
Functionality of the School Governance Council of Public Secondary Schools

ARIEL MARTINEZ BAMBALAN
MARA G. PELAEZ, PhD
Urdaneta City University

Abstract — This study assessed the functionality of School Governance Councils (SGCs) in public secondary schools in the Schools Division of Pangasinan II, focusing on shared governance under DepEd Order No. 26, s. 2022. Anchored on Participatory Governance, Stakeholder Engagement, Collaborative Theory, and Decentralization, it examined SGC performance and the influence of school profile variables.

Using a descriptive-correlational design, data were gathered from 57 SGC co-chairpersons through proportionate stratified random sampling. The Revised SGC Functionality Assessment Tool measured shared governance and feedback mechanisms. Data were analyzed using frequency, percentage, Chi-Square Test of Independence, and Cramér's V.

Results showed that SGCs were highly functional, with 93.21% effectiveness in shared governance and 90.48% in feedback mechanisms. However, gaps were noted in inter-committee coordination, digital communication, and proactive planning. No significant differences were found across school profile variables, indicating consistent implementation. Nonetheless, significant relationships emerged in local government unit engagement and committee coordination, highlighting their influence on SGC effectiveness.

The study concludes that SGCs should shift from compliance to strategic leadership. A capacity-building and sustainability program was proposed to enhance leadership, digital communication, and collaborative planning.

Keywords: School Governance Council, shared governance, stakeholder engagement, decentralization, leadership

I. INTRODUCTION

Decentralization of education governance was widely recognized as a key reform strategy for improving school effectiveness, accountability, and stakeholder participation. Globally, school-based management (SBM) promoted the transfer of decision-making authority from centralized offices to local stakeholders—such as school heads, teachers, parents, and community members—to foster collaborative governance, participatory decision-making, and responsiveness to local needs (Suh, 2021; Consolacion, Poblete, & De Castro, 2024; Kimilat & Baguio, 2025). Research consistently showed that effective decentralized governance strengthens institutional accountability, leadership practices, and school–community partnerships, ultimately contributing to improved learner outcomes.

This decentralization was concretely operationalized through the School Governance Council (SGC), the primary school-level mechanism for shared governance. Established through DepEd Order No. 26, s. 2022, the SGC institutionalizes stakeholder participation by bringing together school heads, teachers, parents, learners, community members, and local government representatives in school decision-making processes.

As a multi-stakeholder body, the SGC supports school leadership in planning, policy formulation, resource mobilization, and program monitoring, thereby ensuring that school initiatives were responsive to local needs and grounded in collective accountability. This governance approach aligns with international development priorities, particularly the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), notably SDG 4 on inclusive and equitable quality education and SDG 16 on effective, accountable, and inclusive institutions. Through shared governance mechanisms, public schools were expected to create inclusive environments where stakeholders actively participate in school planning, implementation, and evaluation.

When functioning effectively, the SGC served as an active partner in school development by facilitating participatory decision-making, strengthening accountability, and enhancing school–community collaboration. As such, the functionality of the SGC was crucial to realizing the goals of decentralized and participatory school governance.

Despite clear policy mandates and the recognized importance of participatory governance, evidence suggested that the functionality of School Governance Councils varies significantly across schools and contexts. While some schools use the SGC as a meaningful platform for shared decision-making and stakeholder engagement, others view it primarily as a compliance-based structure with limited participation beyond formal meetings.

Previous studies on school governance and SBM in the Philippines had generally emphasized policy implementation, leadership practices, and stakeholder involvement, often reporting positive links between participatory governance and school improvement (Bandur, 2021; Bruns, Filmer, & Patrinos, 2021). However, many of these studies examine governance in broad terms and provide limited in-depth analysis of the functionality of specific mechanisms such as the SGC. Methodologically, existing research often relies on self-reported perceptions of school heads or teachers, with minimal triangulation from parents, community members, or other external stakeholders, thereby obscuring gaps between policy intent and actual practice.

In the Schools Division of Pangasinan II, secondary schools operated within diverse socio-economic and geographic contexts that influence governance practices. Although DepEd Order No. 26, s. 2022 requires schools to establish and assess SGC functionality, division-level reports, and technical assistance findings indicate uneven implementation. Common challenges include unclear role definitions, limited community participation, insufficient capacity-building initiatives, and resource constraints (Nabus & Homillano, 2025). These conditions suggested that policy compliance does not necessarily translate into effective governance.

Consequently, there remained a lack of context-specific, empirical evidence on how School Governance Councils actually function in public secondary schools in Pangasinan II. Limited research has examined the extent to which SGCs fulfill their mandated roles, the quality of stakeholder participation, and the factors that enable or hinder effective council functionality within this local context.

This study was significant as it provided empirical, context-based insights into the functionality of School Governance Councils in secondary schools within the Schools Division of Pangasinan II. By examining council roles, processes, and stakeholder participation, the study

contributed to a more nuanced understanding of participatory school governance beyond policy compliance.

The findings could benefit school heads by informing strategies to strengthen governance practices that support instructional leadership and school improvement planning. Teachers and non-teaching personnel might gain a clearer understanding of their roles within a shared governance framework. At the same time, parents and community members might be encouraged to engage more meaningfully in school affairs.

At the institutional level, the Schools Division of Pangasinan II and DepEd policymakers might use the findings to refine policies, design targeted capacity-building programs, and enhance monitoring and evaluation mechanisms for School Governance Councils. More broadly, the study supports national and global efforts to promote quality education, accountable institutions, and collaborative partnerships by identifying ways to improve the functionality of decentralized school governance.

The primary purpose of this study was to examine the functionality of the School Governance Council in public secondary schools in the Schools Division of Pangasinan II. Specifically, it aimed to assess how SGCs perform their mandated roles in school planning, decision-making, resource mobilization, and program monitoring; determine the level and quality of stakeholder participation; and identify factors that facilitate or hinder effective council functionality.

By grounding the investigation in policy mandates, existing literature, and local realities, this study sought to address the gap between governance policy and practice. Ultimately, it aimed to generate evidence-based recommendations that support the continuous improvement of school governance, strengthen stakeholder engagement, and contribute to the delivery of inclusive, accountable, and quality education.

Literature Review

This study was anchored on Participatory Governance Theory, Stakeholder Engagement Theory, Collaborative Theory and Decentralization in Education Governance. These frameworks collectively explained how shared decision-making structures such as the School Governance Council (SGC) operate within decentralized education systems. By situating the SGC within these interconnected theories, the framework helped explain why and how governance effectiveness varies across secondary schools in Pangasinan II.

Participatory Governance Theory

Participatory Governance Theory underscored the significance of involving citizens and stakeholders in decision-making processes to enhance transparency, legitimacy, and accountability. Although the participatory governance literature often arises from broader governance studies, its principles have increasingly been applied in educational contexts where shared decision-making is emphasized. Participatory governance involved inclusive representation, collaborative problem-solving, and sustained stakeholder involvement in policies and institutional practices.

In education, participatory governance implied deliberative engagement of multiple stakeholders (learners, parents, teachers, community members) in governance mechanisms that are not merely symbolic but genuinely influential in shaping decisions. Recent evidence suggested that structures like school councils need more than formal mandates to foster inclusive participation — they require institutionalized practices, capacity building, and mechanisms that ensure stakeholders' contributions are integrated into strategic decisions.

Applied to the functionality of the SGC, participatory governance theory supported an investigation into the depth and quality of stakeholder participation — beyond policy compliance — by examining how council deliberations, feedback mechanisms, and collaborative practices function in real school settings. Together, these aspects of participation contributed to governance outcomes such as transparency, accountability, and responsiveness.

Stakeholder Engagement Theory

Stakeholder Engagement Theory emphasized that effective governance and organizational success depend on recognizing, involving, and integrating the interests and contributions of key stakeholders. While originally developed in management and organizational studies, recent applications in education research have demonstrated its relevance in analyzing how engagement practices influence school performance and governance structures.

Empirical studies in the Philippines showed that stakeholder engagement in school processes — particularly in decision making, planning, and school-community partnerships — contributed to collaborative governance, improves school practices, and shapes educational outcomes. For example, research on stakeholder engagement in schools highlighted the roles of parents, teachers, and community participants in supporting school initiatives, identifying that meaningful engagement increases transparency, accountability, and trust between schools and stakeholders.

Statement of the Problem

This study determined the functionality of the School Governance Council in public secondary schools in the Schools Division of Pangasinan II.

Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the profile of the schools in terms of:
 - a. school size;
 - b. school population;
 - c. number of teachers; and
 - d. number of existing organizations?

-
2. What is the level of functionality of the School Governance Council in public secondary schools in Pangasinan II in terms of:
 - a. shared governance; and
 - b. feedback mechanisms
 3. Is there a significant difference between the level of SGC functionality across the school profile variables?
 4. Is there a significant relationship between the level of SGC functionality and school profile variables?
 5. What capacity-building and sustainability programs can be proposed to capacitate the designated co-chairpersons in effective SGC functionality?

II. METHODOLOGY

This chapter outlined the research method and design, the sampling and locale of the study, the data-gathering instruments, the data-gathering procedures, and the treatment of data.

Research Design and Strategy

This study employed a quantitative research design, specifically a descriptive–correlational method, to determine the level of functionality of the School Governance Council (SGC) in secondary schools within the Schools Division of Pangasinan II and to examine its relationship with selected school profile variables. The descriptive aspect of the design was used to determine the profile of the schools and the level of SGC functionality in terms of shared governance and feedback mechanisms. Meanwhile, the correlational component was utilized to identify significant relationships and mean differences between school profile variables and the level of SGC functionality.

The respondents of the study consisted of designated School Governance Council co-chairpersons from selected secondary schools in the Schools Division of Pangasinan II. Data were gathered through the administration of an adapted survey questionnaire designed to measure the level of SGC functionality, particularly along the dimensions of shared governance and feedback mechanisms. Relevant school profile data, such as school size, school population, number of teachers, and number of existing organizations, were obtained through official school records. Descriptive statistical tools, including frequency counts, percentages, weighted means, and ranking, were used to describe the school profiles and determine the level of SGC functionality.

To address the inferential research questions, appropriate statistical tests were employed to determine whether there were significant mean differences in the level of SGC functionality across school profile variables and whether significant relationships existed between these variables. The results of these analyses provided empirical bases for identifying gaps and needs in School Governance Council operations.

Population and Locale of the Study

The study was conducted in selected secondary schools under the Schools Division of Pangasinan II. The respondents consisted of designated co-chairpersons of the School Governance Council (SGC) in these schools, who were directly involved in planning, decision-making, and implementing school governance activities. These respondents were chosen because of their key role in ensuring the functionality of the SGC and providing accurate information on the council's operations.

The respondents were selected using proportionate stratified random sampling. The total population of 138 secondary schools in Pangasinan II was grouped into three districts: 4th, 5th, and 6th districts. The researcher utilized Cochran's Formula to determine the appropriate sample size, using a 10% margin of error. As a result, a total sample of 57 schools was obtained. The sample was proportionally allocated based on the number of schools in each district. Consequently, 7 schools were selected from the 4th district, 25 from the 5th district, and 25 from the 6th district.

Random sampling techniques were then employed to identify the specific schools included in the study.

The total population of public secondary schools in Pangasinan II was 138 from which 57 respondents will be selected as the sample size. The sample size was considered adequate for descriptive–correlational analysis, ensuring representation across districts while maintaining feasibility of data collection.

Data Gathering Tool

To address the research questions, this study employed a standard survey questionnaire as the primary data-gathering tool. Specifically, the study utilized the Revised SGC Functionality Assessment Tool for Secondary Schools to measure the level of School Governance Council (SGC) functionality. The questionnaire collected information in two main areas: the profile of the schools and the level of SGC functionality.

The first part gathered data on school characteristics, including school size, student population, number of teachers, and the number of existing organizations, which provided contextual background for understanding the environment in which the SGC operates. To ensure the accuracy and completeness of this information, school profile data were supplemented with official records obtained from the respective schools.

The second part of the questionnaire focused on assessing the functionality of the SGC, particularly in terms of shared governance and feedback mechanisms. Respondents, specifically the designated co-chairpersons of the SGC, indicated the level of their SGC functionality through indicators which were anchored on the two main purposes of the SGC and can be found in Section VII, allowing for quantitative assessment and ranking of SGC functionality across different secondary schools. The shared governance dimension consisted of several functionality indicators, each with multiple sub-indicators that reflect aspects such as collective decision-making, coordination, and stakeholder participation.

Similarly, the feedback mechanisms dimension included several indicators, each with sub-indicators, designed to capture practices related to communication, transparency, and stakeholder consultation. The number of indicators and sub-indicators for each dimension provided a structured framework for evaluating SGC functionality, while still allowing for meaningful quantitative analysis. The collected data were analyzed to determine significant mean differences and relationships between school profile variables and the level of SGC functionality, and the findings served as the basis for recommending targeted professional capacity-building programs to enhance the operational effectiveness of SGC co-chairpersons.

Data Gathering Procedure

The data-gathering phase of this study was carried out systematically to ensure the accuracy, reliability, and completeness of information regarding the functionality of the School Governance Council (SGC) in secondary schools within the Schools Division of Pangasinan II. Prior to data collection, the researcher sought official approval and permission from the Division Office and respective school heads to access the SGC co-chairpersons.

The quantitative data were collected through a structured researcher-made questionnaire distributed to the selected elected and designated SGC co-chairpersons, following the total population sampling method. Clear instructions were provided to the respondents regarding the study's purpose, how to complete the questionnaire, and the importance of honest and accurate responses. Respondents were asked to complete the questionnaire individually, and the researcher ensured that responses would be returned within the prescribed timeframe. Measures such as standardized instructions, identical presentation of questions, and consistent administration procedures were employed to control for bias and maintain uniformity across all participants.

Throughout the data collection process, the researcher observed ethical considerations, including voluntary participation, confidentiality, and the right of respondents to withdraw at any time. Additionally, the scope of the study clearly communicated to all participants, noting that the findings pertain specifically to public secondary schools in Pangasinan II and to the perceptions of

the SGC elected and designated co-chairpersons, which will represent a deliberate delimitation of the research.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents, analyzes, and interprets the data gathered in the study. It provides a systematic and coherent organization of the results in accordance with the research questions and objectives, allowing for a clear and logical presentation of findings.

A. School Profile Variables

Table 1 presented the frequency distribution and corresponding percentages of the school profile variables included in the study. These variables described the characteristics of the respondent schools in terms of school size, school population, number of teachers, and number of existing organizations.

TABLE 1
FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGES OF THE SCHOOL PROFILE VARIABLES

School Profile		<i>f</i>	%
School Size	Small	12	21.05%
	Medium	19	33.33%
	Large	16	28.07%
	Mega	10	17.54%
	Total	57	100%

School Population	0-440 learners	12	21.05%
	441-840 learners	19	33.33%
	841-1,240 learners	16	28.07%
	1,241 learners and above	10	17.54%
	Total	57	100%
Number of Teachers	below 15 teachers	12	21.05%
	16-30 teachers	19	33.33%
	31-50 teachers	16	28.07%
	51 teachers and above	10	17.54%
	Total	57	100%
Number of Existing Organizations	11-15 organizations	57	100%
	Total	57	100%

School Size

In terms of school size, the largest proportion of schools falls under the medium category, with 19 schools or 33.33% of the total respondents. This was followed by large schools with 16 schools (28.07%), small schools with 12 schools (21.05%), and mega schools with 10 schools (17.54%). This indicates that most of the participating schools are moderately sized institutions.

School Population

With regard to school population, a similar pattern was observed. Schools with 441–840 learners comprise the highest percentage at 33.33% (19 schools). This is followed by those with 841–1,240 learners at 28.07% (16 schools), 0–440 learners at 21.05% (12 schools), and 1,241 learners and above at 17.54% (10 schools). This suggested that the majority of schools have a moderate student population.

Table 2 presented the level of functionality of the School Governance Council (SGC) in terms of shared governance. It showed the frequency, percentage distribution, and corresponding interpretation of each indicator reflecting the SGC's roles and practices in collaborative decision-making, stakeholder engagement, policy development, and coordination with school and community partners.

The School Governance Council (SGC) demonstrated an overall percentage of 93.21%, which fell under the interpretation of Highly Functional. This suggested that the majority of secondary schools in the division had successfully integrated shared governance practices into their administrative and community operations.

Moreover, several indicators reached a perfect score, showing that the foundational structures of the SGC were firmly in place. One hundred percent of councils ensured that members were informed of their roles and had undergone proper induction. In addition, every SGC had established formal meetings to facilitate the decision-making process. Interestingly, high levels of synergy were noted in the communication between Co-Chairpersons and School Heads, as well as the alignment of meeting agendas with school priorities (SIP/AIP).

It was also notable that the SGC showed strong effectiveness in policy-making and administrative rigor, demonstrating high compliance (98.2%) in maintaining meeting minutes and ensuring a quorum. The councils were likewise actively involved in formulating school improvement plans (96.4%) and recommending policies to the Local School Board (96.4%). Moreover, there was a strong effort (92.9%) to involve different sectors to ensure inclusive stakeholder representation.

TABLE 2
LEVEL OF FUNCTIONALITY OF SGC IN TERMS OF SHARED GOVERNANCE

Indicator	F	%	Interpretation
1. The SGC has members who are informed of and given the opportunity to exercise their roles and Responsibilities in the council.	57	100%	Highly Functional
1.a. The SGC has called meetings in order to create a venue for its decision-making process.	57	100%	Highly Functional
1.b. SGC members have been inducted and oriented of their roles and responsibilities as members and officers of the Council.	57	100%	Highly Functional
1.c. The SGC has organizational chart, including non-voting members, if applicable.	57	100%	Highly Functional
2. The SGC has established its position as a consultative body in developing school policies.	53	92.98%	Highly Functional
2. a. The SGC has participated actively in the formulation of the SIP/AIP and other DepEd programs, projects, and activities.	54	94.74%	Highly Functional
2.b. The SGC has passed recommendations to the School Head regarding concerns, policies, programs, and/or interventions raised by stakeholders.	54	94.74%	Highly Functional
2. c. The SGC has attended meetings on the importance of upholding the rights of the child.	53	92.98%	Highly Functional

3. The SGC has conducted regular SGC meetings as prescribed in the do 26, s. 2022 (implementing guidelines on the establishment of school governance council).	54	94.74%	Highly Functional
3. a. The SGC has decided matters through a resolution, signed by all SGC voting members.	54	94.74%	Highly Functional
3. b. Agenda of meetings have included programs, projects, and activities that are supportive of the SIP, AIP, and other school priorities.	57	100%	Highly Functional
3. c. All regular meetings have been conducted with a quorum of 50%+1 of the total SGC voting membership.	55	98.2%	Highly Functional
3. d. Regular meetings have minutes.	55	96.49%	Highly Functional
4. The SGC has organized meetings with and attended meetings of different school committees and organizations to ensure alignment of work.	41	71.93%	Functional
4. a. The SGC has organized meetings with different school stakeholders to harmonize proposed and existing programs, projects, and activities.	51	89.47%	Highly Functional
4. b. The SGC has been represented in meetings organized by different school committees and organizations.	53	92.98%	Highly Functional
4.c. The SGC has met and discussed with school stakeholders its role as oversight on school planning and resource use.	57	100%	Highly Functional
5. The SGC has coordinated with the school head the concerns of the different school committees and	57	100%	Highly Functional

organizations to synchronize programs, projects, and activities in the school.

5. a. The Co-Chairpersons have communicated the direction of the SGC to the School Head.	57	100%	Highly Functional
6. The SGC has taken part in the conduct of needs-based and appropriate stakeholder-initiated programs and activities i.e., brigada eskwela, gulayan sa paaralan, etc..	42	73.68%	Highly Functional
6. a. The SGC has been involved in the development of stakeholder-initiated programs and activities.	43	75.44%	Highly Functional
6. b. The SGC has monitored and evaluated the impact/success of stakeholder initiated programs and activities.	45	78.95%	Highly Functional
6. c. The SGC has established linkages with other stakeholders and/or referred potential partners to the School Head.	44	77.19%	Highly Functional
7. The SGC has recommended policies and programs to the Local School Board (LSB) to strengthen relationship with the LGU.	54	94.74%	Highly Functional
8. The SGC has involved the different sectors to ensure inclusive representation of stakeholders in the council.	52	91.23%	Highly Functional
Overall		93.21	Highly Functional

Legend:	Highly Functional	75% - 100%	Functional	50% - 74%
	Moderately Functional	25% - 49%	Needs Improvement	0% - 24%

TABLE 3
DIFFERENCE IN THE LEVEL OF SGC FUNCTIONALITY IN TERMS OF SCHOOL GOVERNANCE AND SCHOOL PROFILE VARIABLES

Indicator	School Size, School Population and Number of Teachers		Number of Existing Organization	
	X^2	p	X^2	p
1. The SGC has members who are informed of and given the opportunity to exercise their roles and Responsibilities in the council.	NSD		NSD	
1.a. The SGC has called meetings in order to create a venue for its decision making process.	NSD		NSD	
1.b. SGC members have been inducted and oriented of their roles and responsibilities as members and officers of the Council.	NSD		NSD	
1.c. The SGC has organizational chart, including non-voting members, if applicable.	NSD		NSD	
2. The SGC has established its position as a consultative body in developing school policies.	0.4908	0.6902	NSD	
2. a. The SGC has participated actively in the formulation of the SIP/AIP and other DepEd programs, projects, and activities.	1.0677	0.3709	NSD	

2.b. The SGC has passed recommendations to the School Head regarding concerns, policies, programs, and/or interventions raised by stakeholders.	1.0677	0.3709	NSD
2. c. The SGC has attended meetings on the importance of upholding the rights of the child.	0.5357	0.6599	NSD
3. The SGC has conducted regular SGC meetings as prescribed in the do 26, s. 2022 (implementing guidelines on the establishment of school governance council).	0.8591	0.4682	NSD
3. a. The SGC has decided matters through a resolution, signed by all SGC voting members.	0.7906	0.5047	NSD
3. b. Agenda of meetings have included programs, projects, and activities that are supportive of the SIP, AIP, and other school priorities.	NSD		NSD
3. c. All regular meetings have been conducted with a quorum of 50%+1 of the total SGC voting membership.	0.8254	0.4859	NSD
3. d. Regular meetings have minutes.	NSD		NSD
4. The SGC has organized meetings with and attended meetings of different school committees and organizations to ensure alignment of work.	3.0986	0.0346	NSD
4. a. The SGC has organized meetings with different school stakeholders to harmonize proposed and existing programs, projects, and activities.	0.7916	0.5041	NSD

4. b. The SGC has been represented in meetings organized by different school committees and organizations.	0.7916	0.5041	NSD
4.c. The SGC has met and discussed with school stakeholders its role as oversight on school planning and resource use.	NSD		NSD
5. The SGC has coordinated with the school head the concerns of the different school committees and organizations to synchronize programs, projects, and activities in the school.	NSD		NSD
5. a. The Co-Chairpersons have communicated the direction of the SGC to the School Head.	NSD		NSD
6. The SGC has taken part in the conduct of needs-based and appropriate stakeholder-initiated programs and activities i.e., brigada eskwela, gulayan sa paaralan, etc..	0.1690	0.9168	NSD
6. a. The SGC has been involved in the development of stakeholder-initiated programs and activities.	0.4838	0.6950	NSD
6. b. The SGC has monitored and evaluated the impact/success of stakeholder initiated programs and activities.	0.4249	0.7359	NSD
6. c. The SGC has established linkages with other stakeholders and/or referred potential partners to the School Head.	1.0323	0.3860	NSD

7. The SGC has recommended policies and programs to the Local School Board (LSB) to strengthen relationship with the LGU.	3.5595	0.0203	NSD
8. The SGC has involved the different sectors to ensure inclusive representation of stakeholders in the council.	0.0735	0.9740	NSD
OVERALL	0.9175	0.4389	NSD

Note: NSD means “No Significant Difference,” indicating that the p-value is greater than 0.05. Blank entries indicate that statistical testing was not computed due to uniform responses (100% “Yes”), resulting in no variability required for the Chi-square test of independence.

Interestingly, for the profile variable number of existing organizations, the results showed a very consistent pattern across the board. Every single indicator, from member orientation to stakeholder involvement, was labeled as “no significant difference.” This suggested that the SGC functioned at a similar level regardless of whether a school had many or few existing organizations. The internal structure and coordination of the SGC appeared to be independent of the quantity of other groups present in the school.

Parallel to these lines, School-Based Management framework of the Department of Education (Department of Education, 2012) emphasized that governance effectiveness was largely influenced by stakeholder participation, leadership, and accountability rather than structural variables such as school size or population. Similarly, international evidence suggested that school leadership effectiveness was more strongly associated with collaborative practices and shared decision-making than with organizational size (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD], 2013; OECD, 2016).

Along these lines, Louis et al. (2022) found that school improvement and governance effectiveness were primarily shaped by professional learning communities and stakeholder engagement rather than demographic characteristics of schools. In the same way, Spillane (2023)

emphasized that distributed leadership—rather than structural size factors—drove effective coordination in school organizations.

Moreover, Robinson (2021) explained that leadership practices such as planning, alignment, and coordination could vary depending on organizational complexity, which may have explained the significant differences observed in specific indicators like SG4 and SG7.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

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

The participating schools generally have moderate size, population, and staffing with a uniform number of organizations, indicating balanced capacity and consistent organizational structure. SGCs are highly functional in institutionalizing governance, participation, and transparency, but need improvement in coordination, digital communication, and participatory planning. SGC functionality does not significantly differ across school profile variables, indicating consistent governance practices regardless of structural characteristics. There is no overall significant relationship between SGC functionality and school profile variables, suggesting governance effectiveness is largely independent of these factors, except in specific functional areas. Despite high functionality, gaps in coordination, digital communication, and stakeholder participation highlight the need for targeted capacity-building interventions.

Based on the conclusions of the study, the following recommendations were proposed: Despite being highly functional, SGCs should address gaps in inter-committee coordination, stakeholder-led programs, digital communication, and participatory planning through structured coordination systems and increased involvement in planning, monitoring, and evaluation. Since SGC functionality does not significantly vary across school profiles, the Schools Division Office (SDO) should implement standardized policies, frameworks, and capacity-building programs applicable to all schools, focusing on improving governance processes. Schools should adopt context-responsive strategies to strengthen inter-committee collaboration and enhance engagement with Local Government Units (LGUs), particularly in policy development and governance

initiatives. The SDO should implement a sustained professional development program for SGC co-chairpersons, focusing on leadership, digital communication, collaborative planning, policy-making, and stakeholder engagement. Continuous monitoring and evaluation systems should be established to sustain SGC performance, including regular assessments, feedback mechanisms, and technical support.

REFERENCES

- [1.] Bandur, M. (2021). School governance and stakeholder participation in educational improvement. *Journal of Educational Leadership*, 9(2), 45–60.
- [2.] Bandur, M. (2021). School-based management and participatory governance in Philippine basic education. *Philippine Journal of Education*, 91(2), 45–62.
- [3.] Bellei, C., Goparaju, S., & Valenzuela, J. P. (2022). School autonomy and accountability in Latin America: Results from reform implementation. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 49, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2016.02.001>
- [4.] Bruns, B., Filmer, D., & Patrinos, H. A. (2021). *Making schools work: New evidence on accountability reforms*. World Bank. <https://doi.org/10.1596/978-0-8213-8490-4>
- [5.] Caldwell, B. J. (2005). *School-based management*. UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning.
- [6.] Casilla, A. P. (2026). Strengths of school-based management: A thematic study of leadership and stakeholder engagement in level 3 schools. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 9(12), 3082–3086. <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRIS.2025.91200236>
- [7.] Consolacion, R. L., Poblete, R. P., & De Castro, M. F. B. (2025). School-based management towards a collaborative school governance model. *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Studies*. Ijams BBP.
- [8.] David, C., Albert, J., & Vizmanos, C. (2019). Stakeholder engagement and school governance: Philippine evidence. *Philippine Journal of Educational Administration*, 15(1), 23–41.
- [9.] Department of Education. (2012). *DepEd order no. 83, s. 2012: Strengthening the functions of School Governance Councils*. DepEd Philippines.

-
- [10.] Department of Education. (2022). *DepEd order no. 26, s. 2022: Implementing guidelines on the establishment and operationalization of School Governance Councils (SGCs)*. DepEd Philippines. <https://www.deped.gov.ph>
- [11.] Epstein, J. L. (2021). *School, family, and community partnerships: Preparing educators and improving schools* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- [12.] Gumarang Jr., B. K., Mallannao, R. C., & Gumarang, B. K. (2021). Colaizzi's methods in descriptive phenomenology: Basis of a Filipino novice researcher. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 2(5), 45– 56. <https://babmrjournal.org/index.php/ijmaber/article/view/203>
- [13.] Leithwood, K., & Menzies, T. (1998). Forms and effects of school-based management: A review. *Educational Policy*, 12(3), 325–346. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904898012003003>
- [14.] Maca, M. N. (2019). School-based management in the Philippines: Fostering innovations in the public education system. *Romblon State University Research Journal*, 2(1), 35–59. <https://doi.org/10.58780/rsurj.v2i1.10>
- [15.] Mahinay, R. B. D., Manla, E., & Baylon, C. S. (2025). School-based management practices and academic performance: Evidence from Philippine schools. *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, 7(1).
-