

Rights-Based Education and Instructional Innovation in Public Junior High Schools in the Silang District of Cavite Province: Basis for a Sustainable Equity-Driven Framework

Mark John R. Battad

Eulogio “Amang” Rodriguez Institute of Science & Technology (EARIST-CAVITE) Graduate School -
MA. Education Program

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2026.1308000041>

Received: 17 August 2026; Accepted: 22 August 2026; Published: 31 August 2026

ABSTRACT

Rights-based education (RBE) provides a framework for ensuring that educational practices promote learners' dignity, participation, inclusion, accountability, and holistic development. This study assessed RBE and instructional innovation in selected public junior high schools in the Silang District of Cavite Province and used the findings as the basis for a Sustainable Equity-Driven Framework. A descriptive quantitative research design was employed involving **252 respondents**, comprising 7 school heads, 33 department heads, and 212 teachers. Data were gathered using a researcher-developed questionnaire and analyzed through weighted mean, one-way analysis of variance, post hoc comparisons, and Pearson product-moment correlation. Findings revealed that RBE was **highly evident** across all dimensions, with holistic development obtaining the highest mean ($M = 4.57$), followed by accountability ($M = 4.41$), equity and inclusion ($M = 4.33$), child-centeredness ($M = 4.30$), and participation ($M = 4.30$). Significant differences among respondent groups were found in child-centeredness, equity and inclusion, participation, and accountability, but not in holistic development. Instructional innovation was likewise highly evident ($M = 4.46$). Relationships between RBE and instructional innovation varied across dimensions, indicating that rights-based practices interact selectively with specific forms of instructional innovation. Challenges related to RBE ($M = 2.93$) and instructional innovation ($M = 3.17$) were moderately encountered. The proposed Sustainable Equity-Driven Framework was highly acceptable ($M = 4.30$). The findings underscore the importance of integrating learner rights, inclusive pedagogy, instructional innovation, professional development, and shared accountability in advancing equitable and sustainable public secondary education.

Keywords: rights-based education, instructional innovation, educational equity, inclusive education, learner participation, sustainable educational framework

INTRODUCTION

Education is both a fundamental human right and a public responsibility. A rights-based approach moves beyond access to schooling by requiring educational systems to respect, protect, and fulfill learners' rights through curriculum, pedagogy, assessment, participation, protection, and governance. In the Philippine basic education context, this orientation is reinforced by Department of Education policies that position learners as rights-holders and education personnel as duty-bearers. DepEd Order No. 031, s. 2022 provides an important policy anchor by directing schools to integrate child rights into educational processes and institutional practice.

The challenge, however, lies in translating policy commitments into consistent classroom experience. Rights may be formally recognized while learners continue to encounter uneven opportunities to participate, differences in access to learning resources, limited responsiveness to diverse needs, or instructional practices that do not fully support dignity and agency. These implementation gaps are particularly important in public junior high schools, where teachers and school leaders must respond simultaneously to curriculum requirements, large and diverse learner populations, resource constraints, digital transformation, and changing expectations regarding inclusive and participatory education.

Instructional innovation provides one pathway for operationalizing rights-based education. Learner-centered and differentiated instruction can advance equity and inclusion; participatory pedagogies can strengthen learner voice; alternative and formative assessment can protect dignity while supporting learning; and appropriate technology can expand access, personalization, and engagement. Innovation, however, should not be understood merely as the adoption of new tools. Within a rights-based framework, innovation is meaningful when it improves participation, inclusion, protection, accountability, and holistic development.

The Silang District of Cavite Province provides a relevant setting for examining this intersection. The district includes schools serving varied learner populations and operating under different institutional capacities. The source study notes rapid urbanization, demographic change, and variation in school resources as contextual conditions that may shape implementation. It further identifies a local empirical gap regarding how RBE is enacted in daily instruction, which instructional innovations align with learner rights, and what forms of capacity building and monitoring are needed to sustain these practices.

This study therefore examined RBE and instructional innovation together rather than as isolated educational initiatives. It assessed the extent of RBE implementation, tested differences in perceptions among school heads, department heads, and teachers, assessed instructional innovation, examined relationships between RBE and innovation dimensions, identified implementation challenges, and evaluated the acceptability of a proposed Sustainable Equity-Driven Framework. The study contributes a school-level perspective on how policy, pedagogy, innovation, and equity can be aligned in public secondary education.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The study is anchored primarily in Rights-Based Education and Rogers' Diffusion of Innovations Theory, with the Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK) perspective providing additional relevance to technology-supported instruction. RBE supplies the normative foundation: educational practices are evaluated not only by academic effectiveness but also by whether they advance learners' rights to participation, inclusion, protection, quality, and development. Rogers' theory complements this normative foundation by explaining how new practices are introduced, adopted, diffused, and sustained within organizations. In combination, the frameworks suggest that rights-centered practices require both ethical legitimacy and organizational mechanisms that enable innovations to become routine school practice.

The literature reviewed in the source manuscript consistently links inclusive and rights-oriented education with learner-centered pedagogy, differentiated instruction, participation, professional learning, and supportive school leadership. Ainscow (2020) emphasizes inclusion and equity as systemic rather than purely classroom concerns, while UNESCO (2021) frames education around inclusion, participation, accountability, and holistic human development. Philippine literature similarly points to the importance of culturally responsive and learner-centered planning, teacher development, and institutional support in implementing rights-oriented education.

Instructional innovation literature further indicates that technology, curriculum reform, assessment innovation, collaboration, and professional development are interdependent. Technology by itself does not guarantee innovation; teacher readiness, curricular alignment, access to resources, and pedagogical purpose remain decisive. The source manuscript also highlights evidence that professional learning communities and collaborative action research can strengthen teacher capacity and help sustain instructional change. Thus, instructional innovation is best understood as a multidimensional school process rather than a single technological intervention.

The conceptual connection between RBE and instructional innovation is therefore plausible but not necessarily uniform. Equity-oriented practices may be closely connected with differentiated teaching and assessment, while technology or curriculum innovation may depend more strongly on resources, teacher competence, and institutional systems. This distinction is important because a school may report high levels of both RBE and innovation without every dimension being statistically associated. The present study directly tests these differentiated relationships.

Research Gap

Despite the growing literature on rights-based education (RBE), inclusive education, and instructional innovation, these areas have often been examined independently rather than as interconnected dimensions of educational practice. Existing studies have established the importance of child-centeredness, equity and inclusion, learner participation, accountability, and holistic development in protecting learners' rights, while a separate body of research has emphasized innovative teaching strategies, technology integration, curriculum and assessment innovation, professional development, and student engagement as mechanisms for improving educational quality. However, limited empirical evidence explains how specific dimensions of rights-based education relate to particular dimensions of instructional innovation within public junior high schools, especially in the Philippine basic education setting. The manuscript further identifies a contextual gap in the Silang District of Cavite Province, where there is insufficient localized evidence regarding how school heads, department heads, and teachers perceive the implementation of RBE and whether these perceptions differ according to their organizational roles. Moreover, existing literature provides limited evidence on the practical challenges schools encounter when simultaneously implementing rights-based principles and innovative instructional practices. This gap is important because strong policy recognition of learner rights does not necessarily guarantee their consistent translation into classroom pedagogy, assessment, technology use, learner participation, and everyday school experiences. Accordingly, the present study addresses these empirical, contextual, and practical gaps by examining RBE and instructional innovation simultaneously, determining differences among key school stakeholders, analyzing relationships between their respective dimensions, identifying implementation challenges, and using the resulting evidence to develop a Sustainable Equity-Driven Framework appropriate to the context of public junior high schools in the Silang District of Cavite Province.

Objectives of the Study

The study aimed to assess Rights-Based Education and Instructional Innovation in selected public junior high schools in the Silang District of Cavite Province as a basis for a Sustainable Equity-Driven Framework. Specifically, it assessed RBE in terms of child-centeredness, equity and inclusion, participation, accountability, and holistic development; determined whether assessments differed among school heads, department heads, and teachers; assessed instructional innovation in terms of innovative teaching strategies, technology integration, curriculum and content innovation, assessment innovation, professional development and collaboration, and student engagement and outcomes; examined relationships between RBE and instructional innovation; identified challenges encountered in implementing both constructs; developed a sustainable equity-driven framework; and determined the acceptability of the proposed framework.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

A descriptive quantitative research design was used to determine the prevailing status of Rights-Based Education and instructional innovation in the participating public junior high schools. The design was appropriate because the study sought to describe stakeholder assessments, compare three respondent groups, and examine associations among measured dimensions without manipulating school conditions. The design incorporated descriptive statistics, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), post hoc comparisons for significant group differences, and Pearson product-moment correlation for relationships between RBE and instructional innovation dimensions.

Research Setting and Respondents

The study was conducted during School Year 2025–2026 in eight secondary schools in the Silang District, Division of Cavite Province: Bulihan Integrated National High School, Emilia Ambalada Poblete National High School, Kaong National High School, Lumil Integrated National High School, Gen. Vito Belarmino Integrated National High School, Munting Ilog Integrated National High School, Malabag National High School, and Ulat Integrated School. The data collection period reported in the manuscript was November 2025 to May 2026.

From a total population of 489, the study involved 252 respondents (51.5%), comprising all 7 school heads, all 33 department heads, and 212 of 449 teachers. Purposive sampling was used because the participants were selected based on their direct knowledge of and involvement in the implementation of RBE and instructional innovation. The respondent composition provided perspectives from school-level leadership, instructional supervision, and classroom implementation.

Respondent group	Population (N)	Sample (n)	Coverage
School Heads	7	7	100%
Department Heads	33	33	100%
Teachers	449	212	47.2%
Total	489	252	51.5%

Sampling Technique

The study employed purposive sampling, a non-probability sampling technique, to select respondents who possessed direct knowledge, experience, and involvement in the implementation of Rights-Based Education (RBE) and instructional innovation in the participating public junior high schools in the Silang District of Cavite Province. From a total population of 489 potential respondents, the study included 252 participants, consisting of 7 school heads, 33 department heads, and 212 teachers. All 7 school heads and 33 department heads were included because of their direct administrative and supervisory responsibilities, while 212 teachers were selected from the total population of 449 teachers based on their involvement in classroom instruction and implementation of the practices examined in the study. The use of purposive sampling was appropriate because the research required respondents who could provide informed assessments of child-centeredness, equity and inclusion, participation, accountability, holistic development, and the various dimensions of instructional innovation. By obtaining perspectives from school-level administrators, instructional supervisors, and classroom teachers, the sampling approach enabled the study to capture experiences across different levels of educational implementation. However, because purposive sampling is a non-probability technique, the findings should be interpreted primarily within the context of the participating schools, and generalization to other school districts or educational settings should be made with appropriate caution.

Research Instrument

Data were collected using a researcher-developed survey questionnaire based on the study objectives, literature on RBE and instructional innovation, existing rights-based frameworks, and relevant Department of Education policies. The instrument contained five parts: respondent profile; assessment of Rights-Based Education; assessment of instructional innovation; challenges encountered in implementing RBE and instructional innovation; and acceptability of the proposed Sustainable Equity-Driven Framework. RBE was measured through child-centeredness, equity and inclusion, participation, accountability, and holistic development. Instructional innovation was measured through innovative teaching strategies, technology integration, curriculum and content innovation, assessment innovation, professional development and collaboration, and student engagement and outcomes.

The manuscript reports that the instrument underwent peer and expert review to examine alignment with the research objectives, methodological soundness, and suitability of the data-collection tool. However, the source manuscript does not report numerical content-validity indices, pilot-test sample statistics, or Cronbach's alpha coefficients. Accordingly, no reliability coefficient is introduced in this journal version. For journal submission, the authors should add the actual validation and reliability statistics if these are available in the original validation records or statistical outputs.

Data Gathering Procedure

The data-gathering process commenced after the researcher secured the necessary permission from the Schools Division Superintendent and the school heads of the participating public junior high schools in the Silang District

of Cavite Province. Upon approval, the researcher coordinated with the concerned school authorities regarding the appropriate schedule and procedures for administering the survey questionnaire. The validated questionnaires were distributed to the identified respondents, consisting of school heads, department heads, and teachers, who were given sufficient time to accomplish the instrument. After completion, the questionnaires were retrieved, checked for completeness, organized, and prepared for data processing. The responses were subsequently encoded, tabulated, and subjected to the appropriate descriptive and inferential statistical analyses with the assistance of the researcher's statistician and adviser. The analyzed data were then organized according to the research objectives and presented through tables and narrative discussions to facilitate systematic interpretation of the findings. The manuscript indicates that the data collection was undertaken during School Year 2025–2026, specifically from November 2025 to May 2026.

Ethical Considerations

The data-gathering process commenced after the researcher secured the necessary permission from the Schools Division Superintendent and the school heads of the participating public junior high schools in the Silang District of Cavite Province. Upon approval, the researcher coordinated with the concerned school authorities regarding the appropriate schedule and procedures for administering the survey questionnaire. The validated questionnaires were distributed to the identified respondents, consisting of school heads, department heads, and teachers, who were given sufficient time to accomplish the instrument. After completion, the questionnaires were retrieved, checked for completeness, organized, and prepared for data processing. The responses were subsequently encoded, tabulated, and subjected to the appropriate descriptive and inferential statistical analyses with the assistance of the researcher's statistician and adviser. The analyzed data were then organized according to the research objectives and presented through tables and narrative discussions to facilitate systematic interpretation of the findings. The manuscript indicates that the data collection was undertaken during School Year 2025–2026, specifically from November 2025 to May 2026.

Statistical Treatment of Data

The data gathered from the 252 respondents were organized, tabulated, and analyzed using appropriate descriptive and inferential statistical techniques consistent with the objectives of the study. Descriptive statistics were employed to summarize the respondents' assessments, while inferential statistics were used to determine significant differences among respondent groups and relationships between Rights-Based Education (RBE) and Instructional Innovation. All inferential analyses were evaluated at the 0.05 level of significance.

Percentage was used to describe the distribution of respondents according to their respective groups and participating schools. This statistical measure provided a proportional representation of the 7 school heads, 33 department heads, and 212 teachers who constituted the 252 respondents of the study.

Weighted Mean was employed to determine the respondents' assessments of the extent to which Rights-Based Education and Instructional Innovation were evident in the participating public junior high schools. It was also utilized to determine the extent to which problems associated with the implementation of RBE and Instructional Innovation were encountered and to assess the acceptability of the proposed Sustainable Equity-Driven Framework. For the assessment of RBE and Instructional Innovation, the resulting means were interpreted using the established five-point scale ranging from Highly Evident to Very Least Evident, while the corresponding interpretation scales specified in the research instrument were applied to the problems encountered and acceptability of the proposed framework.

One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was utilized to determine whether statistically significant differences existed among the assessments of the school heads, department heads, and teachers regarding Rights-Based Education. The analysis covered the five RBE dimensions of child-centeredness, equity and inclusion, participation, accountability, and holistic development. This statistical technique was considered appropriate because the study compared the mean assessments of three independent respondent groups. The analysis revealed significant differences in child-centeredness, equity and inclusion, participation, and accountability, while no significant difference was observed in holistic development.

Post Hoc Multiple-Comparison Analysis was subsequently applied to the RBE dimensions for which the ANOVA produced statistically significant results. This procedure was used to determine which specific pairs of respondent groups differed in their assessments. The analysis provided a more detailed interpretation of the differences among school heads, department heads, and teachers and helped identify the particular stakeholder groups responsible for the significant variations in perceptions.

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient was employed to determine the strength, direction, and statistical significance of the relationships between Rights-Based Education and Instructional Innovation. Specifically, the analysis examined the relationships of child-centeredness, equity and inclusion, participation, accountability, and holistic development with innovative teaching strategies, technology integration, curriculum and content innovation, assessment innovation, professional development and collaboration, and student engagement and outcomes. The correlation analysis enabled the study to determine whether higher assessments of particular RBE dimensions were associated with corresponding variations in specific dimensions of instructional innovation.

For hypothesis testing, the 0.05 level of significance was adopted. A probability value equal to or lower than 0.05 was interpreted as statistically significant and resulted in the rejection of the null hypothesis, while a probability value greater than 0.05 was considered not statistically significant and resulted in the failure to reject the null hypothesis. Collectively, these statistical procedures provided the empirical basis for describing the implementation of Rights-Based Education and Instructional Innovation, comparing stakeholder assessments, examining relationships between the study variables, identifying implementation challenges, and evaluating the acceptability of the proposed Sustainable Equity-Driven Framework.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Rights-Based Education

Rights-Based Education was assessed as highly evident across all five dimensions. Holistic Development obtained the highest composite mean ($M = 4.57$), followed by Accountability ($M = 4.41$) and Equity and Inclusion ($M = 4.33$). Child-Centeredness and Participation both obtained $M = 4.30$. The overall pattern indicates that the participating schools have established practices supportive of learner development, responsibility, inclusion, and participation, while also revealing relatively greater room for strengthening learner-centered and participatory mechanisms.

RBE dimension	Composite mean	Interpretation	Relative position
Holistic Development	4.57	Highly Evident	1
Accountability	4.41	Highly Evident	2
Equity and Inclusion	4.33	Highly Evident	3
Child-Centeredness	4.30	Highly Evident	4–5
Participation	4.30	Highly Evident	4–5

The prominence of holistic development suggests that the schools place substantial emphasis on learners' intellectual, social, emotional, moral, and creative growth. This is consistent with the broader rights-based view that quality education extends beyond academic attainment to the development of the whole learner. Accountability ranking second indicates the presence of school mechanisms intended to uphold rights, respond to concerns, and maintain responsibility for learner welfare. Equity and inclusion also received a high assessment, indicating that respondents generally perceive efforts to provide opportunities and support across learner differences.

Child-centeredness and participation, although still highly evident, were the comparatively lower dimensions. This distinction is substantively important. A school can maintain strong policies and development programs while still needing to deepen learner voice, personalized learning opportunities, and meaningful involvement in decisions. The source literature similarly notes that formal recognition of participation does not always translate

into genuine influence over classroom and school-level processes. Thus, the high overall ratings should not obscure the need to strengthen the quality, not merely the presence, of participatory practice.

Differences in RBE Assessments Among Respondent Groups

Dimension	F	P	Decision	Interpretation
Child-Centeredness	40.327	.001	Reject H_0	Significant
Equity and Inclusion	7.170	.001	Reject H_0	Significant
Participation	28.052	.001	Reject H_0	Significant
Accountability	14.073	.001	Reject H_0	Significant
Holistic Development	2.251	.107	Fail to reject H_0	Not significant

Significant differences among school heads, department heads, and teachers were found for child-centeredness, equity and inclusion, participation, and accountability, whereas holistic development showed no significant group difference. The post hoc results reported in the manuscript further identified significant differences between teachers and school heads for child-centeredness ($p = .004$), and between teachers and department heads for child-centeredness ($p = .001$), equity and inclusion ($p = .003$), participation ($p = .001$), and accountability ($p = .001$).

These differences are best interpreted as role-based perceptual gaps rather than simple disagreement. School heads and department heads encounter RBE through policy implementation, supervision, compliance, and school-wide programming, whereas teachers experience its feasibility at classroom level, where time, learner diversity, workload, resources, and immediate instructional demands shape implementation. The convergence on holistic development may reflect the more institutionalized nature of school-wide learner development programs. For management, the implication is that monitoring systems should combine administrative evidence with classroom-level feedback so that high policy-level implementation is matched by consistent learner experience.

Instructional Innovation

Instructional innovation dimension	Composite mean	Interpretation
Innovative Teaching Strategies	4.50	Highly Evident
Technology Integration	4.40	Highly Evident
Curriculum and Content Innovation	4.40	Highly Evident
Assessment Innovation	4.48	Highly Evident
Professional Development and Collaboration	4.48	Highly Evident
Student Engagement and Outcomes	4.48	Highly Evident
Overall	4.46	Highly Evident

Instructional innovation was highly evident overall ($M = 4.46$). Innovative Teaching Strategies received the highest reported composite mean ($M = 4.50$), while Assessment Innovation, Professional Development and Collaboration, and Student Engagement and Outcomes each obtained $M = 4.48$. Technology Integration and Curriculum and Content Innovation both obtained $M = 4.40$. Department heads and teachers each recorded an overall mean of 4.50, compared with 4.37 among school heads.

The results indicate that innovation is most visible in classroom strategies, assessment, professional interaction, and learner engagement. The comparatively lower—but still high—means for technology integration and curriculum/content innovation point to areas where structural conditions may matter more strongly. Digital infrastructure, connectivity, availability of devices, curricular flexibility, and access to updated materials can constrain innovation even when teachers are willing to adopt new practices. This finding reinforces the theoretical position that innovation is not simply an individual teacher behavior; it is also an organizational process requiring resources, professional learning, and leadership support.

Relationship Between Rights-Based Education and Instructional Innovation

The correlation analysis revealed a differentiated rather than uniform relationship between RBE and instructional innovation. Child-Centeredness was not significantly related to any of the six instructional innovation dimensions: Innovative Teaching Strategies ($r = -.058$, $p = .360$), Technology Integration ($r = .041$, $p = .514$), Curriculum and Content Innovation ($r = .015$, $p = .815$), Assessment Innovation ($r = -.058$, $p = .362$), Professional Development and Collaboration ($r = .111$, $p = .078$), or Student Engagement and Outcomes ($r = .004$, $p = .945$). This indicates that the high descriptive presence of child-centered practice and innovation did not translate into a measurable linear association in this sample.

Equity and Inclusion showed significant but low positive correlations with Innovative Teaching Strategies ($r = .238$, $p = .001$) and Assessment Innovation ($r = .247$, $p = .001$), as well as a small negative relationship with Professional Development and Collaboration ($r = -.131$, $p = .037$). It was not significantly associated with Technology Integration, Curriculum and Content Innovation, or Student Engagement and Outcomes. These results suggest that equity may be more directly expressed through pedagogical differentiation and assessment practices than through broader technological or curricular systems.

Participation was reported as significantly related to selected forms of instructional innovation, particularly innovative teaching strategies, assessment innovation, and professional development/collaboration, while relationships with technology integration, curriculum/content innovation, and student engagement/outcomes were not significant. Accountability likewise showed selective relationships, including Professional Development and Collaboration ($r = .135$, $p = .032$) and Student Engagement and Outcomes ($r = .198$, $p = .002$). These patterns support the view that rights-based practices connect with innovation through specific organizational and pedagogical mechanisms rather than through a single generalized pathway.

Holistic Development displayed the strongest and most complex pattern. It was significantly associated with Technology Integration ($r = -.130$, $p = .039$), Curriculum and Content Innovation ($r = .914$, $p = .001$), Assessment Innovation ($r = -.176$, $p = .005$), Professional Development and Collaboration ($r = -.137$, $p = .029$), and Student Engagement and Outcomes ($r = -.157$, $p = .015$), but not with Innovative Teaching Strategies ($r = -.049$, $p = .443$). The very high positive association with curriculum and content innovation is particularly notable and suggests that curricular responsiveness may be central to supporting multidimensional learner development. The negative correlations are small and should not be interpreted causally; they may reflect differences in respondent perceptions, implementation conditions, or measurement patterns that warrant further investigation.

Challenges Encountered

Challenges related to Rights-Based Education obtained an overall composite mean of 2.93, interpreted as Moderately Encountered. Department heads reported the highest overall challenge mean ($M = 3.10$), followed by teachers ($M = 2.94$) and school heads ($M = 2.73$). The manuscript identifies learner participation, resource limitations, learner voice, and teacher preparation among the recurring concerns. These challenges indicate that the principal issue is not the absence of rights-based policy but the consistency and depth of implementation in everyday school practice.

Challenges related to instructional innovation were likewise Moderately Encountered, with an overall composite mean of 3.17. The most prominent item was limited opportunities for professional development aligned with instructional needs ($M = 3.57$), followed by outdated curriculum materials that fail to connect with contemporary issues ($M = 3.55$), limited use of alternative assessment because of time and resource constraints ($M = 3.46$), and restricted flexibility in adapting lesson content because of rigid curriculum guidelines ($M = 3.41$). Poor connectivity ($M = 3.12$) and lack of digital tools ($M = 2.88$) further demonstrate the importance of infrastructure and resource support.

These challenges qualify the otherwise high descriptive assessments of innovation. High implementation and moderate barriers can coexist when teachers compensate for structural constraints through individual effort and

collaboration. From the perspective of Diffusion of Innovations, sustained adoption depends not only on perceived value but also on compatibility, organizational support, opportunities for learning, and the capacity to routinize new practices. The findings therefore support interventions that address both teacher competence and enabling conditions.

Sustainable Equity-Driven Framework and Acceptability

The proposed Sustainable Equity-Driven Framework was designed to strengthen the integration of child-centeredness, equity, inclusion, participation, accountability, and instructional innovation. The framework emphasizes capacity building through seminars, workshops, Learning Action Cells, mentoring, consultation, classroom observation, and feedback; stronger learner voice and leadership; differentiated and inclusive instruction; technology integration; collaboration among school leaders, teachers, parents, learners, and community stakeholders; and systematic monitoring and evaluation.

The framework obtained an overall acceptability mean of 4.30, interpreted as Highly Acceptable. Department heads recorded $M = 4.32$, teachers $M = 4.30$, and school heads $M = 4.28$. The close ratings across respondent groups indicate broad support for the proposed intervention and suggest that its priorities correspond to needs recognized at leadership, supervisory, and classroom levels.

Respondent group	Mean	Interpretation
School Heads	4.28	Highly Acceptable
Department Heads	4.32	Highly Acceptable
Teachers	4.30	Highly Acceptable
Overall	4.30	Highly Acceptable

CONCLUSIONS

1. Rights-Based Education is highly evident in the participating public junior high schools, demonstrating substantial institutional commitment to learner rights. Holistic development emerged as the strongest dimension, followed by accountability and equity and inclusion, while child-centeredness and participation, although also highly evident, represent comparatively greater opportunities for strengthening learner voice and personalized participation.
2. Stakeholder position significantly shapes perceptions of RBE implementation. School heads, department heads, and teachers differed significantly in their assessments of child-centeredness, equity and inclusion, participation, and accountability, while their assessments of holistic development converged. These differences indicate the importance of integrating policy-level, supervisory, and classroom evidence when evaluating rights-based practice.
3. Instructional innovation is highly evident across the participating schools. Innovative teaching strategies, assessment innovation, professional development and collaboration, and student engagement are particular strengths. Technology integration and curriculum/content innovation remain positive but comparatively less prominent areas, suggesting the need for stronger structural and resource support.
4. The relationship between RBE and instructional innovation is multidimensional and selective rather than uniformly strong. Child-centeredness was not significantly associated with the measured innovation dimensions, while equity and inclusion, participation, accountability, and holistic development were related to selected aspects of innovation. The very strong positive relationship between holistic development and curriculum/content innovation highlights the potential importance of responsive curriculum in advancing whole-person development.
5. Implementation challenges are moderate but persistent. RBE challenges center on learner participation, learner voice, resources, and teacher readiness, while instructional innovation challenges include limited professional development opportunities, outdated curriculum materials, assessment constraints, curriculum rigidity, connectivity, and access to digital tools.

6. The proposed Sustainable Equity-Driven Framework is responsive to the empirical gaps identified in the study because it combines rights-based principles with teacher capability building, learner participation, inclusive pedagogy, technology and curriculum support, collaboration, and monitoring.
7. Finally, the high acceptability of the framework across school heads, department heads, and teachers indicates its perceived relevance and feasibility as a guide for strengthening rights-based and innovative educational practice in the Silang District.

Practical Implications

The findings have direct implications for school administrators, department heads, teachers, and education policymakers. Schools should move beyond compliance-oriented implementation of rights-based policies by using classroom-level evidence to determine whether learners genuinely experience participation, inclusion, responsiveness, and protection. Professional development should prioritize differentiated instruction, participatory pedagogy, alternative assessment, technology-supported learning, and the adaptation of curriculum to contemporary and local contexts. The observed perceptual gaps among respondent groups also support stronger feedback loops among administrators, instructional supervisors, teachers, and learners. At the system level, resource allocation for connectivity, digital tools, updated learning materials, mentoring, and sustained Learning Action Cells can help convert isolated innovations into institutionalized practice. The proposed framework can therefore function as an implementation guide that links learner rights with instructional quality, organizational learning, and shared accountability.

Limitations of the Study

The findings should be interpreted within several limitations. The study was confined to eight public junior high schools in the Silang District of Cavite Province and used purposive sampling, which limits statistical generalization beyond the participating schools. The cross-sectional, self-report design captures perceptions at one period and cannot establish causal effects between RBE and instructional innovation. The unequal respondent-group sizes, particularly the small number of school heads relative to teachers, should also be considered when interpreting group comparisons. Moreover, the manuscript reports expert review of the researcher-developed instrument but does not provide numerical content-validity indices, pilot-test statistics, or internal-consistency coefficients; these should be reported if available to strengthen methodological transparency. Finally, the study did not directly collect learner or parent assessments, classroom observations, or objective school outcome measures, which could provide additional evidence regarding how rights-based and innovative practices are experienced and translated into outcomes.

Recommendations and Future Research Directions

1. School heads and department heads should institutionalize the Sustainable Equity-Driven Framework through school improvement planning, Learning Action Cells, mentoring, classroom observation, and periodic monitoring of RBE and instructional innovation indicators.
2. Teacher development programs should prioritize differentiated and inclusive pedagogy, learner participation, alternative and formative assessment, curriculum contextualization, and technology integration. Training should be sustained through coaching and collaborative professional learning rather than limited to one-time seminars.
3. Schools should establish stronger mechanisms for learner voice, including structured classroom feedback, learner-led initiatives, participatory planning opportunities, and safe channels through which students can express concerns without fear of judgment or exclusion.
4. DepEd offices and school administrators should address enabling conditions for innovation by improving access to digital tools, connectivity, updated curriculum resources, and time for teacher collaboration and professional development.
5. Monitoring systems should triangulate administrative reports with teacher feedback, learner experience, classroom observation, and evidence of implementation to reduce perceptual gaps between policy-level and classroom-level assessments.

6. Future researchers should replicate the study in other districts, divisions, and regions using larger samples and probability sampling where feasible. Comparative research across urban, rural, integrated, and stand-alone secondary schools would strengthen external validity.
7. Longitudinal and mixed-methods studies are recommended to examine how RBE and instructional innovation change over time. Interviews, focus groups, classroom observations, and learner narratives could explain why some rights-based dimensions are associated with particular innovations while others are not.
8. Future studies should include learners, parents, guidance personnel, and community stakeholders and may examine additional variables such as school culture, leadership style, teacher self-efficacy, digital readiness, psychological safety, learner well-being, parental involvement, and objective learning outcomes. Advanced analyses such as regression, multilevel modeling, or structural equation modeling may also clarify direct, indirect, and contextual relationships.

REFERENCES

1. Ainscow, M. (2020). Promoting inclusion and equity in education: Lessons from international experiences. *Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy*, 6(1), 7–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20020317.2020.1729587>
2. Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2009). Developing the theory of formative assessment. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 21, 5–31. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-008-9068-5>
3. Booth, T., & Ainscow, M. (2011). *Index for inclusion: Developing learning and participation in schools* (3rd ed.). Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education.
4. Bryk, A. S., Gomez, L. M., Grunow, A., & LeMahieu, P. G. (2015). *Learning to improve: How America's schools can get better at getting better*. Harvard Education Press.
5. CAST. (2018). *Universal Design for Learning guidelines version 2.2*. CAST.
6. Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B., & Osher, D. (2020). Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development. *Applied Developmental Science*, 24(2), 97–140. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2018.1537791>
7. Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). *Effective teacher professional development*. Learning Policy Institute.
8. Department of Education. (2022). DepEd Order No. 031, s. 2022: Child Rights Policy: Adopting the Rights-Based Education Framework in Philippine Basic Education. Department of Education, Republic of the Philippines.
9. Florian, L., & Black-Hawkins, K. (2011). Exploring inclusive pedagogy. *British Educational Research Journal*, 37(5), 813–828. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01411926.2010.501096>
10. Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence. *Review of Educational Research*, 74(1), 59–109. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543074001059>
11. Fullan, M. (2016). *The new meaning of educational change* (5th ed.). Teachers College Press.
12. Fullan, M., & Quinn, J. (2016). *Coherence: The right drivers in action for schools, districts, and systems*. Corwin.
13. Graham, C. R. (2011). Theoretical considerations for understanding technological pedagogical content knowledge (TPACK). *Computers & Education*, 57(3), 1953–1960. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2011.04.010>
14. Harris, J., Mishra, P., & Koehler, M. (2009). Teachers' technological pedagogical content knowledge and learning activity types: Curriculum-based technology integration reframed. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 41(4), 393–416. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15391523.2009.10782536>
15. Hattie, J. A. C., & Donoghue, G. M. (2016). Learning strategies: A synthesis and conceptual model. *npj Science of Learning*, 1, 16013. <https://doi.org/10.1038/npjscilearn.2016.13>
16. Kahu, E. R. (2013). Framing student engagement in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 38(5), 758–773. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2011.598505>
17. Koehler, M. J., Mishra, P., & Cain, W. (2013). What is technological pedagogical content knowledge (TPACK)? *Journal of Education*, 193(3), 13–19. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002205741319300303>

18. Lundy, L. (2007). 'Voice' is not enough: Conceptualising Article 12 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. *British Educational Research Journal*, 33(6), 927–942. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01411920701657033>
19. Meyer, A., Rose, D. H., & Gordon, D. (2014). *Universal Design for Learning: Theory and practice*. CAST Professional Publishing.
20. Mishra, P., & Koehler, M. J. (2006). Technological pedagogical content knowledge: A framework for teacher knowledge. *Teachers College Record*, 108(6), 1017–1054. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9620.2006.00684.x>
21. OECD. (2020). *TALIS 2018 results (Volume II): Teachers and school leaders as valued professionals*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/19cf08df-en>
22. OECD. (2023). *Digital equity and inclusion in education: An overview of practice and policy in OECD countries*. OECD Education Working Papers. OECD Publishing.
23. OECD. (2023). *OECD Digital Education Outlook 2023: Towards an effective digital education ecosystem*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/c74f03de-en>
24. OECD. (2026). *OECD Digital Education Outlook 2026: Exploring effective uses of generative AI in education*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/062a7394-en>
25. Piacentini, M., & Foster, N. (Eds.). (2023). *Innovating assessments to measure and support complex skills*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/e5f3e341-en>
26. Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations* (5th ed.). Free Press.
27. Slee, R. (2018). *Inclusive education isn't dead, it just smells funny*. Routledge.
28. Tomlinson, C. A. (2014). *The differentiated classroom: Responding to the needs of all learners* (2nd ed.). ASCD.
29. United Nations. (1989). *Convention on the Rights of the Child*. United Nations.
30. United Nations. (2015). *Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. United Nations.
31. UNESCO. (2017). *A guide for ensuring inclusion and equity in education*. UNESCO.
32. UNESCO. (2020). *Global education monitoring report 2020: Inclusion and education—All means all*. UNESCO.
33. UNESCO. (2021). *Reimagining our futures together: A new social contract for education*. UNESCO.
34. UNESCO. (2023). *Global education monitoring report 2023: Technology in education—A tool on whose terms?* UNESCO.
35. UNESCO. (2023). *Recommendation on education for peace and human rights, international understanding, cooperation, fundamental freedoms, global citizenship and sustainable development*. UNESCO.
36. UNESCO. (2025). *The right to education: Past, present and future directions*. UNESCO.
37. UNICEF. (2007). *A human rights-based approach to education for all: A framework for the realization of children's right to education and rights within education*. UNICEF/UNESCO.
38. UNICEF. (2022). *Global annual results report 2022: Goal area 2—Every child, including adolescents, learns and acquires skills for the future*. UNICEF.
39. UNICEF. (2023). *Education facts: Philippines*. UNICEF Philippines.
40. Voogt, J., Fisser, P., Pareja Roblin, N., Tondeur, J., & van Braak, J. (2013). Technological pedagogical content knowledge—A review of the literature. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 29(2), 109–121. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2729.2012.00487.x>
41. World Bank. (2018). *World development report 2018: Learning to realize education's promise*. World Bank.
42. World Bank. (2020). *Realizing the future of learning: From learning poverty to learning for everyone, everywhere*. World Bank.