
Strategic Leadership of School Heads in the Implementation of Inclusive Education

KAYE CELINE R. BAUTISTA
MAY RHEA S. LOPEZ, EdD
Urdaneta City University

Abstract — This study determined the level of strategic leadership of school heads in the implementation of inclusive education in SDO Pangasinan II for School Year 2025–2026. It focused on vision and future focus, strategy formulation, adaptability and flexibility, people empowerment, execution and accountability, and monitoring and evaluation, including the significant difference and relationship between strategic leadership and profile variables. The descriptive research method was utilized.

Findings revealed that most respondent school heads were 41 years old and above, female, married, doctoral degree holders, had served for 11–15 years, and attended 1–5 relevant trainings. The overall level of strategic leadership obtained a grand weighted mean of 4.48, interpreted as "High," indicating strong commitment to implementing inclusive education. Significant differences were found across most profile variables, while the highest educational attainment was significantly associated with strategic leadership, making it a determining factor in the implementation of inclusive education.

The study recommends that school heads pursue higher postgraduate studies to improve professional competence. Since people empowerment received the lowest rating, school heads should strengthen trust-based leadership, empower personnel, and enhance stakeholder collaboration to support diverse learners better. Experienced school heads are also encouraged to mentor newly appointed leaders, while future researchers may explore other variables related to strategic leadership in inclusive education.

Keywords: Strategic Leadership, Implementation, Inclusive Education

I. INTRODUCTION

The successful implementation of inclusive education greatly depends on the strategic leadership of school principals, who serve as key drivers in promoting equity, diversity, and quality learning opportunities for all learners. Inclusive education is an educational philosophy that ensures that learners, regardless of their physical, cognitive, emotional, cultural, or social differences, are provided equal access to quality education within regular classroom settings. It promotes a collaborative and supportive learning environment where every learner feels valued, respected, and included. As emphasized by Lambrecht (2022), inclusive education not only supports learners with disabilities but also strengthens diversity, participation, and social acceptance within the school community.

Globally, inclusive education has become a major educational reform agenda supported by international frameworks such as the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD), which recognizes education as a fundamental human right for all learners. In response, educational institutions are expected to remove barriers to learning and create inclusive classrooms that accommodate diverse learners (Stavrou, 2024). In the Philippines, inclusive education is institutionalized through Republic Act No. 11650 or the Inclusive Education Act of 2022, which mandates accessible, equitable, and quality education for all learners, especially those with disabilities. The law further promotes the establishment of Inclusive Learning Resource Centers (ILRCs) and strengthens the implementation of inclusive education in public and private schools.

In the local context, the Schools Division Office of Pangasinan II continuously strengthens the implementation of inclusive education programs to address the diverse needs of learners across schools. School principals play a significant role in ensuring that inclusive policies and practices are effectively implemented at the school level. As educational leaders, they influence school culture, instructional practices, stakeholder participation, and the overall learning environment (Wanjiru, 2021). Their leadership directly affects teachers' commitment to inclusive practices and learners' academic and social development (Massouti, 2023). Principals are also responsible for fostering a culture of acceptance, respect, collaboration, and support among teachers, parents, and the community.

Despite the growing emphasis on inclusive education, school principals continue to face challenges in implementing inclusive practices effectively. Previous studies revealed that some principals still have limited understanding of inclusive education and experience difficulties related to insufficient resources, lack of training, teacher demands, and parental concerns (Andini et al., 2023; DeMatthews et al., 2021; Frick et al., 2021). These challenges highlight the need for strong strategic leadership that can adapt to changing educational demands and establish an inclusive school climate.

Strategic leadership among school principals becomes essential in addressing these challenges. Effective principals are expected to establish a shared vision, allocate resources efficiently, monitor progress, support professional development, and build a school culture that promotes inclusion (Hall, 2022). Likewise, the application of Culturally Responsive School Leadership (CRSL) helps principals create learning environments that recognize and value diversity while ensuring equal participation among learners (Ham et al., 2020). Studies confirmed that CRSL contributes to the development of inclusive schools by encouraging equality, collaboration, and stakeholder involvement (Khalifa et al., 2022).

Although several studies have explored inclusive education and school leadership, limited research has focused specifically on the strategic leadership of school heads in the implementation of inclusive education, particularly in the context of the Schools Division Office of Pangasinan II. Moreover, there is still limited understanding of how school heads address challenges related to school culture, teacher preparedness, stakeholder involvement, and resource management in promoting inclusive education. Hence, this study was conducted to determine the level of strategic leadership of school heads in the implementation of inclusive education and its relationship with selected profile variables.

Furthermore, the role of school principals in inclusive education extends beyond administrative supervision and policy implementation. Principals are expected to become instructional leaders who inspire teachers to adopt learner-centered and inclusive teaching strategies that respond to the varying needs, abilities, and backgrounds of students. Their ability to communicate a clear vision of inclusion, encourage collaboration among stakeholders, and create professional learning opportunities significantly contributes to the success of inclusive programs.

In many schools, principals also serve as advocates of equity by ensuring that learners with disabilities and other marginalized groups receive appropriate support services, accommodations, and interventions necessary for their holistic development. Through strategic leadership, school principals can strengthen teachers' confidence and competence in handling diverse classrooms, thereby improving learners' participation, academic performance, and social interaction.

Literature Review

This study was anchored on the theory of Inclusive Education, which emphasized that all learners, regardless of their abilities, disabilities, socio-economic background, culture, gender, or learning needs, had the right to access quality education within regular classroom settings. Inclusive education promoted equality, participation, acceptance, and respect for diversity in the learning environment. It was grounded on the belief that schools should accommodate the needs of all learners through appropriate curriculum, teaching strategies, support systems, and educational policies.

One of the major theories supporting inclusive education was the Social Model of Disability developed by Michael Oliver. The theory argued that disability was not mainly caused by an individual's impairment but by barriers existing within society, including inaccessible environments, discriminatory attitudes, and exclusionary practices. In the educational setting, this theory emphasized that schools should remove barriers to learning and participation by creating supportive and inclusive environments where all learners could actively engage and succeed. The theory highlighted the responsibility of schools and educational leaders to modify systems, policies, and practices to ensure equal educational opportunities for every learner.

This study was also supported by the Theory of Multiple Intelligences of Howard Gardner, which explained that learners possessed different kinds of intelligences and learned in varied ways. According to Gardner, students had unique strengths and abilities that should be recognized and nurtured in the classroom. This theory supported inclusive education by encouraging teachers and school leaders to provide diverse instructional approaches and learning opportunities that catered

to the varying needs of learners. Through inclusive practices, schools could create environments where all learners were valued and given opportunities to develop their full potential.

Moreover, the study was anchored on Culturally Responsive School Leadership (CRSL) introduced by Muhammad Khalifa. CRSL emphasized that school leaders must recognize and respond to the diverse cultural, social, and educational backgrounds of learners. It encouraged principals to promote equity, inclusivity, collaboration, and social justice within the school community. This theory highlighted the importance of leadership in fostering inclusive school cultures, strengthening stakeholder involvement, and addressing barriers that hindered learner participation and achievement.

These theories were relevant to the present study because they explained the importance of strategic leadership in promoting inclusive education. School heads, as educational leaders, were expected to create inclusive learning environments, support diverse learners, empower teachers, and establish programs and policies that ensured equal access to quality education for all learners.

Statement of the Problem

This study aimed to determine the level of strategic leadership of school heads in the implementation of inclusive education in SDO Pangasinan II, SY 2025-2026.

Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the profile of the respondents in terms of:
 - a. age;
 - b. sex;
 - c. civil status;
 - d. highest educational attainment;
 - e. number of years as school head;

-
- f. number of years in the service;
 - g. number of relevant leadership trainings attended in inclusive education?
2. What is the level of strategic leadership of school heads in the implementation of inclusive education along:
- a. vision and future focus;
 - b. strategy formulation;
 - c. adaptability and flexibility;
 - d. people empowerment;
 - e. execution and accountability; and
 - f. monitoring and evaluation?
3. Is there a significant difference in the level of strategic leadership of school heads in the implementation of inclusive education across their profile variables?
4. Is there a significant relationship between the level of strategic leadership of school heads in the implementation of inclusive education and their profile variables?
5. What training design can be proposed to strengthen school heads' strategic leadership in inclusive education?

II. METHODOLOGY

This chapter discussed the methods and procedures utilized in the present study that includes the research design, population and locale of the study, data collection instruments, data collection procedures, and statistical treatment of data.

Research Design and Strategy

This study utilized the descriptive-correlational research design and employed a quantitative method of research. The descriptive part of the design was used to systematically determine and describe the level of strategic leadership of school heads in the implementation of inclusive education in terms of vision and future focus, strategy formulation, adaptability and flexibility, people empowerment, execution and accountability, and monitoring and evaluation. It provided an objective presentation of the existing conditions, practices, and leadership behaviors of school heads without any manipulation of variables. Through this approach, the study was able to generate a clear profile of how strategic leadership was practiced in relation to inclusive education implementation.

In addition, the correlational aspect of the research design was utilized to determine whether significant differences and relationships existed between the strategic leadership of school heads and their profile variables. This included variables such as age, sex, civil status, highest educational attainment, number of years as school head, number of years in service and number of relevant trainings attended. The design helped identify possible associations between these variables and the level of strategic leadership, thereby providing insights on factors that may influence leadership effectiveness in implementing inclusive education.

Population and Locale of the Study

The subjects of this study will be the 233 public elementary school heads from the 6th District of Pangasinan, under the Schools Division of Pangasinan II. However, during data validation, it was found that some school heads were assigned to more than one school. Specifically, 11 school heads were handling two schools each. To avoid duplication in counting and to ensure that each respondent was represented only once in the analysis, these were consolidated. As a result, the effective number of unique respondents considered in the study became 222 school heads.

Data Gathering Tool

In developing the data-gathering tool for this research, the researcher crafted a self-made questionnaire with substantial contributions from experienced school heads and through readings, focusing on articles in strategic leadership of school heads in implementing inclusive education. This customized instrument specifically designed to explore the strategic leadership of school heads in the implementation of inclusive education. Emphasizing a tailored approach, the questionnaire included a variety of question types, predominantly focus on the teachers' instructional practices in numeracy. The checklist was assessed and validated by experts, including 1 male and 1 female master teacher, 1 male and 2 female school principals. Their feedback was integrated into the final version. The questionnaire was completed after receiving approval from the examination committee. The primary goal of the validation process is to ensure that each question is easily understood and relevant to the actual participants in the study. This guarantees that respondents can answer the questionnaire without difficulty, resulting in valid and reliable data collection. Based on the evaluation of the experts, the instrument obtained an overall validity rating of 4.96, which is described as "Highly Valid." This result signifies that the questionnaire possesses a strong content validity, accurately measuring the variables under investigation and is deemed highly appropriate for gathering the necessary data for the study.

Data Gathering Procedure

the administration of the research instrument, each participating school head was presented with an informed consent form outlining the study's purpose, procedures, and their rights as participants. The informed consent form explicitly stated that participation was entirely voluntary and that refusal or withdrawal at any point would not affect their employment status, professional standing, or future opportunities within their institution or the SDO Pangasinan II. Participants were assured that their decision to participate or not would not affect their professional relationships or responsibilities. They were required to provide their consent before proceeding with answering the questionnaire.

The researcher personally distributed and administered the questionnaire to 233 school heads in the 6th District of Pangasinan under SDO Pangasinan II. To mitigate confidentiality risks, all responses were assigned unique codes to protect participants' identities. The questionnaires and related data were stored securely by the researcher in locked filing cabinets and password-protected digital files accessible only to the researcher.

Likewise, the researcher personally retrieved the questionnaires afterward. The responses and data obtained were kept confidential by the researcher to ensure the highest degree of objectivity.

Prior to data collection, the respective school heads of the institutions were informed of and oriented to the purpose of the study by the researcher.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the interpretation and analysis of data of the study.

Profile of the Respondents

The respondents' profile is to provide and describe the background information about them as subjects of the study. Such profile variables were likewise used to describe and analyze the differences and relationship between the level of strategic leadership of school heads in the implementation of inclusive education.

Table 1 presents the profile of the respondents.

TABLE 1
PROFILE OF THE RESPONDENTS

Profile Variables	Frequency	Percentage
Age (in years)		
31-35	12	5.4
36-40	20	9.0
41-above	190	85.6
Sex		
Male	66	29.7
Female	156	70.3
Civil Status		
Single	27	12.2
Separated	2	.9
Married	179	80.6
Widow/Widowed	14	6.3
Highest Educational Attainment		
MA Units	16	7.2
MA Acad	36	16.2
MA Degree	49	22.1
EdD Units	23	10.4
EdD Acad	10	4.5
EdD Degree	88	39.6
Number of Years as School Head		
1 – 5	44	19.8
6 – 10	60	27.0
11 – 15	66	29.7
16 – 20	33	14.9
21 – above	19	8.6
Years in Service		
1 – 5	4	1.8
6 – 10	18	8.1
11 – 15	17	7.7
16 – 20	64	28.8
21 – above	119	53.6
Relevant Trainings Attended		
District		
1 – 5	204	91.9
6 – 10	9	4.1
11 – 15	9	4.1
Division		
1 – 5	152	68.5
6 – 10	32	14.4
11 – 15	35	15.8
21 – above	3	1.4
Regional		
1 – 5	208	93.7
6 – 10	6	2.7
11 – 15	8	3.6
National		
1 – 5	208	93.7
6 – 10	2	.9
11 – 15	11	5.0
16 – 20	1	.5

Age. As seen in the table, majority of the respondent school heads are in the age bracket 41 years old and above that is 190 or 85.6 percent, 20 or 9 percent belong to the age bracket 36-40 years old, while 12 or 5.4 percent are in age bracket 31-35 years old which is the youngest categorization of age. The data would mean that respondent school heads are just in their prime age of maturity suited for an active and effective school leaders. On the other hand, school heads who are still young have room for improvement for personal and professional growth.

Sex. In terms of sex, there are more female school heads in the locale of the study that is 156 or 70.3 percent while 66 or 29.7 percent are males. This could mean that the male group of respondents is outnumbered by the female group.

Civil Status. The same table shows that majority of the respondent are married that is 179 or 80.6 percent, 27 or 12.2 percent are single, 14 or 6.3 percent are widowed while there are 2 or .9 percent who are separated. Such finding could mean that being married as a professional could create a strategic and enduring partnership that enhances both personal happiness and career success. It is fundamentally about forming a team that offers mutual support, emotional stability and shared responsibility. Some research suggest that a strong positive marriage contributes to better overall well-being that allows better focus or professional work and growth.

Level of Strategic Leadership of School Heads in the Implementation of Inclusive Education

This portion of the chapter deals with the level of strategic leadership of school heads in the implementation of inclusive education along vision and future focus, strategy formulation, adaptability and flexibility, people empowerment, execution and accountability and monitoring and evaluation.

TABLE 2
LEVEL OF STRATEGIC LEADERSHIP OF SCHOOL HEADS IN THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF INCLUSIVE EDUCATION ALONG VISION AND FUTURE
FOCUS

Indicators	WM	TR
As a school head, I....		
1. implement coherent education policies in Inclusive Education to promote the inclusive of all learners in their local communities.	4.78	VH
2. cultivate inclusive school leaders who set a clear direction, value all learners and distribute leadership to key actors within the system.	4.77	VH
3. establish a clear right based for inclusion.	4.79	VH
4. integrate the vision for inclusion into comprehensive evidence-based policies.	4.70	VH
5. ensure the policies of Inclusive Education to be reflected in classroom practices.	4.75	VH
6. promote equity and ensuring to address the needs of all learners.	4.80	VH
7. frame policies around the rights of learners to access mainstream education and receive necessary support services.	4.72	VH
8. integrate clear procedures within school policies to prevent and address discrimination, bullying and harassment based on any personal characteristics.	4.75	VH
9. articulate clearly the core values and goals of inclusive education.	4.73	VH
10. ensure national legislation is consistent with international agreement on inclusive education.	4.58	VH
Overall Weighted Mean	4.74	VH

Legend: 4.50-5.00- Very High (VH); 3.50-4.49- High (H); 2.50-3.49- Moderately High (MH); 1.50-2.49- Slightly High (SH); 1.00-1.49- Not High (NH)

As seen in the table, the respondent school head signified that they are adept in their strategic leadership in the implementation of inclusive education along vision and future focus

with an overall weighted mean of 4.74 denoting a “Very High” transmuted rating having weighted means that range from 4.58 to 4.80. It is surprising to note that all indicators have a “Very High” transmuted rating. This would imply that the respondent head teachers are exceptional in implementing inclusive education as to vision and future focus as they implement coherent education policies in inclusive education to promote the inclusivity of all learners in their local communities as well as in the school. Through this they are able to set a clear direction, value all learners in order to establish a clear right based for inclusion believing that this will promote equity and will ensure to address the needs of the learners. Moreover, the integration of clear procedures within the school policies in inclusive education prevent and address the issues on discrimination, bullying and harassment based on any personal characteristics could articulate clearly the core values and goals of inclusivity. As such as visionary leaders they could frame policies around the rights of the learners to access mainstream education and receive necessary support services which are consistent with the national legislation and international agreement on inclusive education.

Corollary, according to Hipp and Huffman (2022), a school leader who has a vision in the implementation of inclusive education can provide a clear shared and value-driven direction that transforms school culture from exclusion to inclusion. It acts as a normal compass that inspires stakeholders, justifies systemic changes and ensures all students, regardless of ability or background are valued and supported in general education classrooms. Moreover, a successful vision is collaborative involving teachers, parents and leaders to create a shared understanding of success which eventually transforms into actionable goals for such as implementing universal design for learning and collaborative teaching.

Relationship Between the Level of Strategic Leadership of School Heads in the Implementation of Inclusive Education and their Profile Variables

Table 3 shows the relationship between the level of strategic leadership of School Heads in the implementation of inclusive education and their profile variables.

TABLE 3
PEARSON-R CORRELATION BETWEEN THE LEVEL OF STRATEGIC LEADERSHIP OF SCHOOL HEADS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF INCLUSIVE EDUCATION AND THEIR PROFILE VARIABLES

Profile Variable	Vision and Future Focus		Strategy Formulation		Adaptability and Flexibility		People Empowerment		Execution and Accountability		Monitoring and Evaluation	
	r-value	Sig	r-value	Sig	r-value	Sig	r-value	Sig	r-value	Sig	r-value	Sig
Age	.080	.235	.063	.347	-.011	.872	.070	.296	.098	.147	.103	.127
Sex	-.037	.581	.024	.720	.020	.764	.042	.538	.054	.423	.047	.483
Civil Status	.099	.143	.105	.120	.006	.934	.074	.271	.108	.107	.126	.060
Highest Educational Attainment	.136*	.043	.217**	.001	.275**	.000	.230**	.001	.299**	.000	.248**	.000
Number of Years as School Head	-.111	-.099	-.118	.080	-.173*	.010	-.130	.054	-.065	.332	-.065	.339
Number of Years in Service	.070	.298	-.111	.098	-.113	.094	-.092	.173	-.054	.421	-.086	.199
RT_District	.012	.858	.149*	.027	.076	.260	.074	.272	.098	.147	.128	.057
RT_Division	.070	.298	.067	.318	.036	.597	.029	.665	.047	.488	.071	.295
RT_Regional	-.024	.720	.124	.066	.061	.366	.027	.690	.092	.174	.127	.059
RT_National	-.015	.822	.117	.083	.055	.414	-.004	.955	.076	.258	.119	.076

*Significant at .05 level

It can be gleaned in the table that the Pearson-r values of the paired independent and dependent variables do not have significant relationships in the respondents' level of strategic leadership in the implementation of inclusive education except the profile variable highest educational attainment.

This would imply that such profile variable mentioned except highest educational attainment do not have any bearing in the level of strategic leadership of school head in the implementation of inclusive education. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted. In other words, the respondents school heads can strategical lead in the implementation of inclusive education regardless of the aforecited variables.

On the other hand, the profile variable highest educational attainment bears significant relationships thus rejecting the null hypothesis at .05 level of significance. As such, highest educational attainment is a determinant factor in the level of strategic leadership of school head in the implementation of inclusive education. This would imply that the higher the educational attainment of school heads the higher their level of strategic leadership in the implementation of inclusive education. This would also imply that school heads with higher educational attainment tend to demonstrate stronger strategic leadership across all dimensions of inclusive education

implementation. This may be attributed to the fact that advanced academic preparation enhances their knowledge, critical thinking, and exposure to modern leadership theories and educational practices, enabling them to perform more effectively in managing complex school systems and inclusive education demands.

Proposed Leadership Training Design to Strengthen the Implementation of Inclusive Education

IV. Project Title

Strengthening Strategic Leadership of School Heads in the Implementation of Inclusive Education

IV. Rationale

Inclusive education is a fundamental principle of the Department of Education that ensures all learners, regardless of ability, background, or circumstance, are provided with equitable access to quality education. The successful implementation of inclusive education largely depends on the strategic leadership of school heads who guide policies, programs, and practices within the school.

The level of strategic leadership of school heads, particularly in terms of vision and future focus, strategy formulation, adaptability and flexibility, people empowerment, execution and accountability, and monitoring and evaluation, plays a critical role in creating an inclusive school environment. While school heads demonstrate competence in these areas, there remains a need to further enhance their leadership capacity to effectively respond to diverse learner needs and evolving educational challenges.

Anchored on DepEd's commitment to inclusive education and aligned with the School Improvement Plan (SIP) and Annual Implementation Plan (AIP), this training design aims to strengthen the strategic leadership competencies of school heads. It focuses on building leadership

capacity, fostering collaboration, and ensuring sustainable implementation of inclusive education practices in schools.

III. Objectives

General Objective:

To enhance the strategic leadership competencies of school heads in effectively implementing inclusive education.

Specific Objectives:

1. Strengthen school heads' ability to articulate a clear vision and future direction for inclusive education.
2. Enhance skills in strategic planning and formulation of inclusive education programs.
3. Develop adaptability and flexibility in addressing diverse and emerging school needs.
4. Promote people empowerment through shared leadership and collaborative practices.
5. Improve execution and accountability in implementing inclusive education initiatives.
6. Strengthen monitoring and evaluation mechanisms to ensure program effectiveness.
7. To provide accessible information on available resources and support services, strengthen school-community partnerships, and enhance collaboration to effectively support inclusive education.
8. To provide accessible facilities and appropriate technology, ensure equitable access to quality learning resources, and foster a supportive environment that addresses the diverse needs of marginalized learners.
9. To procure assistive resources and ensure accessible materials to address diverse learning needs.

-
10. To gather feedback and assess the inclusion experience to guide strategic improvements.

IV. Scope and Beneficiaries

- Primary Beneficiaries: School Heads (Principals, Head Teachers)
- Secondary Beneficiaries: Teachers, Learners, and School Community
- Coverage: School/District/Division Level

V. Project Description

This leadership training program is designed to build and enhance the strategic leadership capabilities of school heads in implementing inclusive education. It includes a series of seminars, workshops, coaching sessions, and collaborative learning activities focused on key leadership domains. The program will also emphasize practical application through action planning, peer mentoring, and continuous monitoring.

VI. Action Plan (SIP/AIP-Aligned)

Objectives	Activities	Time frame	Persons Responsible	Success Indicators	Means of Verification (MOVs)	Budget (₱)
Strengthen vision and future focus	Visioning Workshop on Inclusive Education	Q1	Schools Division Office (SDO), School Heads	Clear inclusive education vision crafted	Vision statements, reports	10,000
Enhance strategy formulation	Strategic Planning Workshop	Q1	SDO, Education Program Supervisors	Approved school-based inclusive education plan	Action plans, SIP integration	8,000
Develop adaptability and flexibility	Training on Adaptive Leadership	Q2	External/Internal Trainers	Improved response to diverse learner needs	Reflection papers, reports	7,000

Promote people empowerment To provide accessible information on available resources and support services, strengthen school-community partnerships, and enhance collaboration to effectively support inclusive education. To provide accessible facilities and resources, ensure equitable access, and foster a supportive environment for marginalized learners.	Seminar on Distributed Leadership & Team Building	Q2	School Heads, HR Coordinator	Increased teacher participation in decision-making	Meeting minutes, feedback forms	6,000
Improve execution and accountability To procure assistive resources and ensure accessible materials to address diverse learning needs.	Workshop on Program Implementation & Accountability	Q3	SDO, School Heads	Timely implementation of programs	Progress reports, accomplishment reports	7,000
Strengthen monitoring and evaluation To gather feedback and assess the inclusion experience to guide strategic improvements.	Training on Monitoring & Evaluation Tools	Q3	Planning Officer, MTs	Functional M&E system established	M&E tools, evaluation reports	6,000
Ensure continuous support	Coaching and Mentoring Sessions	Q1–Q4	SDO, Master Teachers	Improved leadership practices	Coaching logs, observation reports	3,000
Evaluate program effectiveness	End-of-Program Evaluation	Q4	SDO, School Heads	Completion of evaluation report	Evaluation report	3,000

VII. Budget Requirement

Item	Amount (₱)
Training Materials	15,000
Meals and Snacks	25,000
Honorarium	10,000
Supplies and Documentation	5,000
Miscellaneous	5,000
Total	₱60,000

Source of Fund: MOOE / Division Funds / External Partners

VIII. Monitoring and Evaluation

The implementation of the project will be monitored through:

- Regular progress and accomplishment reports
- Review of school-based inclusive education plans
- Leadership competency assessments
- Feedback from teachers and stakeholders
- Quarterly evaluation meetings

Evaluation will focus on improvements in leadership practices and effectiveness of inclusive education implementation.

IX. Sustainability Plan

To sustain the gains of the program:

- Integrate inclusive education strategies into SIP and AIP
- Conduct continuous leadership development programs
- Establish communities of practice among school heads
- Strengthen partnerships with stakeholders
- Institutionalize monitoring and evaluation systems

X. Expected Outcomes

- Enhanced strategic leadership competencies of school heads
- Improved implementation of inclusive education programs
- Increased teacher engagement and collaboration
- Better learning environment for diverse learners
- Strengthened culture of inclusivity in schools

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In the light of the findings of this research the following conclusions were formulated:

The respondent school heads widely vary in their profile and in certain instances their variations are in extreme cases and are female dominated respondents.

The high level of strategic leadership of school heads in the implementation of inclusive education can be attributed to the commitment and dedication of school heads towards their functions particularly in the proper implementation of programs.

The respondents differ in their level of strategic leadership in the implementation of inclusive education especially when compared to their highest educational attainment and relevant trainings attended in the division level.

The profile variable highest educational attainment is a determinant factor in the level of strategic leadership of school heads in the implementation of inclusive education.

Since highest educational attainment is a determinant factor in the level of strategic leadership of school heads in the implementation of inclusive education, concerned school heads are encouraged to complete their post graduate and post graduate degrees to upgrade themselves personally and professionally to perform well in the implementation of inclusive education program. This is supported by the findings of Howard Gardner's Multiple Intelligences Theory, which emphasizes that continuous intellectual development strengthens an individual's capacity to address diverse and complex challenges. Likewise, studies in educational leadership highlight that higher educational qualifications are associated with improved decision-making, instructional leadership, and strategic thinking in school management (Fabunan & Cabal, 2023; Marmol-Dado, 2023).

In as much as people empowerment domain got the lowest rating, respondent school heads shall involve a shift from command and to control leadership to trust based culture that provides individuals with the authority resources and confidence to make decisions. This aligns with the Culturally Responsive School Leadership (CRSL) framework of Muhammad Khalifa, which promotes shared decision-making, empowerment, and inclusive leadership practices. Studies have shown that empowering teachers and stakeholders improves engagement, collaboration, and effectiveness in implementing inclusive education (Luna, 2022).

The respondent school heads shall strengthen their partnerships with stakeholders in the implementation of inclusive education to foster collaborative holistic environment that could address the needs of diverse learners. This recommendation is grounded on the Social Model of Disability by Michael Oliver, which emphasizes that barriers to learning can be reduced through collective action and institutional support. Research further confirms that strong school-community partnerships enhance resource mobilization and improve inclusive education outcomes (Bagano, 2021; Luna, 2022).

The respondent school heads who have in their position for 11-15 years as principals or school heads are encouraged to coach and mentor their peers who are still young in their position to help them more acquainted on their functions as school heads. This is supported by leadership development theories emphasizing mentorship and experiential learning as key components of professional growth in educational leadership. Studies on school leadership in the Philippine context also highlight that mentoring strengthens leadership capacity and ensures continuity of effective inclusive practices (Fabunan & Cabal, 2023).

Explore more relevant variables to better assess school heads' strategic leadership. As DeMatthews noted, inclusive leadership is multi-dimensional and shaped by diverse factors; expanding variables yields deeper insights to improve leadership and inclusive education.

REFERENCES

- [1.] Ainscow, M. (2021). Taking an inclusive turn. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 7(1), 3-7.
- [2.] Ainscow, M., Booth, T., Dyson, A., Farrell, P., Frankham, J., Gallannaugh, F., Howes, A., & Smith, R. (2020). *Improving schools, developing inclusion*. London: Routledge.
- [3.] Alkaabi, A. M., & Almaamari, S. A. (2020). Supervisory feedback in the principal evaluation process. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 9(3), 503–509. doi:10.11591/ijere.v9i3.20504
- [4.] Al-Rahamneh, A. A. (2022). The degree of application of educational administrative accountability by the principals of special education centers and its relationship to some variables from teachers' perspective. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 12(1), 155–155. doi:10.36941/jesr-2022-0014
- [5.] Alzyoudi, M., Opoku, M. P., & Moustafa, A. (2021). Inclusive higher education in United Arab Emirates: Will perceived knowledge of inclusion impact positively on university students' attitudes towards learning with peers with disabilities? *Frontiers in Education*, 6, 793086. Advance online publication. doi:10.3389/educ.2021.793086
- [6.] Andini, D. W., Rahayu, A., Budiningsih, C. A., & Mumpuniarti, M. (2023). Pandangan Kepala Sekolah Mengenai Pendidikan Inklusif Dan Anak Berkebutuhan Khusus Di Sekolah Dasar DIY. *Taman Cendekia: Jurnal Pendidikan Ke-SD-An*, 2(2), 247–250. <https://doi.org/10.30738/tc.v2i2.3142>
- [7.] Bagano, J. (2021). Knowledge and Awareness of Inclusive Education Policies and Practices among School Heads and Teachers in Alfonso Lista Districts. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*.
- [8.] Bateman, D. F., & Bateman, C. F. (2021). *A principal's guide to special education*. Council for Exceptional Children.

-
- [9.] Bettini, E. A., Cheyney, K., Wang, J., & Leko, C. (2021). Job design: An administrator's guide to supporting and retaining special educators. *Teaching Education*, 50(4), 221–225. doi:10.1177/1053451214532346
- [10.] Billingsley, B., DeMatthews, D., Connally, K., & McLeskey, J. (2023). Leadership for effective inclusive schools: Considerations for preparation and reform. *Australasian Journal of Special and Inclusive Education*, 42(1), 65-81.
- [11.] Billingsley, B., McLeskey, J., & Crockett, J. B. (2020). Principal leadership: Moving toward inclusive and high-achieving schools for students with disabilities. Gainesville, Florida: Ceedar Center.
- [12.] Böbel, S. (2021). Diverse and inclusive leadership teams in public health schools: The change agents for sustainable and inclusive public health education. *South Eastern European Journal of Public Health*, 2021(Query date: 2024-12-01 03:53:49). <https://doi.org/10.11576/seejph-4682>
- [13.] Boscardin, M. L. (2021). What is special about special education administration? Considerations for school leadership. *Exceptionality*, 15(3), 189-200.
- [14.] Burton, J. C. (2022). Principals' assessment and perceptions of their preparation, knowledge, and skills in special education in south-eastern Pennsylvania (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (Publication No. 3383834)
- [15.] Carrington, S. & Robinson, R. (2021). A case study of inclusive school development: A journey of learning. *The International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 8(2), 141-153.
-