 4.15) and Management of Resources (WM = 4.09). The results indicate a division environment characterized by strong strategic direction and improvement mechanisms, while instructional processes and resource management remain relative opportunities for further strengthening.

The pattern is consistent with the Revised School-Based Management System, which treats leadership and governance, curriculum and instruction, accountability and continuous improvement, and management of resources as interconnected dimensions of school effectiveness (Department of Education, 2024). Liwanag (2025) likewise emphasized alignment between HR development, management strategies, and organizational performance in public elementary schools.

## Association Between HRM Practices and Organizational Performance

**Table 5** Retained Aggregate-Level Regression Summary

| r    | R <sup>2</sup> | Adjusted R <sup>2</sup> | F(1,2) | p     | Std. Error | Interpretation                             |
|------|----------------|-------------------------|--------|-------|------------|--------------------------------------------|
| .931 | .867           | .801                    | 13.03  | 0.069 | 0.021      | Very strong positive aggregate association |

Note. The retained degrees of freedom (df = 1, 2) indicate an aggregate-level analysis based on four analytic observations. Recruitment, Selection and Placement was identified as the reported predictor variable.

The retained regression output shows a very strong positive aggregate association ( $r = .931$ ) and a large coefficient of determination ( $R^2 = .867$ ). However, with only two residual degrees of freedom, the model did not reach statistical significance at  $\alpha = .05$ ,  $F(1, 2) = 13.03$ ,  $p = .069$ . Accordingly, the large coefficient should be interpreted as descriptive evidence of a strong pattern in the aggregate data rather than proof of a stable predictive relationship at the individual-responder level.

The direction of the association is consistent with evidence that staffing, development, performance management, and recognition are strategically relevant to educational outcomes (Biron, 2023; Liwanag,

2025). Nevertheless, causal language is not warranted because the design is nonexperimental and the retained model is based on very few analytic units.

### Facilitating Factors Relative to Human Resource Management

**Table 6** Facilitating Factors Relative to Human Resource Management

| Indicator                                                                      | Composite WM | VI        | Rank     |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|-----------|----------|
| Regular feedback supports continuous improvement                               | 4.39         | HF        | 1        |
| Continuous training supports employee growth and instructional improvement     | 4.37         | HF        | 2        |
| Institutional support promotes a culture of lifelong learning                  | 4.35         | HF        | 3.5      |
| Monetary and non-monetary rewards motivate employee engagement                 | 4.35         | HF        | 3.5      |
| Individual performance goals align with organizational targets                 | 4.33         | HF        | 5        |
| Professional development aligns with DepEd priorities and competency standards | 4.31         | HF        | 6.5      |
| Performance evaluation follows objective and policy-aligned standards          | 4.31         | HF        | 6.5      |
| Clear guidelines strengthen trust in recognition practices                     | 4.30         | HF        | 8        |
| Merit-based and transparent hiring follows DepEd and civil service policies    | 4.29         | HF        | 9.5      |
| Recognition systems use fair and performance-based criteria                    | 4.29         | HF        | 9.5      |
| Open recruitment ensures equal access to employment opportunities              | 4.28         | HF        | 11       |
| Employee placement aligns with qualifications and organizational needs         | 4.26         | HF        | 12       |
| <b>Overall weighted mean</b>                                                   | <b>4.32</b>  | <b>HF</b> | <b>—</b> |

Facilitating factors were Highly Facilitating overall (WM = 4.32). Regular feedback ranked first (WM = 4.39), followed by continuous training (WM = 4.37), institutional support for lifelong learning, and employee-engagement rewards (WM = 4.35 each). The findings indicate that developmental feedback, continuous learning, and supportive recognition mechanisms are central strengths of the division's HR environment.

These strengths reinforce the developmental orientation of HRM described by Swanson (2022) and are consistent with PRIME-HRM's emphasis on integrated systems for staffing, development, performance, and recognition (Civil Service Commission, 2012).

### Hindering Factors Relative to HRM

**Table 7** Hindering Factors Relative to Human Resource Management

| Indicator                                                                          | Composite WM | VI | Rank |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|----|------|
| Inconsistent follow-through and monitoring reduce the long-term impact of training | 2.57         | LH | 1    |
| Limited funding and scheduling constrain access to professional development        | 2.46         | LH | 2    |
| Training is sometimes generalized rather than role- or school-responsive           | 2.16         | LH | 3.5  |
| Heavy workloads constrain meaningful performance feedback                          | 2.16         | LH | 3.5  |
| Hiring delays due to documentation and approval processes                          | 2.06         | LH | 5    |
| Limited vacancy dissemination reduces applicant awareness                          | 2.03         | LH | 6    |

|                                                                         |             |           |          |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-----------|----------|
| Competency-role mismatch can occur because of urgent staffing needs     | 1.95        | LH        | 7        |
| Variations in performance standards create perceived inconsistencies    | 1.89        | LH        | 8        |
| Evaluation results are not always linked clearly to professional growth | 1.70        | NH        | 9        |
| Recognition opportunities may be perceived as uneven                    | 1.65        | NH        | 10       |
| Delays in rewards reduce motivational effect                            | 1.51        | NH        | 11       |
| Limited incentives weaken the perceived value of recognition programs   | 1.45        | NH        | 12       |
| <b>Overall weighted mean</b>                                            | <b>1.97</b> | <b>LH</b> | <b>—</b> |

Hindering factors were generally Least Hindering (WM = 1.97), indicating that major barriers were not strongly perceived. The most prominent concerns were inconsistent follow-through and monitoring of training (WM = 2.57), limited funding and scheduling for professional development (WM = 2.46), generalized training content (WM = 2.16), and workload constraints affecting performance feedback (WM = 2.16). These concerns are operational rather than structural and therefore lend themselves to targeted improvement.

Recruitment delays and workforce-deployment pressures remain relevant in the broader public education environment, as reflected in continuing teacher-shortage concerns (Cariaso, 2025). Within the present study, however, the relatively low hindering ratings indicate that the division’s current HR systems provide a generally workable foundation for improvement.

### Proposed Sustainable Context-Responsive Development Program

Based on the findings, the Sustainable Context-Responsive Development Program is designed to reinforce the strongest HR practices while addressing areas that require greater alignment, follow-through, role responsiveness, and monitoring. The program focuses on staffing alignment, targeted professional development, performance-feedback quality, fair recognition, leadership and accountability, and systematic evaluation. It is intended to operate through existing division and school HR, planning, professional-development, and monitoring structures rather than as a separate stand-alone project.

**Table 8** Illustrative Sustainable Context-Responsive Development Program Activities

| Key Result Area                      | Illustrative Activity                                | Implementation Strategy                                                                                                                                            | Performance Evidence                                                                  |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Recruitment, Selection and Placement | Competency-Based Staffing Alignment Review           | Review vacancy communication, competency requirements, selection documentation, and placement alignment; identify high-friction steps and recurring staffing gaps. | Vacancy and placement audit; processing-time record; competency-role alignment matrix |
| Learning and Development             | Role-Responsive Development and Follow-Through Cycle | Use needs data to design role-specific learning activities, establish post-training application plans, and review implementation after each cycle.                 | Training needs analysis; learning outputs; application logs; post-training review     |
| Performance Management               | Feedback Quality and Goal Alignment Clinic           | Calibrate performance standards, strengthen supervisor feedback practices, and align individual development plans with organizational targets.                     | Calibrated tools; feedback records; development plans; monitoring summary             |

|                                           |                                          |                                                                                                                                                                                |                                                                                 |
|-------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Rewards and Recognition                   | Transparent Recognition Standards Review | Clarify recognition criteria, improve communication of opportunities, and monitor timeliness and perceived fairness of recognition processes.                                  | Recognition guidelines; communication records; release timeline; staff feedback |
| Leadership and Organizational Performance | HR-Performance Alignment Forum           | Use HR and organizational-performance data in collaborative planning among division leaders, supervisors, administrators, and HR personnel.                                    | Alignment matrix; action plans; review minutes; performance dashboard           |
| Monitoring and Sustainability             | Quarterly HRM-Performance Pulse Review   | Track implementation indicators, stakeholder feedback, training follow-through, staffing concerns, and selected organizational-performance measures for iterative improvement. | Quarterly dashboard; corrective-action log; implementation review minutes       |

### Suitability, Acceptability, and Feasibility of the Proposed Program

**Table 9** Summary Evaluation of the Proposed Sustainable Context-Responsive Development Program

| Dimension     | District Supervisors | School Administrators | HR Personnel | Teachers/Non-Teaching | Composite | Interpretation    |
|---------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------|-----------------------|-----------|-------------------|
| Suitability   | 4.20                 | 4.25                  | 4.22         | 4.34                  | 4.25      | Highly Suitable   |
| Acceptability | 4.21                 | 4.40                  | 4.25         | 4.38                  | 4.31      | Highly Acceptable |
| Feasibility   | 4.30                 | 4.07                  | 3.85         | 3.91                  | 4.03      | Feasible          |

The proposed program was evaluated positively across all three criteria. Suitability was rated Highly Suitable (WM = 4.25), indicating strong alignment with stakeholder and organizational needs. Acceptability was Highly Acceptable (WM = 4.31), reflecting support for the program's practical and policy-related value. Feasibility was rated Feasible (WM = 4.03), suggesting that the proposed strategies are considered implementable within existing conditions, although HR personnel and teachers/non-teaching personnel gave comparatively more moderate feasibility ratings.

The positive ratings support pilot implementation; however, they indicate perceived suitability, acceptability, and feasibility rather than demonstrated program effectiveness. Actual implementation should therefore include clear responsibilities, resource requirements, timelines, fidelity measures, and outcome monitoring (Nellis & Fenning, 2023).

## CONCLUSIONS

1. Human Resource Management practices in the Schools Division Office of Antipolo City are effectively embedded in daily operations and are widely implemented, resulting in positive experiences among various stakeholder groups.
2. The school personnel observe human resource practices in unique ways based on their roles and responsibilities. Appreciating these differences allows leaders to design HR initiatives that better support staff growth, engagement, and collaboration across the school system.

3. The organizational performance of the Division of City Schools in Antipolo, Rizal, is functioning at a commendable level, manifesting effective systems, sound management practices, and the division's capacity to meet its institutional goals.
4. Strengthening staffing strategies directly boosts the overall efficiency and impact of schools. Focusing on selecting and placing the right personnel not only improves leadership and instructional delivery but also fosters a culture of accountability and effective resource use, showing that targeted human resource efforts are central to achieving sustained institutional success.
5. The conditions influencing human resource management in the Schools Division of Antipolo, Rizal, are largely supportive and conducive to effective practice. Likewise, obstacles to HR processes remain minimal, indicating that current systems and procedures provide a strong foundation for sustained and efficient implementation.
6. The Proposed Sustainable Context-Responsive Development Program is crafted to reinforce and modernize HR processes while also strengthening leadership, accountability, and operational support systems to ensure the division remains effective, responsive, and capable of delivering high-quality education services.
7. The Proposed Sustainable Context-Responsive Development Program is considered appropriate, well-received, and realistically implementable, indicating strong support for its adoption and integration into the division's operations.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The School Head, in collaboration with teachers and Non-teaching staff may pilot the Proposed Sustainable Context-Responsive Development Program at Sapinit Elementary School, with the intention of expanding its adoption to other public elementary schools within the Schools Division of Antipolo.
2. The Human Resource Management Unit of the Schools Division, in coordination with district supervisors and school heads, may conduct regular collaborative workshops and alignment meetings that focus on clarifying HR policies, sharing best practices, and fostering a common understanding of processes such as recruitment, training, performance management, and rewards to ensure consistent application and understanding of HR practices across all levels.
3. The Schools Division Superintendent, supported by the Assistant Superintendent, the Division Planning and Development Office may reinforce strong leadership and accountability by providing targeted training and mentoring for school heads and key staff. They may also improve curriculum delivery and resource use through collaborative planning, ongoing teacher development, and regular progress monitoring, with school heads leading implementation alongside department coordinators and support personnel.
4. HR Personnel, in coordination with the School Administrators and district supervisors may strengthen recruitment, selection, and placement practices by implementing systematic staffing strategies, including competency-based hiring, transparent selection procedures, and ongoing evaluation of placement decisions. These measures will ensure that qualified personnel are matched to the right roles, directly enhancing leadership, teaching quality, and overall school performance.
5. School heads, with the help of HR coordinators, may sustain strong HR practices by maintaining regular feedback, ongoing training, and fair recognition systems, and ensuring hiring, placement, and evaluation remain transparent and aligned with policy. Likewise, school heads, HR coordinators, and department supervisors may operationalize the improvements through effective planning, monitoring, and coordination. Schools may strengthen professional development by offering role-specific training, improving follow-up, and ensuring staff can access learning opportunities. They may also streamline hiring and placement procedures at the school level to reduce delays and better match skills to roles, while making performance evaluation and recognition more consistent and clearly tied to growth and motivation.
6. The School Head and the administrative officer, in coordination with the Division Research Committee may create a regular and structured monitoring plan to review the implementation of the Proposed Sustainable Context-Responsive Development Program. This will ensure that progress is tracked consistently and adjustments are made promptly.

7. The School Head, in coordination with the Division Research Committee and teachers may actively collect and analyze feedback from both teaching and non-teaching staff through surveys, focus group discussions, or feedback forms. The information gathered may be used to identify strengths, address challenges, and refine the program to better meet staff and school needs.
8. Future research may be conducted in other public schools within the Schools Division Office of Antipolo City will extend and deepen the insights gained from this study. Examining additional school settings may reveal unique HR development needs, organizational strengths, and challenges that were not captured in the current research. Such studies would help build a more comprehensive understanding of how human resource practices and organizational performance vary across schools, leading to more responsive and practical strategies for staff development and sustainable organizational performance.

## REFERENCES

1. Aguinis, H. (2023). *Performance management* (5th ed.). Chicago Business Press.
2. Bian, L., Smith, T., Zhang, Y., & Lee, C. (2022). *Statistical methods for behavioral and social sciences*. Academic Press.
3. Biron, L. S. (2023). *Human resources management practices and teachers' efficiency in the Division of San Jose Del Monte City: Basis for step up level up program for teachers* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Eulogio "Amang" Rodriguez Institute of Science and Technology.
4. Bogenschutz, M. P., Smith, A. R., O'Hara, K., & Thomas, M. R. (2022). *Introduction to research methods and statistics*. Academic Press.
5. Borg, W. R., & Gall, M. D. (2020). *Educational research: An introduction* (10th ed.). Pearson.
6. Calmorin, M. L. (2018). *Fundamentals in research methods*. National Book Store.
7. Cariaso, B. (2025, May 21). DepEd: Shortage of teachers nationwide still at 30,000. *The Philippine Star*. <https://www.philstar.com/headlines/2025/05/21/2444622/depd-shortage-teachers-nationwide-still-30000>
8. Civil Service Commission. (2012). CSC Memorandum Circular No. 3, s. 2012: Program to institutionalize meritocracy and excellence in human resource management (PRIME-HRM). <https://www.csc.gov.ph/phocadownload/userupload/irmo/mc/2012/mc3s2012PRIMEHRM.pdf>
9. Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.
10. Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
11. Cuofano, G. (2017). SFA matrix in a nutshell. *FourWeekMBA*. <https://fourweekmba.com/sfa-matrix>
12. Department of Education. (2024). DepEd Order No. 007, s. 2024: Policy guidelines on the implementation of the revised School-Based Management System. [https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2024/05/DO\\_007\\_s2024.pdf](https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2024/05/DO_007_s2024.pdf)
13. Elger, D. (2007). *Theory of performance*. University of Idaho. [https://www.facultyguidebook.com/4th/demo/1/1\\_2\\_1.htm](https://www.facultyguidebook.com/4th/demo/1/1_2_1.htm)
14. Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, 5(1), 1–4.
15. Field, A. (2018). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.
16. Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2019). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (10th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
17. Gutierrez, M. A. (2021). *Organizational performance in Philippine educational institutions: Principles and practices*. C&E Publishing, Inc.
18. Liwanag, M. L. (2025). *Human resource development, change management strategies, and organizational performance of public elementary schools in the Schools Division of Pasay City: Basis for a proposed localized enrichment program* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Eulogio "Amang" Rodriguez Institute of Science and Technology.
19. McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (2018). *Research in education: Evidence-based inquiry* (8th ed.). Pearson.

- 
20. Nellis, L. M., & Fenning, P. A. (2023). Systems consultation and change in schools: Integrating implementation science into practice. Springer.
  21. Roman, A. G., Roman, J. A., & Valverde, O. T. (2025). Performance management, rewards and recognition, and satisfaction of employees on the implementation of PRIME-HRM: A partial mediation analysis. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 6(2), 753–769.
  22. Swanson, R. A. (2022). *Foundations of human resource development* (3rd ed.). Berrett-Koehler Publishers.