

21st–Century Strategic Governance, Organizational Ethos, and School Outcomes in Public Elementary Schools in Bacoar City: Basis for a Proposed Context-Driven Sustainable Development Program

Dr. Dorarose M. Madrona

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

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100701086>

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

ABSTRACT

Effective governance and a values-driven organizational culture are essential to sustainable school improvement. This study examined strategic governance, organizational ethos, and their relationships with school outcomes in public elementary schools in the Schools Division of Bacoar City, Philippines. It further compared stakeholder assessments, identified implementation concerns, and developed a Context-Driven Sustainable Development Program. Using a quantitative descriptive–comparative–correlational design, the study involved 390 respondents from 29 public elementary schools, including supervisors, school heads, teachers, and non-teaching personnel. Findings revealed high levels of strategic governance and organizational ethos, with curriculum relevance and innovation, sustainable learning environments, and learner-centered orientation emerging as prominent dimensions. Aggregate-level comparisons showed no significant differences among respondent groups across governance and ethos dimensions. School performance based on OPCRf ratings was outstanding, while school-level analyses revealed significant positive associations between strategic governance dimensions, organizational ethos dimensions, and school outcomes. Implementation concerns were generally minimal, and the proposed Context-Driven Sustainable Development Program was assessed as highly suitable, acceptable, and feasible. Findings highlight the importance of digital transformation, stakeholder engagement, values-driven leadership, professional capacity development, and systematic monitoring in advancing sustainable school improvement. The findings demonstrate associations among school-level indicators and should not be interpreted as evidence of causal relationships.

Keywords: 21st-century strategic governance; organizational ethos; school outcomes; educational leadership; school improvement; educational governance

INTRODUCTION

Public elementary schools now operate in environments shaped by technological change, accountability requirements, diverse learner needs, stakeholder expectations, and continuing pressure for sustainable improvement. In this context, governance extends beyond administrative compliance to include strategic direction, evidence-informed decision-making, resource stewardship, digital readiness, shared leadership, and continuous monitoring. Organizational ethos complements these functions by shaping the values, beliefs, norms, relationships, and professional commitments through which personnel interpret and enact institutional priorities.

In the Philippine basic-education system, Republic Act No. 9155 established a decentralized governance framework that positions schools as central units of educational delivery and gives school leaders responsibility and accountability for local decision-making. DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020 further institutionalized the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads, emphasizing strategic leadership, resource management, stakeholder engagement, and the improvement of teaching and learning. These policy directions provide a strong governance structure, but their effectiveness still depends on the organizational values and capabilities through which they are implemented.

The study is guided by Dynamic Capabilities Theory, which explains how organizations sustain effectiveness by sensing change, responding strategically, and continually transforming resources and practices (Teece, 2020). Organizational Culture Theory emphasizes the role of shared assumptions, values, and norms in shaping behavior and institutional effectiveness (Schein & Schein, 2018). The Resource-Based View further highlights leadership capacity, human capital, and organizational culture as internal resources that can support sustained performance (Barney, 2021). Together, these perspectives provide a basis for examining how strategic governance and organizational ethos align with school outcomes.

Recent literature has emphasized vision-driven and collaborative leadership, ethical and transparent governance, organizational culture, and inclusive practice as important conditions for school effectiveness. Baldera (2024) highlighted the value of data-informed digital leadership, while Nazareno et al. (2024) emphasized trust, communication, collaboration, and inclusivity in positive school culture. At the same time, continuing demands for digital transformation, stakeholder participation, and adaptive organizational capacity suggest that high-performing schools must continually renew both governance systems and shared cultural practices.

Despite this growing literature, limited empirical work has examined 21st-century strategic governance, organizational ethos, and measurable school outcomes together in a localized Philippine public-elementary-school setting. Accordingly, this study assessed governance and ethos, tested respondent-group differences, examined school outcomes, investigated school-level associations among the major variables, identified implementation concerns, and evaluated a Context-Driven Sustainable Development Program developed from the findings.

METHODOLOGY

This study employed a quantitative descriptive-comparative-correlational research design. The descriptive component determined the extent of 21st-century strategic governance, organizational ethos, school outcomes, implementation problems, and program evaluation. The comparative component examined differences in the assessments of supervisors, school heads, teachers, and non-teaching personnel. The correlational component examined the associations of strategic governance and organizational ethos with school outcomes under naturally occurring conditions without experimental manipulation.

The respondents comprised 390 personnel from 29 public elementary schools in the Schools Division of Bacoar City: 10 supervisors, 29 school heads, 322 teachers, and 29 non-teaching personnel. Total enumeration was used for supervisors, school heads, and non-teaching personnel, while stratified random sampling was used for teachers to support proportional representation across schools. The reported methodology indicates that Slovin's formula was used to determine the teacher sample size.

Data were gathered through a structured researcher-developed questionnaire aligned with the study objectives and relevant literature. Strategic governance was measured across 10 dimensions, while organizational ethos was assessed across seven dimensions. School outcomes were represented by OPCRF ratings for School Years 2023–2024 and 2024–2025. Separate item sets assessed implementation challenges and the suitability, acceptability, and feasibility of the proposed program. Prior to final administration, the instrument underwent expert content validation and reliability testing to establish its validity and internal consistency.

Ethical principles were observed throughout the study. Participation was voluntary, informed consent was secured, confidentiality and anonymity were protected, and institutional permissions were obtained before data gathering. Information collected from participants was used only for academic research purposes.

Frequency and percentage summarized respondent characteristics, while weighted means and rank ordering summarized governance, ethos, implementation problems, program evaluation, and OPCRF outcomes. One-way ANOVA was used for respondent-group comparisons. The reported school-outcome relationship tables provide Pearson correlation coefficients with t-tests at $df = 27$, corresponding to 29 school-level analytic units. All inferential tests used $\alpha = .05$.

A statistical reporting limitation should be noted. The retained ANOVA tables indicate aggregate-level analyses (df = 3, 36) rather than 390 independent respondent observations; therefore, group comparisons are interpreted at the aggregate analytic level. The reported results reflect the available statistical outputs, although the discrepancy between the stated regression methodology and reported correlation analyses requires verification using the original dataset. School-level correlations indicate associations and should not be interpreted as causal or individual-level effects.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

21st-Century Strategic Governance

Table 1. Assessment of 21st-Century Strategic Governance

Criterion	Supervisors	VI	School Heads	VI	Teachers	VI	Non-Teaching	VI	Overall	VI	Rank
Vision-Driven and Data-Informed Leadership	4.75	HE	4.66	HE	4.72	HE	4.67	HE	4.7	HE	5.5
Strengthened School-Based Management	4.63	HE	4.53	HE	4.53	HE	4.56	HE	4.56	HE	9
Digital Transformation and ICT Integration	4.09	E	4.11	E	4.15	E	4.14	E	4.12	E	10
Inclusive, Equitable, and Child-Centered Policies	4.82	HE	4.68	HE	4.72	HE	4.71	HE	4.73	HE	3
Transparent and Accountable Financial Governance	4.61	HE	4.67	HE	4.68	HE	4.71	HE	4.67	HE	7
Community and Multi-Sectoral Partnership	4.66	HE	4.59	HE	4.62	HE	4.61	HE	4.62	HE	8
Continuous Learning and Professional Development	4.73	HE	4.73	HE	4.71	HE	4.71	HE	4.72	HE	4
Curriculum Relevance and Innovation	4.77	HE	4.77	HE	4.73	HE	4.69	HE	4.74	HE	1.5
Safe, Resilient, and Sustainable Environment	4.74	HE	4.79	HE	4.72	HE	4.72	HE	4.74	HE	1.5
Monitoring and Evaluation	4.7	HE	4.73	HE	4.71	HE	4.67	HE	4.7	HE	5.5
Overall weighted mean	4.65	HE	4.62	HE	4.63	HE	4.62	HE	4.63	HE	—

Strategic governance was Highly Evident overall (WM = 4.63). Curriculum relevance and innovation and a safe, resilient, and sustainable environment ranked jointly first (WM = 4.74), followed by inclusive, equitable, and child-centered policies (WM = 4.73) and continuous learning and professional development (WM = 4.72). The pattern indicates strong attention to adaptive curriculum, safe and resilient learning conditions, inclusion, professional growth, and monitoring.

Digital transformation and ICT integration received the lowest composite rating (WM = 4.12), interpreted as Evident rather than Highly Evident. This relative gap identifies digital capacity, infrastructure, and technology-enabled governance as the clearest improvement priority. The finding is consistent with Baldera (2024), who emphasized the growing role of digital leadership in contemporary school management, and with the broader governance emphasis on strategic oversight and institutional responsiveness.

Organizational Ethos

Table 2. Assessment of Organizational Ethos

Criterion	Supervisors	VI	School Heads	VI	Teachers	VI	Non-Teaching	VI	Overall	VI	Rank
Vision, Mission, and Core Values	4.70	AO	4.76	AO	4.71	AO	4.67	AO	4.71	AO	5.5
Shared Beliefs and Norms	4.70	AO	4.72	AO	4.74	AO	4.72	AO	4.72	AO	4
Stakeholder Engagement and Community Partnership	4.64	AO	4.60	AO	4.64	AO	4.66	AO	4.64	AO	7
Commitment to Public Service	4.72	AO	4.71	AO	4.74	AO	4.75	AO	4.73	AO	3
Inclusivity and Respect for Diversity	4.74	AO	4.72	AO	4.76	AO	4.78	AO	4.75	AO	2
Accountability and Transparency	4.70	AO	4.70	AO	4.72	AO	4.73	AO	4.71	AO	5.5
Learner-Centered Orientation	4.74	AO	4.77	AO	4.80	AO	4.78	AO	4.77	AO	1
Overall weighted mean	4.71	AO	4.71	AO	4.73	AO	4.73	AO	4.72	AO	—

Organizational ethos was Always Observed overall (WM = 4.72). Learner-centered orientation ranked first (WM = 4.77), followed by inclusivity and respect for diversity (WM = 4.75) and commitment to public service (WM = 4.73). These results indicate a strongly values-driven school culture in which learner needs, inclusion, public-service commitment, and shared norms are prominent.

Stakeholder engagement and community partnership ranked lowest (WM = 4.64), although it remained Always Observed. Its relative position suggests that schools can strengthen external collaboration even within an already positive cultural environment. Schein and Schein (2018) emphasize that shared values and norms guide organizational behavior, while Nazareno et al. (2024) similarly highlight trust, communication, collaboration, and inclusivity as important elements of positive school culture.

Differences in Respondent-Group Assessments of Strategic Governance

Table 3. Aggregate-Level Comparison of Strategic-Governance Assessments

Dimension	F(3,36)	p	η^2	Decision	Interpretation
Vision-Driven and Data-Informed Leadership	2.28	0.096	0.16	Fail to reject H_0	Not significant
Strengthened School-Based Management	1.15	0.342	0.087	Fail to reject H_0	Not significant
Digital Transformation and ICT Integration	1.51	0.228	0.112	Fail to reject H_0	Not significant
Inclusive, Equitable, and Child-Centered Policies	2.33	0.091	0.163	Fail to reject H_0	Not significant
Transparent and Accountable Financial Governance	1.24	0.309	0.094	Fail to reject H_0	Not significant

Community and Multi-Sectoral Partnership	0.85	0.476	0.066	Fail to reject H_0	Not significant
Continuous Learning and Professional Development	0.34	0.797	0.028	Fail to reject H_0	Not significant
Curriculum Relevance and Innovation	1.73	0.178	0.126	Fail to reject H_0	Not significant
Safe, Resilient, and Sustainable Environment	0.85	0.476	0.066	Fail to reject H_0	Not significant
Monitoring and Evaluation	0.59	0.626	0.047	Fail to reject H_0	Not significant

Note. p -values and η^2 values were calculated from the retained F-statistics and df. The retained df structure indicates aggregate-level rather than individual-level comparison.

No significant differences were found among respondent groups across any strategic-governance dimension (all $p > .05$). The results indicate broadly comparable aggregate assessments of governance practices among supervisors, school heads, teachers, and non-teaching personnel. The largest retained effect-size estimates occurred for vision-driven and data-informed leadership ($\eta^2 = .160$) and inclusive, equitable, and child-centered policies ($\eta^2 = .163$), but neither omnibus test reached statistical significance in the retained analysis.

The overall pattern suggests a shared understanding of governance priorities across organizational roles. Baldera (2024) similarly described vision-driven, data-informed, and collaborative leadership as central to coordinated school improvement.

Differences in Respondent-Group Assessments of Organizational Ethos

Table 4. Aggregate-Level Comparison of Organizational-Ethos Assessments

Dimension	F(3,36)	p	η^2	Decision	Interpretation
Vision, Mission, and Core Values	2.43	0.081	0.168	Fail to reject H_0	Not significant
Shared Beliefs and Norms	0.32	0.811	0.026	Fail to reject H_0	Not significant
Stakeholder Engagement and Community Partnership	1.14	0.346	0.087	Fail to reject H_0	Not significant
Commitment to Public Service	0.51	0.678	0.041	Fail to reject H_0	Not significant
Inclusivity and Respect for Diversity	0.78	0.513	0.061	Fail to reject H_0	Not significant
Accountability and Transparency	0.39	0.761	0.031	Fail to reject H_0	Not significant
Learner-Centered Orientation	0.56	0.645	0.045	Fail to reject H_0	Not significant

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

No significant differences were found among respondent groups across the seven organizational-ethos dimensions (all $p > .05$). The findings indicate consistent aggregate perceptions of shared values, beliefs, public-service commitment, inclusivity, accountability, and learner-centered practices. The largest effect-size estimate was observed for vision, mission, and core values ($\eta^2 = .168$), but the retained omnibus test remained non-significant ($p = .081$).

The uniform pattern is consistent with a cohesive organizational culture in which common values and behavioral expectations are broadly shared across roles. Lazaga (2024) likewise emphasized participation, accessibility, and equity as important features of inclusive school environments.

School Outcomes Based on OPCRF Ratings

Table 5. School Outcomes Based on Office Performance Commitment and Review Form Ratings

School	2023-2024	VI	2024-2025	VI	Average	VI	Rank
Aniban CS	4.64	O	4.74	O	4.69	O	10.5
Bacoor ES	4.67	O	4.62	O	4.65	O	16
Bayanan ES	4.82	O	4.73	O	4.78	O	5

Cuidad de Strike IS	4.42	VS	4.51	O	4.47	VS	25
Digman ES	4.71	O	4.71	O	4.71	O	9
Dulong Bayan ES	4.24	VS	4.31	VS	4.28	VS	29
Gawaran ES	4.61	O	4.74	O	4.68	O	12
Gov. P.F. Espiritu ES	4.87	O	4.84	O	4.86	O	3.5
Habay ES	4.64	O	4.58	O	4.61	O	18.5
Ligas 1 ES	4.71	O	4.51	O	4.61	O	18.5
Ligas 2 ES	4.73	O	4.73	O	4.73	O	7
Likha Molino IV ES	4.84	O	4.87	O	4.86	O	3.5
Longos ES	4.37	VS	4.41	VS	4.39	VS	27
Mabolo ES	4.46	VS	4.49	VS	4.48	VS	24
Maliksi ES	4.64	O	4.67	O	4.66	O	15
Malipay ES	4.58	O	4.41	VS	4.5	O	23
Mambog ES	4.73	O	4.73	O	4.73	O	7
Molino ES	4.94	O	4.97	O	4.96	O	1
Niog ES	4.52	O	4.64	O	4.58	O	20
Poblacion ES	4.53	O	4.61	O	4.57	O	21
Progressive ES	4.68	O	4.77	O	4.73	O	7
Queens Row ES	4.81	O	4.94	O	4.88	O	2
Real ES	4.67	O	4.67	O	4.67	O	13.5
Salinas ES	4.47	VS	4.41	VS	4.44	VS	26
San Nicolas ES	4.47	VS	4.56	O	4.52	O	22
Sineguelasan ES	4.38	VS	4.38	VS	4.38	VS	28
Soldiers Hills IV ES	4.62	O	4.62	O	4.62	O	17
Talaba ES	4.67	O	4.67	O	4.67	O	13.5
Zapote ES	4.62	O	4.76	O	4.69	O	10.5
Overall average rating	4.62	O	4.64	O	4.63	O	—

School outcomes were Outstanding overall, increasing slightly from 4.62 in School Year 2023-2024 to 4.64 in 2024-2025, for a two-year average of 4.63. Molino Elementary School obtained the highest two-year average (4.96), followed by Queens Row Elementary School (4.88). Several schools were classified as Very Satisfactory rather than Outstanding, indicating that targeted support may still be useful within an otherwise high-performing division.

The results align with DepEd Order No. 02, s. 2015, which uses the Results-Based Performance Management System to align commitments, standards, and accountability. Orbeta et al. (2025) likewise emphasized that educational outcomes depend on interconnected factors such as teacher quality, resources, curriculum alignment, and monitoring, while Zara (2024) highlighted the importance of structured performance management in sustaining school effectiveness.

Association Between Strategic Governance and School Outcomes

Table 6. School-Level Association of Strategic-Governance Dimensions with School Outcomes

Governance dimension	r	t(27)	p	Interpretation	Decision
Vision-Driven and Data-Informed Leadership	0.79	6.7	< .001	Moderately high positive	Significant
Strengthened School-Based Management	0.83	7.73	< .001	High positive	Significant
Digital Transformation and ICT Integration	0.86	8.76	< .001	High positive	Significant

Inclusive, Equitable, and Child-Centered Policies	0.72	5.39	< .001	Moderately high positive	Significant
Transparent and Accountable Financial Governance	0.74	5.72	< .001	Moderately high positive	Significant
Community and Multi-Sectoral Partnership	0.78	6.48	< .001	Moderately high positive	Significant
Continuous Learning and Professional Development	0.73	5.55	< .001	Moderately high positive	Significant
Curriculum Relevance and Innovation	0.75	5.89	< .001	Moderately high positive	Significant
Safe, Resilient, and Sustainable Environment	0.66	4.56	< .001	Moderately high positive	Significant
Monitoring and Evaluation	0.74	5.72	< .001	Moderately high positive	Significant

Note. The retained correlation tables use $df = 27$, corresponding to 29 school-level analytic units. p -values were calculated from the retained r -values and df .

All strategic-governance dimensions were positively and significantly associated with school outcomes at the school level. Digital transformation and ICT integration showed the strongest association ($r = .86$), followed by strengthened School-Based Management ($r = .83$) and vision-driven and data-informed leadership ($r = .79$). Even the lowest coefficient, for a safe, resilient, and sustainable environment ($r = .66$), remained positive and statistically significant.

The pattern indicates that schools reporting stronger strategic-governance conditions also tended to have stronger OPCRf outcomes. Garcia (2024) emphasized the relevance of transparency, accountability, and ethical leadership to school governance and performance. Because the analysis is correlational and school-level, the findings should be interpreted as associations rather than evidence that a governance dimension directly causes higher performance.

Association Between Organizational Ethos and School Outcomes

Table 7. School-Level Association of Organizational-Ethos Dimensions with School Outcomes

Organizational-ethos dimension	r	$t(27)$	p	Interpretation	Decision
Vision, Mission, and Core Values	0.71	5.24	< .001	Moderately high positive	Significant
Shared Beliefs and Norms	0.71	5.24	< .001	Moderately high positive	Significant
Stakeholder Engagement and Community Partnership	0.72	5.39	< .001	Moderately high positive	Significant
Commitment to Public Service	0.72	5.39	< .001	Moderately high positive	Significant
Inclusivity and Respect for Diversity	0.71	5.24	< .001	Moderately high positive	Significant
Accountability and Transparency	0.72	5.39	< .001	Moderately high positive	Significant
Learner-Centered Orientation	0.7	5.09	< .001	Moderately high positive	Significant

Note. The retained analysis is school-level ($n = 29$; $df = 27$). p -values were calculated from the retained r -values and df .

All organizational-ethos dimensions were positively and significantly associated with school outcomes. Stakeholder engagement and community partnership, commitment to public service, and accountability and transparency each reached $r = .72$; vision, mission, and core values; shared beliefs and norms; and inclusivity and respect for diversity each reached $r = .71$; and learner-centered orientation reached $r = .70$. The narrow range of coefficients indicates a broadly consistent relationship between a positive school ethos and OPCRf performance.

These results are consistent with Nazareno et al. (2024), who emphasized that shared beliefs, collaboration, inclusive leadership, and trust contribute to positive organizational culture. The findings suggest that values-driven cultural conditions and collective commitment are closely aligned with stronger school performance, while causal interpretation remains unwarranted.

Problems Encountered in Strategic Governance

Table 8. Problems Encountered Relative to 21st-Century Strategic Governance

Indicator	Supervisors	VI	School Heads	VI	Teachers	VI	Non-Teaching	VI	Composite	VI	Rank
Vision is not consistently communicated to all personnel	1.80	LE	1.69	NE	1.78	NE	1.55	NE	1.71	NE	8
Decisions are made without adequate data or evidence	1.60	NE	1.55	NE	1.74	NE	1.72	NE	1.65	NE	5
Limited stakeholder involvement affects planning and decision-making	1.70	NE	1.97	LE	1.88	LE	1.59	NE	1.79	NE	9
SBM roles and processes are unclear to stakeholders	1.60	NE	1.52	NE	1.73	NE	1.52	NE	1.59	NE	4
Insufficient ICT resources hinder digital-tool integration	1.70	NE	2.10	LE	2.11	LE	1.93	LE	1.96	LE	10
Staff lack adequate training in digital tools and technology	1.60	NE	1.97	LE	1.85	LE	1.38	NE	1.70	NE	7
Inclusive policies are not fully implemented	1.50	NE	1.48	NE	1.67	NE	1.34	NE	1.50	NE	2
Financial processes are not clearly communicated	1.50	NE	1.41	NE	1.60	NE	1.14	NE	1.41	NE	1
Weak partnerships limit community/external support	1.60	NE	1.72	NE	1.65	NE	1.14	NE	1.53	NE	3
Monitoring results are not effectively used for improvement	1.50	NE	1.59	NE	1.63	NE	1.97	LE	1.67	NE	6
Overall weighted mean	1.61	NE	1.70	NE	1.76	NE	1.53	NE	1.65	NE	—

Strategic-governance problems were generally Not Encountered (WM = 1.65), indicating that the major governance mechanisms were functioning with relatively few reported difficulties. The most prominent concern was insufficient ICT resources for digital integration (WM = 1.96, Least Encountered), followed by limited stakeholder involvement in planning and decision-making (WM = 1.79). Digital training and use of monitoring results also represent relative improvement opportunities.

The pattern reinforces the need to sustain existing strengths while continuing to invest in digital capacity, stakeholder participation, and evidence-informed improvement. Lubuguin (2022) similarly emphasized

transparency, ethical practice, accountability, and stakeholder involvement as important features of effective school governance.

Problems Encountered in Organizational Ethos

Table 9. Problems Encountered Relative to Organizational Ethos

Indicator	Supervisors	VI	School Heads	VI	Teachers	VI	Non-Teaching	VI	Composite	VI	Rank
Some personnel do not clearly understand the vision, mission, and core values	2.20	LE	2.14	LE	2.2	LE	2	LE	2.14	LE	5.5
Decisions are occasionally inconsistent with stated values	2.00	LE	2.24	LE	2.19	LE	2.03	LE	2.12	LE	3
Differences in beliefs and work attitudes hinder collaboration	2.20	LE	2.26	LE	2.2	LE	2.28	LE	2.24	LE	7
Communication gaps weaken trust and teamwork	2.50	LE	2.29	LE	2.23	LE	2.28	LE	2.33	LE	10
Stakeholder participation in school activities is limited	2.30	LE	2.29	LE	2.35	LE	2.24	LE	2.30	LE	9
Not all personnel consistently demonstrate commitment to public service	2.20	LE	2.39	LE	2.30	LE	2.14	LE	2.26	LE	8
Inclusivity and respect for diversity are not consistently practiced	2.10	LE	2.24	LE	2.22	LE	1.90	LE	2.12	LE	4
Accountability mechanisms are not strictly enforced	2.00	LE	2.21	LE	2.30	LE	1.79	NE	2.08	LE	2
Transparency in processes and decisions is sometimes lacking	2.20	LE	2.18	LE	2.18	LE	2.00	LE	2.14	LE	5.5
Learner needs are not always prioritized in planning and programs	1.90	LE	2.14	LE	2.28	LE	1.93	LE	2.06	LE	1
Overall weighted mean	2.16	LE	2.24	LE	2.25	LE	2.06	LE	2.18	LE	—

Organizational-ethos problems were generally Least Encountered (WM = 2.18). Communication gaps (WM = 2.33), limited stakeholder participation (WM = 2.30), and inconsistent public-service commitment (WM = 2.26) were the relatively highest concerns. Although these ratings remain low, they identify the area's most likely to benefit from continuing attention to communication, participation, shared values, and collective responsibility.

The results indicate that a positive organizational culture is already established but still requires deliberate maintenance. Regular value-reflection activities, stakeholder dialogue, recognition of collaborative practice, and transparent communication may help preserve alignment as school needs and external demands change.

Proposed Context-Driven Sustainable Development Program

Based on the findings, the Context-Driven Sustainable Development Program is designed to sustain the strongest existing governance and cultural practices while addressing the clearest opportunities for improvement: digital transformation and ICT integration, stakeholder engagement, continuing capacity development, evidence-informed monitoring, and reinforcement of shared organizational values. Rather than functioning as a stand-alone initiative, the program is intended to be integrated into existing school-improvement, professional-development, stakeholder-engagement, and monitoring mechanisms.

Table 10. Illustrative Context-Driven Sustainable Development Program Activities

Key Result Area	Illustrative Activity	Implementation Strategy	Performance Evidence
Digital Governance and ICT Readiness	Digital Governance Readiness Cycle	Conduct school-level ICT capacity review, prioritize feasible infrastructure and workflow improvements, and provide role-based digital-skills sessions for leaders and staff.	ICT readiness profile; training records; digital-process improvements; utilization logs
Stakeholder Engagement and Shared Governance	Community Partnership and Co-Design Forum	Use structured consultations with parents, community partners, personnel, and learners to review priorities, partnership opportunities, and shared commitments.	Attendance and consultation records; partnership action matrix; stakeholder feedback; documented commitments
Values-Driven Organizational Ethos	Vision, Values, and Culture Renewal Sessions	Integrate periodic reflection on vision, mission, core values, public service, inclusion, transparency, and learner-centered practice into meetings and professional learning activities.	Reflection outputs; revised commitments; recognition records; culture-feedback summaries
Evidence-Informed Improvement	OPCRF and Governance Data Review	Use OPCRf and governance monitoring results to identify school-specific strengths, priority gaps, and corrective actions rather than relying on overall high ratings alone.	School improvement dashboard; action plans; progress reviews; corrective-action log
Capacity Development and Sustainability	Leadership, Coaching, and Peer-Learning Network	Provide mentoring, coaching, benchmarking, and peer sharing on strategic leadership, digital integration, inclusive practice, and stakeholder collaboration.	Coaching records; peer-learning outputs; implementation examples; participant feedback
Monitoring and Sustainability	Quarterly Governance-Ethos Pulse Review	Track program implementation, emerging barriers, digital-readiness indicators, stakeholder participation, culture indicators, and selected performance outcomes for iterative improvement.	Quarterly dashboard; implementation minutes; feedback summaries; improvement actions

Evaluation of the Proposed Program

Table 11. Suitability, Acceptability, and Feasibility of the Proposed Program

Evaluation dimension	Supervisors	School Heads	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	4.2	4.23	4.22	4.18	4.21	Highly Feasible

The proposed program received strong evaluations across all three implementation criteria: Highly Suitable (WM = 4.25), Highly Acceptable (WM = 4.31), and Highly Feasible (WM = 4.21). The results indicate that respondents viewed the program as relevant to local needs, practical for adoption, and workable within school settings. The acceptability rating was the highest of the three summary dimensions, while feasibility was comparatively lower but remained within the Highly Feasible range.

These ratings support the program's perceived readiness for piloting, but they should not be interpreted as evidence of actual effectiveness. Cuofano (2017) describes suitability, feasibility, and acceptability as complementary strategic criteria, while Nellis and Fenning (2023) and Sanetti and Collier-Meek (2019) emphasize implementation support, organizational capacity, monitoring, and stakeholder usability as conditions for sustainable school-based interventions.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The 21st-century strategic governance is strongly manifested and consistently practiced in the operations of public elementary schools in Bacoar City.
2. The organizational ethos of public elementary schools in Bacoar City is firmly grounded and consistently lived out in practice, where school personnel demonstrate a shared understanding of the school's core values and emphasize these in their daily actions and interactions.
3. The assessment across the different dimensions of 21st-century strategic governance and organizational ethos reflects a common understanding and experience of how these practices are carried out in schools.
4. The school outcomes of public elementary schools in Bacoar City consistently reach an exceptional level of performance and effectively meet their targets and sustain high standards across key areas of operation.
5. The 21st-century strategic governance and organizational ethos are considerably associated with better school outcomes, confirming that strong leadership practices, effective governance systems, and a deeply rooted values-driven culture collectively influence school performance.
6. Public elementary schools in Bacoar City generally experience very minimal issues related to 21st-century strategic governance and organizational ethos, indicating that both areas are well implemented and effectively sustained within the school system.
7. The Proposed Context-Driven Sustainable Development Program builds on the strengths identified in the study and focuses on sustaining and enriching current governance practices and the school's shared culture.
8. The Proposed Context-Driven Sustainable Development Program is highly appropriate for implementation by the target users in further sustaining and improving the 21st-century strategic governance and organizational ethos in public elementary schools.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The School Head, in coordination with teachers and non-teaching personnel, may implement the Proposed Context-Driven Sustainable Development Program in Molino Elementary School and gradually expand its application to other public elementary schools within the City Schools Division of Bacoar to further enhance existing best practices.
2. The School Head, teachers, and non-teaching personnel, in coordination with the School Division Office Supervisors, may sustain and further enrich the positive practices in organizational ethos by embedding them into continuous professional development programs, reflective sessions, and recognition systems. Strengthening a culture of shared values may be achieved by regularly revisiting the school's vision, mission, and core values in meetings, integrating them into daily routines, and encouraging open dialogue among stakeholders.
3. The School head, teachers, and non-teaching personnel, in consultation with Supervisors, may continue fostering a strong organizational ethos by benchmarking and sharing of best practices among schools within the division to help ensure that effective strategies are replicated and refined. Continuous monitoring and evaluation systems may also be revisited to ensure they remain responsive, evidence-based, and aligned with evolving educational needs. By doing so, schools can transform consistent implementation into dynamic, high-impact governance and a deeply rooted organizational culture.
4. Supervisors, School Head, teachers, and other school stakeholders may sustain this high level of performance by institutionalizing continuous improvement mechanisms rather than relying on existing practices alone. Schools may strengthen data-driven planning by regularly analyzing OPCR results to identify specific areas for refinement, even within high-performing indicators. To further elevate outcomes, targeted capacity-building programs, coaching, and mentoring should be provided, especially in areas such as instructional innovation, assessment practices, and the integration of technology in teaching and school management.

5. The School Head may continue integrating effective leadership practices and values-driven culture by promoting shared responsibility, participatory governance, and continuous feedback mechanisms among stakeholders to strengthen school performance further. A stronger emphasis may be placed on deepening digital transformation, enhancing inclusive and learner-centered policies, and sustaining transparent governance through continuous capacity-building and reflective practice.
6. The School Head and stakeholders may focus on sustaining excellence through proactive and forward-looking strategies. Schools may establish regular review and feedback mechanisms, such as reflective sessions, internal audits, and stakeholder consultations, to ensure that effective practices remain relevant and responsive to changing educational demands. Strengthening a culture of openness, adaptability, and shared accountability will ensure that small concerns are addressed early and do not develop into larger challenges.
7. The School Head, in coordination with the Division Research Committee, may conduct regular monitoring, feedback collection, and periodic evaluation to track progress and allow timely adjustments. Recognizing milestones and sharing successful practices across schools can further strengthen commitment and motivation among implementers.
8. The education program supervisor, school head, teachers, and non-teaching personnel may foster a sense of ownership and accountability by encouraging active participation, collaboration, and accountability throughout the implementation of the Proposed Context-Driven Sustainable Development Program. This will ensure that the program not only remains relevant but also continues to enhance strategic governance and organizational ethos over time.
9. Future researchers may be encouraged to extend this line of inquiry to public secondary schools in Bacoar City. Doing so would help validate whether the present findings hold across different school levels and settings. It may also open the door to examining additional strategies and emerging practices that can further strengthen 21st-century strategic governance and organizational ethos.

REFERENCES

1. Baldera, P. R. (2024). Digital leadership pioneers: Navigating outstanding school principals' successes in the evolving educational landscape. *Philippine Journal of Learning, Teaching and Education*, 64(1), 1–15.
2. Barney, J. B. (2021). *Gaining and sustaining competitive advantage* (6th ed.). Pearson.
3. Cuofano, G. (2017). *SFA matrix in a nutshell*. FourWeekMBA. <https://fourweekmba.com/sfa-matrix>
4. Creswell, J. W. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Sage.
5. Department of Education. (2015). *DepEd Order No. 02, s. 2015: Guidelines on the establishment and implementation of the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) in the Department of Education*. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2015/02/06/do-2-s-2015-guidelines-on-the-establishment-and-implementation-of-the-results-based-performance-management-system-rpms-in-the-department-of-education/>
6. Department of Education. (2020). *DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020: National adoption and implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH)*. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/DO_s2020_024-.pdf
7. Garcia, J. M. (2024). The effect of ethical leadership at work on school head transparency and trust in governance in public elementary schools. *Philippine Journal of Teaching, Learning, and Language*, 9(3), 427–435. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10049652>
8. Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2020). *Multivariate data analysis* (8th ed.). Cengage Learning.
9. Lazaga, R. J. (2024). Navigating engagement, representation, and expression in inclusive learning environments. *International Journal of Interdisciplinary Viewpoints*.
10. Lubuguin, M. (2022). *Transparent, ethical, and accountable (TEA) governance to successful school management in selected public elementary schools in Region IV-CALABARZON* [Unpublished thesis]. Batangas State University.
11. Nazareno, J. V., Lumanas, A. C., Sarillana, M. S., & Cayogyog, A. O. (2024). Exploring the impact of organizational culture among school heads in public elementary schools. *International Journal of*

Research and Innovation in Social Science, 8(6), 183–192.

<https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.806015>

12. Nellis, L. M., & Fenning, P. A. (2023). *Systems consultation and change in schools: Integrating implementation science into practice*. Springer.
13. Orbeta, A. C., Jr., A., M. R. M., & Paqueo, V. B. (Eds.). (2025). *Making Philippine education reforms and interventions more transformative*. Philippine Institute for Development Studies.
<https://doi.org/10.62986/bk2025.01>
14. Republic of the Philippines. (2001). *Republic Act No. 9155: Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001*. Official Gazette. <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/2001/08/11/republic-act-no-9155/>
15. Sanetti, L. M. H., & Collier-Meek, M. A. (2019). *Supporting successful interventions in schools: Tools to plan, evaluate, and sustain effective implementation*. Guilford Press.
16. Schein, E. H., & Schein, P. A. (2018). *Organizational culture and leadership* (6th ed.). Wiley.
17. Teece, D. J. (2020). *Dynamic capabilities and strategic management: Organizing for innovation and growth*. Oxford University Press.
18. UNESCO International Institute for Higher Education in Latin America and the Caribbean. (2024). *New insights into different models of higher education governance*. <https://unesco.org/en/articles/new-insights-different-models-higher-education-governance>
19. Zara, N. M. (2024). Unveiling excellence: An appreciative inquiry with performing secondary schools in Region IV-A CALABARZON. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 8(10), 2659–2679.