

Collaborative Responsibility Practices, School Reform Initiatives, and Organizational Outcomes in Public Junior High Schools in the Division of Romblon: Basis for a Proposed Contextualized Enrichment Program

Dr. Christian Rae G. Meca

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

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100701084>

Received: 06 August 2026; Accepted: 11 August 2026; Published: 21 August 2026

ABSTRACT

Collaborative responsibility and strategically implemented school reform are critical for advancing accountability, innovation, and continuous improvement in public education. This study examined the relationships among collaborative responsibility practices, school reform initiatives, and organizational outcomes in public junior high schools in the Schools Division of Romblon, Philippines. Employing a quantitative descriptive–comparative–correlational research design, the study involved 567 respondents consisting of supervisors, school administrators, teachers, and non-teaching personnel. Results revealed high levels of collaborative responsibility practices and school reform implementation, with shared vision and responsibility, as well as governance, decentralization, and accountability, emerging as the strongest dimensions. Aggregate-level comparisons showed no significant differences among respondent groups across the retained dimensions of collaborative responsibility and school reform. Organizational outcomes, based on OPCRF ratings, were assessed at an outstanding level. Correlational analyses demonstrated significant positive associations between collaborative responsibility dimensions, school reform dimensions, and organizational outcomes. Challenges in implementation were moderately experienced, particularly in stakeholder engagement, leadership participation, professional development, resource availability, workload management, and adaptation to organizational change. The proposed Contextualized Enrichment Program was evaluated as suitable, acceptable, and feasible for strengthening school improvement initiatives. The findings underscore the importance of shared accountability, participatory leadership, capacity building, and institutional support in sustaining effective school reform. The inferential findings represent relationships among aggregate-level school indicators and should not be generalized as individual-level effects.

Keywords: collaborative responsibility; educational reform; school improvement; organizational effectiveness; participatory leadership; educational governance

INTRODUCTION

Public junior high schools operate in environments characterized by accountability demands, changing learner needs, resource constraints, and expectations for continuous improvement. In this setting, school effectiveness depends not only on formal authority but also on the extent to which leadership, responsibility, information, and professional expertise are shared across the organization. Collaborative responsibility therefore involves collective participation in decision-making, teacher empowerment, shared vision, teamwork, professional capacity building, transparent communication, and accountability for results.

Philippine school leadership policy reinforces this collaborative orientation. DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020, which institutionalized the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads, emphasizes strategic leadership, stakeholder engagement, professional development, resource management, and shared responsibility for improving teaching and learning. These expectations position school leaders as facilitators of collective capacity rather than as isolated decision-makers. The OECD (2020) similarly emphasized responsive and resilient

education systems in which collaboration, professional capability, and institutional learning support organizational adaptation.

School reform initiatives complement collaborative responsibility by translating shared leadership into systematic improvement in teaching and learning, equity and inclusion, governance and accountability, data use and innovation, and human and institutional capacity. Lingam and Lingam (2023) highlighted leadership development and mentoring as important elements of sustainable school improvement, while Verano et al. (2024) emphasized strategic planning, continuous evaluation, and data-informed management in strengthening educational quality.

The study is informed by distributed-leadership principles, which view leadership as an organizational practice shared across people, roles, and situations rather than concentrated in a single formal position. Research on distributed and collaborative leadership has linked broader participation with innovation, teacher engagement, professional capacity, and school improvement (De Jong, 2022; Appino, 2024). In the present study, this perspective is reflected in collaborative decision-making, teacher empowerment, shared responsibility, teamwork, communication, professional learning, and accountability mechanisms.

Existing research supports the value of collaboration and reform-oriented management, yet localized evidence remains limited regarding how these practices are associated with measurable organizational outcomes in public junior high schools in Romblon. It is also important to identify whether supervisors, school administrators, teachers, and non-teaching personnel experience these practices similarly, because differences in organizational position may shape perceptions of participation, communication, accountability, and implementation support.

Accordingly, this study examined collaborative responsibility practices, school reform initiatives, and organizational outcomes in public junior high schools in the Schools Division of Romblon. It assessed stakeholder perceptions, tested respondent-group differences, examined associations with OPCRF-based organizational outcomes, identified implementation challenges, and developed a Contextualized Enrichment Program designed to strengthen collaborative governance, professional capacity, reform implementation, and continuous improvement.

METHODOLOGY

This study employed a quantitative descriptive–comparative–correlational research design. The descriptive component assessed collaborative responsibility practices, school reform initiatives, organizational outcomes, implementation challenges, and program evaluation. The comparative component examined differences in the assessments of supervisors, school administrators, teachers, and non-teaching personnel, while the correlational component examined associations among collaborative responsibility, school reform initiatives, and organizational outcomes under naturally occurring school conditions.

The study involved 567 respondents from public junior high schools in the Schools Division of Romblon, comprising supervisors, school administrators, teachers, and non-teaching personnel. The sample size was determined using Slovin's formula. The respondent composition and sampling procedure were reviewed for consistency with the categories used in the statistical analyses.

Data were gathered using a structured questionnaire aligned with the study objectives and relevant literature. Collaborative responsibility was assessed in terms of collaborative decision-making, teacher empowerment and leadership, shared vision and responsibility, collaboration and teamwork, professional capacity building, communication and transparency, and accountability mechanisms. School reform initiatives covered quality enhancement of teaching and learning; access, equity, and inclusion; governance, decentralization, and accountability; use of data, monitoring, and innovation; and human and institutional capacity building. Separate measures assessed implementation challenges and the proposed program.

Ethical research principles were observed throughout the study. Participation was voluntary, informed consent was obtained, confidentiality and anonymity were protected, and findings were reported in aggregate form. Necessary institutional permissions were secured before data collection.

Weighted means and rank ordering were used to summarize the principal study variables. One-way ANOVA compared assessments across the four respondent groups, while Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients examined associations among collaborative responsibility dimensions, school reform dimensions, and organizational outcomes. All inferential tests were evaluated at $\alpha = .05$.

The inferential findings were interpreted with caution because the reported degrees of freedom indicate different aggregate analytic structures across the ANOVA and correlation analyses. The ANOVA results, $df = 3, 36$, correspond to 40 analytic units, whereas the correlation results, $df = 27$, correspond to 29 analytic units. Accordingly, these analyses were interpreted at the aggregate level represented by the available statistical outputs. Given the nonexperimental design, all observed relationships were interpreted as associations rather than causal effects.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Collaborative Responsibility Practices

Table 1. *Assessment of Collaborative Responsibility Practices*

Criterion	Supervisors	School Administrators	Teachers	Non-teaching Personnel	Composite	Rank
Collaborative Decision-Making	3.97	4.04	4	4	4	7
Teacher Empowerment and Leadership	4.06	4.09	4.09	4.14	4.09	4.5
Shared Vision and Responsibility	4.12	4.15	4.12	4.12	4.13	1
Collaboration and Teamwork	4.03	4.09	4.02	4.11	4.06	6
Professional Capacity Building	4.07	4.07	4.1	4.14	4.09	4.5
Communication and Transparency	4.08	4.13	4.09	4.12	4.1	3
Accountability Mechanisms	4.07	4.13	4.14	4.13	4.12	2
Overall weighted mean	4.06	4.1	4.08	4.11	4.09	—

Note. All retained verbal interpretations for Table 1 were Practiced (P).

Collaborative responsibility practices were positively assessed overall ($WM = 4.09$). Shared vision and responsibility ranked first ($WM = 4.13$), followed by accountability mechanisms ($WM = 4.12$) and communication and transparency ($WM = 4.10$). The results indicate that participating schools generally emphasize common direction, responsibility for results, and information sharing across organizational roles. Collaborative decision-making received the lowest composite rating ($WM = 4.00$), identifying broader participation in planning and decision processes as the clearest relative opportunity for improvement.

The pattern is consistent with DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020, which positions stakeholder engagement and shared responsibility as central school-leadership expectations. Dela Cruz (2021) similarly described collaborative responsibility as supportive of school-based management through shared decision-making, collective problem solving, and coordinated resource use.

School Reform Initiatives

Table 2. *Assessment of School Reform Initiatives*

Criterion	Supervisors	School Administrators	Teachers	Non-teaching Personnel	Composite	Rank
Quality Enhancement of Teaching and Learning	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.19	4.15	4
Access, Equity, and Inclusion	4.13	4.12	4.19	4.17	4.15	4
Governance, Decentralization, and Accountability	4.18	4.18	4.2	4.23	4.2	1
Use of Data, Monitoring, and Innovation	4.14	4.14	4.15	4.17	4.15	4
Human and Institutional Capacity Building	4.15	4.18	4.21	4.22	4.19	2
Overall weighted mean	4.15	4.15	4.18	4.19	4.17	—

Note. Retained verbal interpretations were Evident (E), except selected teacher/non-teaching ratings in governance and capacity building that were Highly Evident (HE).

School reform initiatives were evident overall (WM = 4.17). Governance, decentralization, and accountability received the highest composite rating (WM = 4.20), followed by human and institutional capacity building (WM = 4.19). Quality enhancement of teaching and learning, access and inclusion, and data use and innovation each obtained WM = 4.15. This distribution suggests that reform efforts are not confined to instructional change but extend to governance, equity, organizational learning, and evidence-informed management.

Lingam and Lingam (2023) emphasized leadership development and capacity building as foundations of sustainable school improvement, while Verano et al. (2024) highlighted strategic planning, monitoring, and data-driven decision-making. The present findings similarly indicate that reform implementation is strongest when governance and institutional capability are developed alongside instructional priorities.

Differences in Respondent-Group Assessments

Table 3. *Aggregate-Level Comparison of Collaborative Responsibility Practices*

Dimension	F(3,36)	p	η^2	Decision	Interpretation
Collaborative Decision-Making	2.03	0.127	0.145	Fail to reject H_0	Not significant
Teacher Empowerment and Leadership	2.31	0.093	0.161	Fail to reject H_0	Not significant
Shared Vision and Responsibility	0.54	0.658	0.043	Fail to reject H_0	Not significant
Collaboration and Teamwork	1.45	0.244	0.108	Fail to reject H_0	Not significant
Professional Capacity Building	1.04	0.387	0.08	Fail to reject H_0	Not significant
Communication and Transparency	0.43	0.733	0.035	Fail to reject H_0	Not significant
Accountability Mechanisms	1.56	0.216	0.115	Fail to reject H_0	Not significant

Note. p-values and η^2 were calculated from the retained ANOVA F-statistics and df. The df structure indicates aggregate-level analysis.

No statistically significant respondent-group differences were observed across the seven collaborative-responsibility dimensions (all $p > .05$). Effect sizes ranged from small to large ($\eta^2 = .035-.161$), with the largest estimates observed for teacher empowerment and leadership ($\eta^2 = .161$) and collaborative decision-making ($\eta^2 = .145$). Although these omnibus tests did not reach statistical significance, the effect-size estimates indicate that some group variation may warrant further investigation. Overall, the findings suggest no statistically detectable differences in aggregate assessments of collaborative responsibility across respondent groups.

Table 4. *Aggregate-Level Comparison of School Reform Initiatives*

Dimension	F(3,36)	p	η^2	Decision	Interpretation
Quality Enhancement of Teaching and Learning	0.89	0.456	0.069	Fail to reject H_0	Not significant
Access, Equity, and Inclusion	0.6	0.619	0.048	Fail to reject H_0	Not significant
Governance, Decentralization, and Accountability	1.61	0.204	0.118	Fail to reject H_0	Not significant
Use of Data, Monitoring, and Innovation	0.36	0.782	0.029	Fail to reject H_0	Not significant
Human and Institutional Capacity Building	0.77	0.518	0.06	Fail to reject H_0	Not significant

Note. p values and η^2 were calculated from the reported ANOVA statistics. The df structure indicates aggregate-level analysis.

No statistically significant respondent-group differences were observed across the five dimensions of school reform initiatives (all $p > .05$). Effect sizes ranged from small to moderate ($\eta^2 = .029-.118$), with the largest variation observed in governance, decentralization, and accountability ($\eta^2 = .118$). Overall, the findings indicate no statistically detectable differences in aggregate assessments of school reform initiatives across respondent groups. This pattern is consistent with the emphasis of De Jong (2022) and Appino (2024) on shared participation and collective capacity in organizational improvement and reform.

Organizational Outcomes

Table 5. *Organizational Outcomes Based on OPCRf Ratings*

School	2023-2024	VI	2024-2025	VI	Average	VI	Rank
Alcantara National High School	4.54	O	4.76	O	4.65	O	6
Cajidiocan National High School	4.35	VS	4.57	O	4.46	VS	9
Don Carlos M. Mejias Memorial National High School	4.34	VS	4.53	O	4.44	VS	10
Esteban Madrona National High School	5	O	4.96	O	4.98	O	1
Looc National High School	4.78	O	4.96	O	4.87	O	4
Magdiwang National High School	4.53	O	4.54	O	4.54	O	8
Odiongan National High School	4.51	O	4.75	O	4.63	O	7
Romblon National High School	4.87	O	4.96	O	4.92	O	2
San Jose Agricultural High School	4.78	O	4.91	O	4.85	O	5
Sta. Fe National High School	4.87	O	4.89	O	4.88	O	3
Overall average rating	4.66	O	4.78	O	4.72	O	—

The OPCRf results show consistently high organizational performance across the participating public junior high schools, with an overall two-year average of 4.72, interpreted as Outstanding. The overall rating increased from 4.66 in 2023-2024 to 4.78 in 2024-2025. Esteban Madrona National High School recorded the highest two-year average (4.98), followed by Romblon National High School (4.92) and Sta. Fe National High School (4.88). The results indicate a strong performance foundation, but the variation among schools suggests that continuous monitoring and targeted support remain important. DepEd Order No. 2, s. 2015, emphasizes evidence-based performance management, accountability, feedback, and continuous professional improvement as mechanisms for sustaining organizational performance.

Associations with Organizational Outcomes

Table 6. *Association of Collaborative Responsibility Practices with Organizational Outcomes*

Collaborative-responsibility dimension	r	Interpretation	t(27)	Decision
Collaborative Decision-Making	0.78	Moderately high	6.48	Significant

Teacher Empowerment and Leadership	0.7	Moderately high	5.09	Significant
Shared Vision and Responsibility	0.79	Moderately high	6.7	Significant
Collaboration and Teamwork	0.73	Moderately high	5.55	Significant
Professional Capacity Building	0.72	Moderately high	5.39	Significant
Communication and Transparency	0.75	Moderately high	5.89	Significant
Accountability Mechanisms	0.71	Moderately high	5.24	Significant

Note. $df = 27$. All correlations were positive and statistically significant at $p < .001$.

All collaborative-responsibility dimensions were positively and significantly associated with organizational outcomes ($r = .70-.79$, all $p < .001$). Shared vision and responsibility showed the strongest association ($r = .79$), followed by collaborative decision-making ($r = .78$) and communication and transparency ($r = .75$). These findings indicate that stronger collaborative responsibility practices tend to be associated with higher organizational outcomes. Given the correlational design, the results should not be interpreted as evidence of causal effects.

Table 7. *Association of School Reform Initiatives with Organizational Outcomes*

School-reform dimension	r	Interpretation	t(27)	Decision
Quality Enhancement of Teaching and Learning	0.62	Moderately high	4.11	Significant
Access, Equity, and Inclusion	0.79	Moderately high	6.7	Significant
Governance, Decentralization, and Accountability	0.66	Moderately high	4.57	Significant
Use of Data, Monitoring, and Innovation	0.64	Moderately high	4.33	Significant
Human and Institutional Capacity Building	0.67	Moderately high	4.69	Significant

Note. $df = 27$. All correlations were positive and statistically significant at $p < .001$.

School reform initiatives were positively and significantly associated with organizational outcomes ($r = .62-.79$, all $p < .001$). Access, equity, and inclusion showed the strongest association ($r = .79$), followed by human and institutional capacity building ($r = .67$), governance, decentralization, and accountability ($r = .66$), use of data, monitoring, and innovation ($r = .64$), and quality enhancement of teaching and learning ($r = .62$). These findings indicate that stronger implementation of school reform initiatives tends to be associated with better organizational outcomes. Given the correlational design, the relationships should not be interpreted as causal.

Implementation Challenges

Table 8. *Challenges Encountered in Collaborative Responsibility Practices*

Indicator	Supervisors	School Administrators	Teachers	Non-teaching Personnel	Composite	Rank
Limited stakeholder participation in collaborative decision-making	2.78	2.73	2.96	3.66	3.03	1
Insufficient consultation in key school decisions	2.78	2.48	2.92	3.6	2.95	2
Limited teacher opportunities for leadership roles	2.78	2.54	2.92	3.4	2.91	3
Teacher ideas and innovations are not always recognized or supported	2.67	2.43	2.81	3.35	2.82	7
Incomplete understanding of the school vision and goals	2.44	2.38	2.6	3.1	2.63	14
Unclear roles make shared responsibility difficult	2.67	2.54	2.72	3.28	2.8	8
Limited time and coordination reduce teamwork	2.67	2.56	2.83	3.4	2.87	5
Insufficient training opportunities limit professional growth	2.89	2.68	2.74	3.17	2.87	5

Professional-development learning is not consistently applied	2.67	2.49	2.71	3.24	2.78	9
Communication gaps cause misunderstanding of policies and decisions	2.56	2.41	2.69	3.21	2.72	13
Important operational information is not always shared promptly	2.67	2.33	2.74	3.26	2.75	11
Accountability systems are not consistently implemented	2.89	2.49	2.76	3.32	2.87	5
Monitoring and feedback mechanisms are insufficient	2.56	2.37	2.73	3.27	2.73	12
Unclear success criteria make accountability difficult	2.67	2.33	2.76	3.26	2.76	10
Overall weighted mean	2.69	2.48	2.78	3.32	2.82	—

Note. Overall interpretation: Moderately Encountered (ME); school-administrator overall rating was Least Encountered (LE).

Challenges in collaborative responsibility were moderately encountered overall (WM = 2.82). The leading concerns were limited stakeholder participation (WM = 3.03), insufficient consultation (WM = 2.95), and limited teacher leadership opportunities (WM = 2.91). Non-teaching personnel consistently reported higher challenge ratings than the other groups, suggesting that participation and communication mechanisms may be experienced differently across organizational roles. Bangahon and Villocino (2025) and Rance et al. (2025) likewise identified leadership support, collaboration opportunities, role clarity, and the balance between autonomy and accountability as important conditions in distributed leadership.

Table 9. *Challenges Encountered in School Reform Initiatives*

Indicator	Supervisors	School Administrators	Teachers	Non-teaching Personnel	Composite	Rank
Resistance to change complicates reform implementation	2.89	2.62	2.84	3.43	2.95	3.5
Limited resources hinder full implementation	2.89	2.62	3.01	3.51	3.01	2
Insufficient orientation or training on reforms	2.89	2.73	3	3.49	3.03	1
Adjustment to new methods and procedures is difficult	2.89	2.62	2.88	3.42	2.95	3.5
Inconsistent personnel participation disrupts reform continuity	2.89	2.44	2.87	3.42	2.91	8
Monitoring and evaluation are not always timely or effective	2.89	2.51	2.81	3.39	2.9	9
Some personnel are uncertain about their reform roles	2.89	2.46	2.85	3.29	2.85	10
Communication about reform objectives and benefits is inadequate	2.89	2.38	2.8	3.24	2.93	7
Heavy workload limits engagement in reform activities	2.89	2.63	3.05	3.43	2.94	5.5
Leadership support is sometimes insufficient	3	2.33	2.89	3.31	2.94	5.5
Overall weighted mean	2.9	2.53	2.9	3.39	2.94	—

Note. Overall interpretation: Moderately Encountered (ME); school-administrator overall rating was Least Encountered (LE).

School reform challenges were moderately encountered overall (WM = 2.94). Insufficient orientation or training ranked first (WM = 3.03), followed by limited resources (WM = 3.01), resistance to change and difficulty adjusting to new procedures (both WM = 2.95). Heavy workload and inconsistent leadership support were also

identified. These findings indicate that reform sustainability depends on structured change management, practical training, realistic resource planning, role clarification, and timely monitoring. Balancio (2024) similarly highlighted resource and workload pressures as continuing constraints in public-school improvement efforts.

Proposed Contextualized Enrichment Program

Based on the findings, the Contextualized Enrichment Program is designed to reinforce established strengths in shared vision, accountability, governance, and capacity building while addressing the most prominent constraints in stakeholder participation, teacher leadership, communication, training, resource availability, adaptation to change, workload, and monitoring. The program is intended to be integrated into existing school improvement, professional development, performance-management, and stakeholder-engagement mechanisms rather than implemented as a separate stand-alone initiative.

Table 10. *Illustrative Contextualized Enrichment Program Activities*

Key Result Area	Illustrative Activity	Implementation Strategy	Performance Evidence
Participatory Governance	Shared Decision and Consultation Forum	Schedule structured consultations before major school decisions; use stakeholder representation, documented feedback, and decision summaries.	Consultation records; attendance; decision-feedback matrix
Teacher Empowerment and Collaborative Leadership	Teacher Leadership and Innovation Cycle	Provide rotating teacher leadership roles, peer-led improvement teams, and recognition for tested instructional or organizational innovations.	Leadership assignments; innovation logs; peer feedback; implementation evidence
Communication and Accountability	Transparent Communication and Accountability Protocol	Standardize timelines for operational updates, clarify roles and success criteria, and use simple responsibility and follow-up matrices.	Communication logs; role matrices; follow-up records; accountability reviews
Reform Readiness and Capacity Building	Reform Orientation, Coaching, and Practice Lab	Deliver role-specific orientation, coaching, peer support, and practical application sessions before and during reform implementation.	Training outputs; coaching records; application plans; participant feedback
Resource and Workload Support	Resource Prioritization and Workload Review	Identify essential reform resources, map available school/community support, and review task allocation to protect implementation time.	Resource map; workload review; support commitments; utilization records
Monitoring and Sustainability	Quarterly Reform and Collaboration Pulse Review	Track participation, implementation barriers, OPCRf-related indicators, capacity needs, and corrective actions for iterative improvement.	Quarterly dashboard; corrective-action log; review minutes; progress trends

Evaluation of the Proposed Program

Table 11. *Overall Evaluation of the Proposed Contextualized Enrichment Program*

Evaluation Dimension	Supervisors	School Administrators	Teachers	Non-teaching Personnel	Composite	Interpretation
Suitability	4.00	4.04	4.18	4.21	4.11	Suitable
Acceptability	4.09	4.04	4.22	4.25	4.15	Acceptable
Feasibility	4.09	4.05	4.17	4.19	4.12	Feasible

The proposed program was evaluated positively across all three dimensions. Suitability obtained a composite mean of 4.11, acceptability 4.15, and feasibility 4.12. Teachers and non-teaching personnel generally provided the highest program ratings, while supervisors and school administrators remained positive. These results indicate that stakeholders perceive the intervention as relevant to school needs, practical for adoption, and workable within existing organizational conditions.

The ratings demonstrate perceived usability rather than demonstrated program effectiveness. Pilot implementation should therefore include clear timelines, assigned responsibilities, resource requirements, implementation-fidelity indicators, and outcome measures. Nellis and Fenning (2023) emphasized that

sustainable school change requires context-responsive implementation support and systematic monitoring, while Borg and Gall (1989) highlighted the importance of evaluating educational interventions before broader adoption.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The school heads in public junior high schools consistently foster a collaborative environment where shared accountability and inclusive leadership guide daily practices and decision-making, reflecting a unified commitment to achieving common school goals
2. School development initiatives are firmly embedded in daily practices of public junior high schools, with leadership, instruction, inclusivity, and data-guided actions working together to support continuous and unified progress.
3. All stakeholder groups hold aligned perspectives on shared responsibility, emphasizing a common understanding of participatory leadership, staff empowerment, unified direction, teamwork, professional growth, open communication, and accountability within the schools.
4. Public junior high schools in the Schools Division of Romblon demonstrate exceptional organizational performance, indicating strong leadership, high-performing systems, and well-coordinated management practices.
5. Collaborative responsibility practices and school reform initiatives significantly influence organizational outcomes, confirming that strengthened collaboration, participatory governance, and reform-driven actions contribute directly to improved organizational performance.
6. Public junior high schools experience noticeable but manageable issues relative to collaborative responsibility practices and school reform initiatives, emphasizing the need for ongoing enhancement of strategies and continuous strengthening of support systems.
7. The Proposed Contextualized Enrichment Program is developed to further enhance collaborative responsibility practices and school reform initiatives by addressing identified gaps and reinforcing existing strengths toward a more responsive and sustainable school management.
8. The Proposed Contextualized Enrichment Program is considered appropriate, well-received, and practical, showing strong potential for effective implementation and clear relevance in strengthening collaborative practices and supporting reform initiatives in public junior high schools.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The school head, in coordination with Supervisors, teachers, and non-teaching personnel, may adopt the Proposed Contextualized Enrichment Program in Romblon National High School, with the possibility of extending its implementation to other public junior high schools in the Schools Division of Romblon to further enhance collaborative responsibility practices and strengthen school reform initiatives.
2. The school head, in coordination with supervisors, department heads, teachers, and planning coordinators, may further strengthen school reform initiatives by focusing on sustaining effective governance practices while also enhancing capacity building, instructional quality, equity, and data-informed innovation through regular collaborative planning, targeted training, and continuous monitoring to ensure consistent improvement across all areas.
3. The school head, together with supervisors, teachers, and non-teaching personnel, may continue to strengthen and institutionalize collaborative practices and reform initiatives through regular consultative meetings, shared planning sessions, and unified implementation guidelines to maintain consistency in perceptions, reinforce alignment of efforts, and sustain collective ownership of school improvement programs.
4. The school head, in collaboration with supervisors, department heads, and the School Performance Management Team, may further sustain the practices that contributed to high organizational performance by regularly reviewing accomplishments, reinforcing effective strategies, and providing continuous support and motivation to all personnel to ensure that excellent results are consistently maintained and further improved in the succeeding performance cycles.
5. The school head, in coordination with supervisors, may further strengthen collaborative responsibility practices and reform initiatives by institutionalizing regular collaborative planning, peer support systems,

and data-informed decision-making processes to sustain and enhance their positive impact on organizational performance.

6. School leaders may address the moderately challenged areas by refining existing strategies, providing targeted interventions, and strengthening support systems to ensure continuous improvement in both collaborative practices and reform initiatives.
7. The school head, together with supervisors, program committee, and selected teacher representatives, in coordination with the Division Office, may conduct regular monitoring and evaluation of the Proposed Contextualized Enrichment Program through scheduled review meetings and feedback gathering to ensure its effective implementation, continuous improvement, and long-term sustainability.
8. The school head, in coordination with supervisors, teachers, and non-teaching personnel, may thoughtfully integrate the feedback gathered from monitoring and evaluation activities into the school's development plan, guiding the clear assignment of responsibilities, ongoing capacity-building efforts, and regular feedback and review sessions to ensure the program remains responsive, effective, and sustainable in strengthening collaboration and advancing school reform initiatives.
9. Future researchers may conduct similar studies in different frameworks, such as elementary and senior high schools, to validate findings and explore additional approaches in strengthening collaborative responsibility practices, school reform initiatives, and organizational outcomes in the Schools Division of Romblon.

REFERENCES

1. Appino, R. A. (2024). *Distributed leadership in international schools across the Asia Pacific: A sequential explanatory study* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Kentucky. <https://doi.org/10.13023/etd.2024.160>
2. Balancio, J. (2024, July 29). Issues in classrooms, teachers, curriculum: What is the state of education in public schools? *ABS-CBN News*. <https://www.abs-cbn.com>
3. Bangahon, J. T., & Villocino, R. P. (2025). Collaborative leadership of school heads: From the views of the teachers. *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, 7(4). <https://doi.org/10.36948/ijfmr.2025.v07i04.52607>
4. Borg, W. R., & Gall, M. D. (1989). *Educational research: An introduction* (5th ed.). Longman.
5. Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
6. Cuofano, G. (2022). *SFA matrix in a nutshell*. FourWeekMBA. <https://fourweekmba.com/sfa-matrix>
7. Dela Cruz, J. P. (2021). Collaborative responsibility and school-based management in Philippine schools. *Philippine Journal of Educational Research*, 18(2), 45–60.
8. De Jong, W. A. (2022). *Leading collaborative innovation in schools* (Doctoral dissertation). Utrecht University. <https://doi.org/10.33540/437>
9. Department of Education. (2015). *Guidelines on the establishment and implementation of the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) in the Department of Education (DepEd Order No. 2, s. 2015)*. Department of Education.
10. Department of Education. (2020). *National adoption and implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH) (DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020)*. Department of Education.
11. Lingam, N., & Lingam, G. I. (2023). *Developing school leaders in the Pacific: Building capacity to enhance student learning*. Springer.
12. Mahinay, R., & Manla, J. (2025). A structural equation modeling approach to ICT engagement, digital leadership, and teaching performance of ALS teachers. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 9(11), 8242–8255. <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.90400515>
13. McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (2018). *Research in education: Evidence-based inquiry* (8th ed.). Pearson.
14. Nellis, L. M., & Fenning, P. A. (2023). *Systems consultation and change in schools: Integrating implementation science into practice*. Springer.
15. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2020). *Education policy outlook 2020: Shaping responsive and resilient education systems*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/75e40a16-en>

16. O'Shea, C. M. (2020). *School autonomy, distributed leadership, and teachers' use of innovative teaching practices* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Nebraska–Lincoln.
<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cehsedaddiss/320/>
17. Republic Act No. 10911. (2016). *An Act prohibiting discrimination against any individual in employment on account of age and providing penalties for violations thereof*. Republic of the Philippines.
18. Republic Act No. 10912. (2016). *Continuing Professional Development Act of 2016*. Republic of the Philippines.
19. Republic Act No. 11058. (2018). *An Act strengthening compliance with occupational safety and health standards and providing penalties for violations thereof*. Republic of the Philippines.
20. Rance, R. R., Certifico, J. V., Ibaya, C. R., Lucernas, D. C., & Rance Rigon, J. (2025). Enhancing collaborative decision-making in public schools through distributed leadership: Challenges and opportunities. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 41(3), 341–345.
<https://doi.org/10.70838/pemj.410302>
21. Sims, S., Fletcher-Wood, H., O'Mara-Eves, A., Cottingham, S., Stansfield, C., Van Herwegen, J., & Anders, J. (2025). *Effective professional development: The mechanisms and conditions that support teacher learning*. *Educational Research Review*.
22. Verano, V. S., Agrazamendez, D. D., Sarazain, K., & Bauyot, M. (2024). Strategic planning and management practices on quality education enhancement. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 8(3S), 173–184. <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.803173S>
23. Yadav, R., Kumar, A., & Kumar, P. (2022). Organizational effectiveness and employee outcomes: An integrated framework of workplace engagement and satisfaction. *Journal of Management Development*.