



Administrative Practices of School Heads in Relation to the Engagement of Teachers and Parents

Joemel P. Zamora¹, Luciano T. Magallanes²

¹DepEd - Negros Occidental, Philippines

²La Carlota City College, Philippines

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100800306>

Received: 21 August 2026; Accepted: 26 August 2026; Published: 03 September 2026

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to determine the administrative practices of school heads and their relationship to the engagement of teachers and parents in a School Division in Negros Occidental during School Year 2026. Specifically, it assessed the extent of administrative practices of school heads toward teachers in terms of monitoring and evaluation, resource management and allocation, personnel management and welfare, and accountability and records management. It also examined administrative practices toward parents in terms of parent involvement strategies, conflict resolution and support, structured communication and engagement, and transparency and accountability. Furthermore, the study determined the level of engagement of teachers and parents and examined the relationship between administrative practices and stakeholder engagement. The study employed a descriptive-quantitative research design using a researcher-made questionnaire to determine the extent of administrative practices and level of engagement. Findings revealed that administrative practices toward teachers and parents were implemented to a very high extent, while stakeholder engagement was also very high. However, no significant relationships were found between administrative practices and teacher and parent engagement. The study recommends strengthening stakeholder engagement initiatives and exploring other factors affecting participation.

Keywords: Administrative Practices; School Heads; Teacher Engagement; Parent Engagement; Stakeholder Engagement.

INTRODUCTION

The Department of Education (DepEd) continues to strengthen school leadership as an essential component of quality education. Through the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH), school heads are guided in developing competencies related to instructional leadership, human resource management, school operations, and stakeholder engagement (Department of Education, 2025). These emphasizes that effective school leadership involves not only managing school resources and personnel but also creating an environment that encourages teachers and parents to participate in school activities and decision-making.

School heads play an important role in establishing a positive school environment through their administrative practices. These include monitoring and evaluation, resource management and allocation, personnel management and welfare, accountability and records management, parent involvement strategies, conflict resolution and support, communication, and transparency. Effective administrative practices can provide teachers with appropriate support and resources while creating opportunities for parents to participate meaningfully in their children's education.

Despite the established guidelines under the PPSSH, a research gap remains in determining how specific administrative practices of school heads are related to the engagement of teachers and parents within a local school context. Existing studies and discussions on school leadership often focus on leadership styles, instructional leadership, or general school performance, with less emphasis on examining specific administrative practices and stakeholder engagement together. Moreover, teachers and parents have different



roles and experiences in the school community, yet they are not always examined within the same framework. There is also limited school-level evidence reflecting the experiences of stakeholders.

Therefore, this study was conducted to determine the administrative practices of school heads toward teachers and parents and examine their relationship with stakeholder engagement. Specifically, it assessed administrative practices toward teachers in terms of monitoring and evaluation, resource management and allocation, personnel management and welfare, and accountability and records management, as well as practices toward parents in terms of parent involvement strategies, conflict resolution and support, structured communication and engagement, and transparency and accountability. The study also determined the level of teacher and parent engagement and examined the relationship between administrative practices and stakeholder engagement.

The findings may provide school heads and education stakeholders with local evidence that can support the improvement of administrative practices, strengthen communication and collaboration, and promote meaningful teacher and parent engagement in school programs and activities.

METHODOLOGY

This study employed a descriptive-quantitative research design to determine the extent of administrative practices of school heads and the level of teacher and parent engagement in a School Division in Negros Occidental during School Year 2026. The respondents were 153 stakeholders, consisting of 73 teachers and 80 parents from four public elementary schools. Total population sampling was used for teachers, while quota sampling was employed for parents.

Data were collected using an 80-item researcher-made questionnaire based on relevant DepEd policies, particularly the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH). The instrument measured administrative practices toward teachers and parents and their corresponding engagement. Content validity was established through five expert validators using Lawshe's method, while reliability was assessed through pilot testing with 30 respondents using Cronbach's alpha.

After securing the necessary permissions, questionnaires were personally administered to the respondents, with confidentiality and voluntary participation ensured. The collected data were encoded and analyzed using SPSS. Mean was used to determine the extent of administrative practices and level of stakeholder engagement, while Goodman and Kruskal's Gamma was employed to determine the significant relationship between administrative practices and teacher and parent engagement.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Level of Administrative Practices of School Heads on Teachers

Table 2. Level of Administrative Practices of School Heads on Teachers

Statements	Mean	Std. Dev.	Interpretation
Monitoring and Evaluation	4.61	.43	Very High
1. The school head regularly observes classroom instruction	4.47	.65	Very High
2. The school head provides constructive feedback after classroom observations.	4.64	.54	Very High
3. The school head regularly evaluates the teachers' performances and is evaluated fairly and objectively.	4.59	.57	Very High
4. The school head's regular monitoring results are used to improve	4.70	.46	Very High



instructional practices.			
5. The school head follows up on recommendations from classroom observations to ensure continuous improvement in teaching practices.	4.67	.50	Very High
Resource Management and Allocation	4.62	.40	Very High
6. The school head makes sure that teaching materials are adequately provided to teachers.	4.49	.65	Very High
7. The school head makes sure that school funds are allocated transparently for instructional needs.	4.63	.63	Very High
8. The school head ensures equitable distribution of resources.	4.66	.51	Very High
9. The school addresses promptly the requests for instructional materials.	4.60	.52	Very High
10. The school head regularly assesses resource needs and plans accordingly to support effective teaching and learning.	4.73	.51	Very High
Personnel Management and Welfare	4.74	.34	Very High
11. The school head allows teachers to attend seminars and trainings to support teachers' professional development.	4.84	.37	Very High
12. The school head recognizes teachers' accomplishments.	4.79	.44	Very High
13. The school head assigns the workload fairly among teachers.	4.70	.46	Very High
14. The school head encourages teamwork and collaborating among teachers.	4.73	.45	Very High
15. The school head addresses teachers' concerns and welfare needs in a timely and supportive manner.	4.63	.54	Very High
Accountability and Records Management	4.67	.39	Very High
16. The school head clearly communicates the deadlines and reporting requirements.	4.66	.48	Very High
17. The school head ensures compliance with DepEd policies.	4.70	.46	Very High
18. The school head makes sure that school records are properly organized and secured.	4.67	.47	Very High
19. The school head submits required school reports accurately and on time.	4.66	.51	Very High
20. The school head regularly monitors the completeness and accuracy of teachers' records and reports.	4.66	.53	Very High
Administrative Practices of School Heads on Teachers as a Whole	4.66	.33	Very High

Legend: (4.21-5.0)-Very High; (3.41 – 4.20)-High; (2.61-3.40) Moderate (1.81 – 2.60)-Low; (1.00 – 1.80)-Very Low



Table 2 revealed that teachers as a whole, had assessed the level of administrative practices performed by the school heads as “very high” ($M=4.66$, $SD=.33$), which indicates that school heads consistently demonstrate effective leadership and management practices in the areas of monitoring and evaluation, resource management and allocation, personnel management and welfare, and accountability and records management.

In terms of monitoring and evaluation the overall mean was ($M=4.61$, $SD=.43$) interpreted as “very high”, indicates that school heads consistently perform supervisory functions that support instructional improvement and teacher development. The statement that got the highest mean on the category of monitoring and evaluation was “The school head’s regular monitoring results are used to improve instructional practices” were ($M=4.70$, $SD=.46$) interpreted as “very high”, indicates that monitoring activities conducted by school heads are not merely compliance oriented but are utilized as a basis for instructional enhancement and professional growth among teachers. On the other hand, the statement that got the lowest mean was “The school head regularly observes classroom instruction” which is also interpreted as “very high”, suggests that monitoring activities conducted by school heads are not merely compliance-oriented but are utilized as a basis for instructional enhancement and professional growth among teachers.

The findings are supported by the study of Trust and Whalen (2020) which found that school leaders who provide regular feedback, instructional supervision, and mentoring contribute significantly to teachers' professional engagement and instructional improvement. Similarly, the OECD (2021) reported that effective school leadership practices, particularly instructional supervision and participatory leadership, positively influence teacher motivation, collaboration, and commitment to school goals. Furthermore, Darling-Hammond et al. (2021) emphasized that teachers become more engaged and effective when school leaders provide support mechanisms that encourage continuous improvement and professional learning. These findings are likewise consistent with the provisions of the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (DepEd Order No. 024, s. 2020), which require school heads to exercise instructional leadership by monitoring teaching performance and providing developmental support to teachers.

In terms of resource management and allocation with the overall mean ($M=4.62$, $SD=.40$) interpreted as “very high”, conclude that the school heads effectively manage, allocate, and utilize school resources to support instructional delivery and promote a beneficial teaching and learning environment. The statement that obtained the highest mean was “The school head regularly assesses resource needs and plans accordingly to support effective teaching and learning” were ($M=4.73$, $SD=.51$) interpreted as “very high”, indicates that school heads consistently engage in strategic planning and needs assessment to ensure that available resources are aligned with instructional requirements and school improvement goals. While the statement that obtained a lowest mean was “The school head makes sure that teaching materials are adequately provided to teachers” were ($M=4.49$, $SD=.65$) was likewise interpreted as “very high”. Although suggests that teachers generally perceive instructional materials to be sufficiently available, but there may be instances where limitations in funding, procurement processes, or delays in the delivery of materials affect the adequacy and timeliness of resource provision.

The findings are supported by the provisions of the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH) under DepEd Order No. 024, s. 2020, which emphasizes the responsibility of school heads to ensure effective resource management and strategic utilization of school resources to improve teaching and learning outcomes. The policy underscores that school leaders should exercise sound governance practices by planning, allocating, and monitoring resources based on school priorities and stakeholder needs.

In terms of personnel management and welfare with the overall mean ($M=4.74$, $SD=.34$) were interpreted as “very high”, the findings show that school heads effectively implement personnel management practices that promote teachers' professional growth, recognize their contributions, ensure equitable workload distribution, and support their overall welfare and well-being. The statement that got the highest mean was “The school head allows teachers to attend seminars and trainings to support teachers’ professional development” were ($M=4.84$, $SD=.37$) interpreted as “very high”, indicates that school heads strongly support continuous professional development by providing teachers with opportunities to participate in seminars, workshops, and training programs that enhance their competencies and instructional practices. While the statement that obtained the lowest mean was “The school head addresses teachers’ concerns and welfare needs in a timely



and supportive manner” were ($M=4.63$, $SD=.54$) which was also interpreted as “very high”, suggests that while school heads generally provide support for teachers' welfare and concerns, there may be instances where administrative demands, competing responsibilities, or limited resources affect the immediacy of responses to teachers' needs. Nevertheless, the very high rating indicates that teachers still perceive school heads as responsive and supportive of their welfare concerns.

The findings are supported by DepEd Order No. 024, s. 2020, which emphasizes that school heads should promote teacher development, provide mentoring and coaching opportunities, and create an enabling environment that supports teachers' professional and personal well-being. The Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH) recognizes teacher empowerment and professional growth as essential components of effective school leadership.

In terms of accountability and records management with the overall mean ($M=4.67$, $SD=.39$) were interpreted as “very high”, the findings show that school heads effectively implement systems and procedures that promote accountability, ensure compliance with policies and regulations, and maintain accurate and organized school records and reports. The statement that got the highest mean was “The school head ensures compliance with DepEd policies” were ($M=4.70$, $SD=.46$) interpreted as “very high”, indicates that school heads consistently uphold and enforce Department of Education policies, guidelines, and standards in the management and operation of the school. While the statement that obtained the lowest mean was “The school head clearly communicates the deadlines and reporting requirements” were ($M=4.66$, $SD=.48$) which was also interpreted as “very high”, suggests that although school heads effectively communicate reporting expectations and timelines, there may be occasions when multiple reporting requirements, urgent directives, and changing schedules create challenges in disseminating information promptly and consistently. Nevertheless, the very high rating indicates that communication regarding deadlines and reporting requirements remains effective and satisfactory among teachers.

The findings are supported by DepEd Order No. 024, s. 2020, which emphasizes accountability, transparency, and compliance with educational policies as key competencies expected of school heads under the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH). The policy highlights the responsibility of school leaders to establish systems that ensure proper record keeping, accurate reporting, and adherence to legal and administrative requirements.

Overall, the findings indicate that the administrative practices of school heads on teachers were implemented to a very high extent, demonstrating strong and effective school leadership across the areas of monitoring and evaluation, resource management and allocation, personnel management and welfare, and accountability and records management.

This suggests that school heads consistently perform their managerial and instructional leadership roles in ways that support teachers' professional growth, instructional effectiveness, and active participation in school programs and activities. The results further imply that teachers perceive their school heads as competent, supportive, and responsive leaders who foster a positive organizational climate and promote a culture of collaboration, accountability, and continuous improvement.

The findings are consistent with the provisions of DepEd Order No. 024, s. 2020, which institutionalized the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH) and emphasized that effective school leadership encompasses instructional supervision, strategic resource management, personnel development, and stakeholder engagement.

Likewise, the findings support the studies of Darling-Hammond et al. (2021) and the OECD (2021), which highlighted that effective administrative and instructional leadership contributes significantly to teacher engagement, organizational effectiveness, and improved educational outcomes. Similarly, Trust and Whalen (2020) emphasized that school leaders who provide professional support, recognition, and opportunities for collaboration create more engaged and motivated teaching personnel.

**Level of Administrative Practices of School Heads on Parents**

Table 3. Level of Administrative Practices of School Heads on Parents

Statements	Mean	Std. Dev.	Interpretation
Parent Involvement Strategies	4.64	.42	Very High
1. The school head makes sure that parents are regularly informed about school activities.	4.63	.49	Very High
2. The school head encourages parents to participate in school programs.	4.63	.54	Very High
3. The school heads ensures that PTA meetings are conducted regularly.	4.60	.55	Very High
4. The school head always involves parents in school decision-making processes.	4.66	.56	Very High
5. The school head responds promptly to parents' concerns and inquiries.	4.68	.47	Very High
Conflict Resolution and Support	4.60	.54	Very High
6. The school head ensures that issues between teachers and parents are resolved fairly.	4.56	.60	Very High
7. The school head encourages open communication between school and home.	4.53	.67	Very High
8. The school head handles complaints professionally.	4.67	.53	Very High
9. The school head provides a safe and respectful environment where parents feel comfortable expressing their concerns.	4.62	.64	Very High
10. The school head follows up on resolved concerns to ensure that agreed solutions are properly implemented.	4.62	.64	Very High
Structured Communication and Engagement	4.73	.43	Very High
11. The school head establishes clear communication channels for parents.	4.74	.47	Very High
12. The school head makes sure that school announcements reach parents on time.	4.79	.44	Very High
13. The school head ensures that parents are updated about learners' academic performance.	4.71	.51	Very High
14. The school head provides parents with opportunities to discuss their children's progress and needs.	4.68	.62	Very High
15. The school head encourages two-way communication between parents and the school.	4.70	.52	Very High
Transparency and Accountability	4.72	.39	Very High
16. The school head promotes transparent financial matters involving	4.68	.47	Very High



PTA funds.			
17. The school head explains clearly the school policies to parents.	4.67	.53	Very High
18. The school head ensures that reports on school programs are shared with stakeholders.	4.75	.43	Very High
19. The school head promotes integrity and accountability.	4.71	.46	Very High
20. The school head provides parents with accurate and timely information regarding school plans, activities, and accomplishments.	4.75	.43	Very High
Administrative Practices of School Heads on Parents as a Whole	4.67	.40	Very High

Legend: (4.21-5.0)-Very High; (3.41 – 4.20)-High; (2.61-3.40) Moderate (1.81 – 2.60)-Low; (1.00 – 1.80)-Very Low

The highest mean was obtained in the category structured communication and Engagement, which means that parents expressed their strong agreement with the statement that school administrations provide effective communication system, deliver announcements in time, inform parents about the academic performance of their children, and provide an opportunity to communicate with school through different means.

The second dimension that scored the highest in ratings is transparency and accountability ($M = 4.72$, $SD = 0.39$). It has again shown that school administrators are perceived as open with regard to the money spent, clearly outlining their school's policies, sharing reports with different parties involved, and assuring parents that they are provided with correct information about the programs of the school and the achievements. All of these practices gain parents' confidence in school administration and help it with getting support from different parties in the implementation of various initiatives. Additionally, parent involvement strategies ($M = 4.64$, $SD = 0.42$) and conflict resolution and support ($M = 4.60$, $SD = 0.54$) received very high ratings as well. They both resulted in a conclusion that school administrators help parents take part in various activities of the school, respond quickly to their requests and issues, treat conflicts in a fair way, and create a respectful atmosphere where parents will not hesitate to speak up. Even though the means of these two indicators are a bit lower than the means of the findings above, it has been established that the mentioned dimensions indicate high rates of administration quality as well.

The study corroborates the model proposed by Epstein (2018), that effective school leadership entails creating strong partnerships among school, family, and community through significant involvement of parents, free communication, inclusion in making decisions, and sharing of responsibility for pupils' successes. Additionally, the outcomes are similar to those described by Dela Peña and Escueta (2022), who have noticed that involvement of parents as well as the establishment of effective cooperation with the community motivate the improvement of governance of public schools in the Philippines as well as their outcomes. On top of that, the findings of the study are also compliant with the Department of Education Order No. 024, s. 2020 regarding PPSSH as the authors state that stakeholder engagement, transparent leadership, accountability, and successful communication are significant qualities of leaders of learning institutions.

Level of Engagement of Teachers and Parents on the Administrative Practices

Table 4. Level of Engagement of Teachers and Parents on the Administrative Practices.

Statements	Mean	Std. Dev.	Interpretation
Teachers' Engagement	4.87	.35	Very High
1. The school head regularly monitors teachers' performance and	4.99	.12	Very High



classroom practices.			
2. The school head provides timely feedback after observations.	4.97	.16	Very High
3. The school head's evaluation results are used to improve teaching strategies.	4.93	.30	Very High
4. The school head guides teachers through clear performance standards.	4.93	.35	Very High
5. The school head recognizes and acknowledges teachers' improvements and achievements based on monitoring and evaluation results.	4.88	.47	Very High
6. The school head ensures equitable distribution of teaching materials.	4.92	.36	Very High
7. The school head makes sure that teachers receive an adequate instructional resource.	4.79	.67	Very High
8. The school head provides support for instructional innovation.	4.78	.61	Very High
9. The school head efficiently manages the available school resources for teaching needs.	4.84	.55	Very High
10. The school head consults teachers in identifying and prioritizing instructional resource needs.	4.88	.44	Very High
11. The school head promotes professional development opportunities.	4.79	.62	Very High
12. The school head recognizes the teachers' accomplishments.	4.89	.43	Very High
13. The school head addresses teachers' concerns promptly.	4.84	.53	Very High
14. The school head supports teachers in maintaining work-life balance.	4.86	.51	Very High
15. The school head fosters a positive and collaborative working environment among teachers.	4.86	.45	Very High
16. The school head ensures accurate documentation of teachers' reports.	4.89	.49	Very High
17. The school head guides teachers on the proper submission of required records.	4.84	.55	Very High
18. The school head promotes transparency in performance documentation.	4.88	.44	Very High
19. The school head regularly monitors the completeness and timeliness of teachers' records and reports.	4.85	.62	Very High
20. The school head ensures that teachers' records are properly organized, maintained, and kept confidential when necessary.	4.84	.58	Very High



Parents Engagement	4.91	.28	Very High
1. I attend school meetings and activities.	4.90	.41	Very High
2. I participate in programs that support my child's education.	4.92	.36	Very High
3. I collaborate with teachers regarding my child's academic progress.	4.88	.47	Very High
4. I support school initiatives at home.	4.84	.53	Very High
5. I actively communicate with teachers and school officials regarding my child's needs and concerns.	4.89	.49	Very High
6. I raise school-related concerns respectfully.	4.95	.28	Very High
7. I follow proper procedures when addressing issues.	4.96	.35	Very High
8. I cooperate with school authorities in resolving conflicts.	5.00	.00	Very High
9. I promote positive relationships between school and home.	4.90	.45	Very High
10. I listen to and consider the perspectives of teachers and school officials when resolving concerns or conflicts.	4.82	.56	Very High
11. I regularly read school communications and announcements.	4.88	.50	Very High
12. I respond promptly to school messages.	4.86	.48	Very High
13. I use available communication platforms provided by the school.	4.93	.30	Very High
14. I regularly communicate with teachers regarding my child's academic progress and school-related concerns.	4.96	.26	Very High
15. I attend parent-teacher conferences and other school meetings when invited.	4.99	.12	Very High
16. I participate in PTA meetings and discussions.	4.90	.41	Very High
17. I support transparency in school programs and financial matters.	4.90	.48	Very High
18. I provide feedback on school improvement initiatives.	4.90	.45	Very High
19. I support accountability in school-related activities.	4.89	.46	Very High
20. I stay informed about school policies, programs, and reports shared with stakeholders.	4.92	.43	Very High
Engagement as a Whole	4.91	.30	Very High

Legend: (4.21-5.0)-Very High; (3.41 – 4.20)-High; (2.61-3.40) Moderate (1.81 – 2.60)-Low; (1.00 – 1.80)-Very Low

The item that received the highest average rating was "I cooperate with school authorities in resolving conflicts," with the scores of (M=5.00, SD = .00), which means "very high," indicating agreement among parents' minds about their cooperation with the school staff in solving problems. This shows a healthy atmosphere of cooperation and respect between parents and authorities of the school. On the contrary, the item



that had the lowest mean score was "I listen to and consider the views of the teachers and school officials when settling the problems," with the index of ($M=4.82$, $SD = .56$), but still considered as very high. This indicates that parents, though generally pay attention to the opinion of educators and school officials, may have different situations or views regarding the matters. Still, it proves that parents are inclined to work together in resolving the issues.

To sum up, it has been determined that the appropriate administrative leadership of school leaders plays a vital role in improving participation from parents and teachers alike. The results corroborate the provisions of DepEd Order No. 024, s. of 2020, which highlights that stakeholder participation, democratic governance, and collaborative leadership practices are areas of performance for addressing the principles of the PPSSH.

This discovery is backed up by the findings of Darling-Hammond et al. (2021), which state that participative leadership makes a positive impact on teachers' engagement in taking part in the improvement processes. In the same manner, Trust and Whalen (2020) proved that the teachers' engagement levels depend on instructional supervision, their recognition, and professional development.

For the parents, these findings are similar to Epstein (2018) findings, which emphasized that involvement of parents in educational processes increases effectiveness of schools, and the results of Flores and Navarro (2023), which demonstrated that the educational leaders promote open communication between parents and educational institutions.

Relationship Between the Administrative Practices of School Head on Teachers and Engagement

Table 5. Relationship Between the Administrative Practices of School Head on Teachers and Engagement

Variable	Test Statistics (G)	P-value	Decision for Ho	Interpretation
Administrative Practices of School Heads on Teachers Vs Engagement	.056	.563	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant

The table 5 indicates the relationship of the administrative practices of the school heads toward teachers and teacher engagement. The results show it was revealed a Goodman and Kruskal's Gamma of 0.056 and the p-value of 0.563 which is larger than the p-value of 0.05. Therefore the null hypothesis was accepted as there is no significant relationship between the administrative practices of the school heads and teacher engagement.

The results prove that the changes in the practice of school heads did not lead to the changes in teacher engagement of the respondent. Even though the school heads may have effective practices but these practices cannot predict the teacher engagement in the school processes. This may mean that other aspects such as workload, availability of resources, professional motivation, personal engagement, and working environment may influence the teacher engagement.

Such results differ from previous findings, which indicate that good leadership will help ensure teachers are effectively engaged and motivated. Darling-Hammond et al. (2021) wrote that teachers are likely to take an active part in school programs and interact with colleagues when they are backed by proper school leadership.

Likewise, according to the OECD (2021), participatory management, instructional supervision, and professional development are beneficial for teacher engagement. Trust and Whalen (2020) added that school principals will influence teacher commitment and participation thanks to their appreciation and providing feedback as well as making collaboration opportunities possible.

Nevertheless, Kim and Asbury (2020) pointed out that engagement could also depend on such factors as work pressure and working conditions, which could help understand why there was no significant connection found in this study.



Relationship Between the Administrative Practices of School Head on Parents and Engagement

Table. 6 Relationship Between the Administrative Practices of School Head on Parents and Engagement

Variable	Test Statistics(G)	P-value	Decision for Ho	Interpretation
Administrative Practices of School Heads on Parents Vs Engagement	.036	.545	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant

Table 6 illustrates the association between the administrative practices of heads of schools towards parents and parent involvement. The result related to the Gamma coefficient is 0.036 with the p-value being 0.545, which is higher than the accepted significance level of 0.05. Thus, the null hypothesis has been retained pointing out that there is no substantial influence of the administrative practices of school leaders on parent involvement.

Thus, the outcomes suggest that there is no substantial association between the administrative practices of heads of school and the level of parent involvement and participation in various school schemes and activities. Hence, parent engagement may also be influenced by other factors that are out of the realms of school leadership practices such as parents' working conditions, economic circumstances, possibility to attend the school affairs, and knowledge of the school programs.

The obtained outcomes differ from prior research that insisted on the significance of school leadership in reinforcing parent engagement. Epstein (2018) indicated that parent involvement plays a key role in students' achievement and school performance. Bush (2020) confirmed that open and cooperative leadership style improves parent involvement in school affairs. Additionally, Flores and Navarro (2023) stated that school leaders are crucial for building effective home-school partnerships through appropriate communication and collaborative procedures; however, Dela Peña and Escueta (2022) revealed that financial issues, work requirements, and a lack of knowledge about school programs limit the involvement of parents in school operations regardless of the initiatives undertaken by the school administration, thus providing an explanation for the current findings.

Despite the lack of substantial correlations, the research can't undermine the relevance of the administrative regulations described in DepEd Order No. 024, s. 2020, or the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH). The regulations still put emphasis on the need for stakeholder involvement, shared governance, and collaborative leadership, which are the key principles of proper school management. The outcomes just indicate that teacher and parental participation is likely to depend on the combination of leadership practices and other contextual factors, which are beyond the direct influence

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions were formulated:

The administrative practices of school heads toward teachers in terms of monitoring and evaluation, resource management and allocation, personnel management and welfare, and accountability and records management were implemented to a very high extent.

The administrative practices of school heads toward parents in terms of parent involvement strategies, conflict resolution and support, structured communication and engagement, and transparency and accountability were implemented to a very high extent.

The level of engagement of teachers and parents in relation to the administrative practices of school heads was very high.

There was no significant relationship between the administrative practices of school heads toward teachers and teachers' engagement.



There was no significant relationship between the administrative practices of school heads toward parents and parents' engagement.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The researcher sincerely expresses heartfelt gratitude to all individuals who contributed to the successful completion of this study. Appreciation is extended to the research adviser, statistician, thesis panel members, and research instrument validators for their valuable guidance, expertise, constructive recommendations, and support throughout the research process.

The researcher likewise acknowledges the school administrators for granting permission and facilitating the conduct of the study, as well as the teacher-respondents for their cooperation, time, and meaningful participation. Special gratitude is extended to the researcher's family, friends, colleagues, and classmates for their unwavering encouragement, prayers, understanding, and support throughout this academic journey.

Above all, the researcher offers profound thanksgiving to Almighty God for His wisdom, strength, guidance, grace, and sustaining presence, which made the completion of this study possible.

REFERENCES

1. Bush, T. (2020). School leadership and management in education. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 48(4), 543–559. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143220902083>
2. Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2021). Effective teacher professional development. *Educational Policy Analysis Archives*, 29(35), 1–33. <https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.29.5615>
3. Dela Peña, J. A., & Escueta, E. F. (2022). Parental involvement and school–community partnership in Philippine public schools. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, Arts and Sciences*, 9(2), 12–21.
4. Department of Education. (2020). DepEd Order No. 024, s. 2020: National adoption and implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH). <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2020/02/17/do-024-s-2020-national-adoption-and-implementation-of-the-philippine-professional-standards-for-school-heads/>
5. Department of Education. (2025). DepEd memorandum circular on school leadership and engagement. <https://www.deped.gov.ph>
6. Epstein, J. L. (2018). *School, family, and community partnerships* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
7. Flores, M. L., & Navarro, R. T. (2023). School leadership practices and parental engagement in Philippine elementary schools. *Philippine Journal of Education Studies*.
8. Kim, L. E., & Asbury, K. (2020). 'Like a rug had been pulled from under you': Teacher experiences during COVID-19. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 90(4), 1062–1083. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjep.12322>
9. OECD. (2021). *Teachers and school leaders as valued professionals*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264383937-en>
10. Trust, T., & Whalen, J. (2020). Should teachers be trained in emergency remote teaching? *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, 28(2), 189–199.