

Instructional Leadership Practices, Change Management Strategies, and Institutional Effectiveness in Selected State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) With Level I Status: Basis for a Three-Year Intervention Program

Rodora, T, Oliveros

Eulogio “Amang” Rodriguez Institute of Science and Technology - Manila

rtoliveros@earist.edu.ph

Date Submitted:
February 21, 2026

Date Accepted:
April 19, 2026

Date Published:
July 13, 2026

DOI:
10.5281/zenodo.21340995

ABSTRACT

This study evaluated the implementation and acceptability of the LEAD-CHANGE Framework as an intervention program designed to enhance instructional leadership practices, change management strategies, and institutional effectiveness among selected Philippine State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) with Level I status. Anchored on Instructional Leadership Theory, Lewin's Change Management Theory, and Systems Theory, the framework was developed in response to identified strengths, gaps, and significant differences in stakeholder perceptions regarding institutional leadership and effectiveness. Using a descriptive-correlational and developmental research design, data were gathered from 386 administrators, faculty members, and non-teaching staff from four selected

SUCs. Results showed that instructional leadership practices (WM = 4.16), change management strategies (WM = 4.17), and institutional effectiveness (WM = 4.16) were positively assessed. Significant differences were found among respondent groups, particularly between non-teaching personnel and academic stakeholders. Regression analysis revealed that instructional leadership practices and change management strategies significantly influenced institutional effectiveness, with instructional leadership emerging as the stronger predictor. The proposed LEAD-CHANGE Framework obtained ratings of 4.18 (Suitable), 4.14 (Acceptable), and 4.16 (Feasible), indicating strong stakeholder support for its implementation. The findings affirm the relevance and practicality of the framework as a strategic intervention for institutional development among Philippine SUCs.

Keywords: *LEAD-CHANGE Framework, instructional leadership, change management, institutional effectiveness, Philippine SUCs*

INTRODUCTION

The contemporary higher education environment requires institutions to continuously improve instructional quality, organizational responsiveness, and institutional performance. Philippine State Universities and Colleges (SUCs), particularly those with Level I status, face challenges associated with program quality, research productivity, governance efficiency, stakeholder engagement, and student outcomes. As institutions strive to meet quality assurance standards and national development goals, leadership effectiveness and organizational adaptability have become increasingly important determinants of institutional success.

Studies on educational leadership consistently emphasize the role of instructional leadership in improving academic outcomes, strengthening faculty performance, and promoting organizational effectiveness. Similarly,

organizational change literature highlights the importance of strategic planning, stakeholder engagement, and sustainability mechanisms in ensuring successful institutional transformation. However, despite positive leadership and change management practices, the study identified perceptual differences among institutional stakeholders and developmental areas requiring intervention, particularly in vision alignment, research productivity, stakeholder engagement, and change sustainability.

To address these concerns, the LEAD-CHANGE Framework (Leadership Enhancement and Adaptive Development through Change Management for Higher Institutional Effectiveness) was developed as an evidence-based intervention model. The framework integrates instructional leadership principles, organizational change processes, and institutional effectiveness indicators into a unified system for institutional improvements.

METHODS

Research Design

The study employed a quantitative, cross-sectional, descriptive-correlational research design to examine instructional leadership practices, change management strategies, and institutional effectiveness in selected State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) with Level I status. This design was appropriate because the variables were measured as they naturally occurred, without introducing experimental interventions or manipulating the conditions experienced by the respondents.

The descriptive component was used to determine the respondents' assessments of instructional leadership practices, change management strategies, institutional effectiveness, and the facilitating and hindering factors encountered by their respective institutions. It provided a systematic description of the prevailing conditions based on the perspectives of administrators, faculty members, and non-teaching personnel.

The correlational and predictive components were used to examine the relationships among the major variables and determine whether instructional leadership practices and change management strategies significantly predicted institutional effectiveness. Multiple regression analysis was employed to estimate the individual and combined contributions of the predictor variables to variations in institutional effectiveness. Because the study was nonexperimental and cross-sectional, the findings were interpreted in terms of statistical association and predictive contribution rather than direct causal influence.

The design enabled the researcher to generate empirical evidence concerning the institutional variables under investigation. The findings subsequently served as the basis for developing an intervention program intended to strengthen instructional leadership, support the implementation of organizational change, and improve institutional effectiveness in the participating SUCs.

Research Locale

The study was conducted in four selected State Universities and Colleges with Level I status: the Eulogio "Amang" Rodriguez Institute of Science and Technology (EARIST), Marikina Polytechnic College (MPC), National Aviation Academy of the Philippines (NAAP), and Sulu State College (SSC).

These institutions were selected because they satisfied the institutional criterion established for the study and employed administrators, faculty members, and non-teaching personnel who were directly involved in academic leadership, policy implementation, organizational change, instructional delivery, administrative support, and institutional operations. The inclusion of multiple institutions provided a broader institutional setting in which instructional leadership practices, change management strategies, and institutional effectiveness could be examined.

At the time of the study, the four institutions had a combined personnel population of 2,160. This consisted of 415 personnel from EARIST, 480 from MPC, 445 from NAAP, and 820 from SSC. Conducting the study across

these institutions allowed the researcher to gather perspectives from personnel occupying different organizational roles while maintaining the common setting of publicly funded higher education institutions with Level I status.

Sampling Technique

The study employed a stratified purposive sampling technique. The population was initially stratified according to institution and respondent classification—administrators, faculty members, and non-teaching personnel—to ensure that the major sectors involved in institutional leadership, instruction, and administrative operations were represented in the study. Within each stratum, participants were selected purposively based on the relevance of their institutional roles to the variables being investigated.

From a total population of 2,160 personnel, 386 respondents were included in the study. The sample consisted of 50 administrators, 200 faculty members, and 136 non-teaching personnel. By institution, the sample included 76 respondents from EARIST, 86 from MPC, 80 from NAAP, and 144 from SSC. The allocation across institutions was approximately proportionate to their respective personnel populations. A comparatively larger sampling fraction was assigned to administrators to provide sufficient representation of this smaller but institutionally significant group.

The use of stratification ensured the inclusion of respondents from each participating institution and personnel category, whereas purposive selection ensured that the participants possessed direct knowledge of instructional leadership practices, change management processes, and institutional operations. This procedure provided a sufficiently varied set of perspectives for examining the study variables while recognizing that the use of non-probability selection limits the statistical generalizability of the findings beyond the participating institutions.

Table 1. Distribution of Respondents by Institution

Institution	Frequency	Percentage
SUC 1	76	19.69%
SUC 2	86	22.28%
SUC 3	80	20.73%
SUC 4	144	37.31%
TOTAL	386	100.00%

Table 2. Distribution of Respondents by Classification

Classification	Population	Sample	Percentage
Administrators	160	50	31.3%
Faculty	1,200	200	16.7%
Non-Teaching Staff	800	136	17.0%
TOTAL	2,160	386	17.9%

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Instructional Leadership Practices

Instructional leadership practices were generally assessed as practiced (WM = 4.16). Curriculum supervision obtained the highest rating (WM = 4.22), followed by outcome monitoring (WM = 4.21), while vision alignment received the lowest rating (WM = 4.01).

Table 3. Summary of Instructional Leadership Practices

Dimension	WM	Interpretation
Vision Alignment	4.01	Practiced
Curriculum Supervision	4.22	Highly Practiced
Outcome Monitoring	4.21	Highly Practiced
Faculty Support	4.18	Practiced
Instructional Innovation	4.17	Practiced
Overall	4.16	Practiced

To determine whether perceptions differed across respondent groups, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted. The results revealed statistically significant differences among administrators, faculty members, and non-teaching staff in all dimensions of instructional leadership practices. These findings indicate that the three groups viewed leadership practices differently based on their institutional roles and experiences.

Subsequent Tukey post hoc analysis revealed that significant differences were primarily observed between non-teaching staff and the other two respondent groups. In contrast, no significant differences were found between administrators and faculty members. This suggests a closer alignment in perceptions between academic leaders and faculty members, while non-teaching personnel maintained relatively distinct views regarding leadership practices.

Table 4. Summary of Tukey Post Hoc Results for Instructional Leadership Practices

Comparison	Result
Administrator vs Faculty	Not Significant
Administrator vs Non-Teaching Staff	Significant
Faculty vs Non-Teaching Staff	Significant

Significant at $p < .05$.

Change Management Strategies

The overall assessment of change management strategies yielded a weighted mean of 4.17, interpreted as Evident. Strategic Planning received the highest rating (WM = 4.19), followed by Policy Adaptation (WM = 4.17), Stakeholder Engagement (WM = 4.16), Resource Utilization (WM = 4.16), and Change Sustainability (WM = 4.15). These results indicate that planning and policy-related aspects of change management are relatively stronger than sustainability-related mechanisms.

Table 5. Summary of Change Management Strategies

Dimension	WM	Interpretation
Strategic Planning	4.19	Evident
Policy Adaptation	4.17	Evident
Stakeholder Engagement	4.16	Evident
Resource Utilization	4.16	Evident
Change Sustainability	4.15	Evident

Dimension	WM	Interpretation
Overall	4.17	Evident

ANOVA results indicated significant differences among the respondent groups. Tukey post hoc analysis revealed significant differences between non-teaching staff and both administrators and faculty members across all dimensions.

Table 6. *Summary of Tukey Post Hoc Results for Change Management Strategies*

Comparison	Result
Administrator vs Faculty	Not Significant
Administrator vs Non-Teaching Staff	Significant
Faculty vs Non-Teaching Staff	Significant

Significant at $p < .05$.

Institutional Effectiveness

Institutional effectiveness was assessed as Effective with an overall weighted mean of 4.16. Program Quality obtained the highest weighted mean ($WM = 4.18$), while Research Output received the lowest weighted mean ($WM = 4.14$). Community Service, Governance Efficiency, and Student Outcomes each obtained a weighted mean of 4.16. These findings suggest that while the institutions perform effectively across all areas, research productivity remains a comparatively weaker aspect.

Table 7. *Summary of Institutional Effectiveness*

Dimension	WM	Interpretation
Program Quality	4.18	Effective
Community Service	4.16	Effective
Governance Efficiency	4.16	Effective
Student Outcomes	4.16	Effective
Research Output	4.14	Effective
Overall	4.16	Effective

Table 8. *ANOVA Results for Institutional Effectiveness*

Dimension	F-value	p-value	Decision
Program Quality	4.36	.014	Reject H_0
Research Output	4.12	.018	Reject H_0
Community Service	3.98	.022	Reject H_0
Governance Efficiency	4.21	.016	Reject H_0
Student Outcomes	4.08	.019	Reject H_0

The Tukey post hoc analysis revealed a pattern similar to that observed in instructional leadership and change management. Significant differences were found between non-teaching staff and both administrators and faculty members, whereas no significant differences were observed between administrators and faculty members. These findings suggest that non-teaching personnel perceive institutional effectiveness differently from personnel directly involved in academic and leadership functions.

Table 9. *Summary of Tukey Post Hoc Results for Institutional Effectiveness*

Comparison	Result
Administrator vs Faculty	Not Significant
Administrator vs Non-Teaching Staff	Significant
Faculty vs Non-Teaching Staff	Significant

Significant at $p < .05$.

Regression Analysis

Table 10. Regression Model

Predictor	β	p-value
Instructional Leadership Practices	0.48	< .001
Change Management Strategies	0.37	< .001

Model Summary

R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	F
0.71	0.50	0.49	58.42

The model explained 50% of the variance in institutional effectiveness, with instructional leadership emerging as the stronger predictor.

Table 11. Assessment of the LEAD-CHANGE Framework

Criterion	WM	Interpretation
Suitability	4.18	Suitable
Acceptability	4.14	Acceptable
Feasibility	4.16	Feasible

These results indicate that respondents viewed the framework as relevant, practical, and implementable within their respective institutions.

The findings revealed that instructional leadership practices were generally practiced ($WM = 4.16$), indicating that the participating SUCs demonstrated favorable leadership behaviors in terms of vision alignment, curriculum supervision, outcome monitoring, faculty support, and instructional innovation. Among these dimensions, curriculum supervision and outcome monitoring obtained the highest ratings, suggesting that institutional leaders place considerable emphasis on monitoring instructional quality and academic performance. These findings support Hallinger's Instructional Leadership Theory, which emphasizes the role of educational leaders in guiding instructional processes, monitoring student outcomes, and promoting a positive learning environment. Similarly, DeWitt argued that effective instructional leadership extends beyond administrative functions and directly contributes to improved teaching practices and institutional performance. The results are likewise consistent with the findings of He et al., who reported that instructional leadership positively influences teacher development, instructional quality, and organizational effectiveness.

Change management strategies were assessed as evident ($WM = 4.17$), indicating that the participating institutions possess organizational mechanisms that support institutional adaptation and continuous improvement. Strategic planning emerged as the highest-rated dimension, followed by policy adaptation, stakeholder engagement, resource utilization, and change sustainability. These findings suggest that institutional leaders recognize the importance of planning and policy responsiveness in navigating organizational changes. The results support Lewin's Change Management Theory, which posits that successful organizational transformation depends

on structured planning, implementation, and sustainability processes. Likewise, previous studies have emphasized that stakeholder engagement, policy adaptation, and strategic planning are essential components of effective organizational change and long-term institutional success.

Institutional effectiveness was assessed as effective ($WM = 4.16$), indicating that the participating SUCs generally perform well in fulfilling their core functions. Program quality received the highest rating, while research output obtained the lowest, although it remained within the effective category. The relatively lower assessment of research output suggests that research productivity continues to be a developmental area among SUCs with Level I status. This finding is consistent with studies showing that research performance in higher education institutions is often constrained by limited funding, heavy teaching workloads, insufficient research infrastructure, and inadequate institutional support mechanisms. Strengthening research capability-building programs and providing greater institutional support may therefore contribute to improved research productivity and overall institutional performance.

The study further established that significant differences existed among administrators, faculty members, and non-teaching staff in their assessments of instructional leadership practices, change management strategies, and institutional effectiveness. However, the Tukey post hoc analysis revealed that these differences primarily occurred between non-teaching staff and the two academic groups, while no significant differences were observed between administrators and faculty members. This pattern suggests that administrators and faculty members share relatively similar experiences and perspectives due to their direct involvement in academic planning, instructional supervision, and institutional decision-making processes. In contrast, non-teaching personnel may have different perceptions due to varying levels of participation, communication, and access to institutional information. These findings support the work of Gonzales, who argued that perception gaps often arise from differences in organizational involvement and access to decision-making processes. Similarly, Lemana and Ahmad emphasized that stakeholder perceptions of organizational change are influenced by the degree of communication, participation, and engagement within institutional systems.

The regression analysis demonstrated that instructional leadership practices and change management strategies significantly influenced institutional effectiveness, collectively explaining 50% of the variance in institutional performance ($R^2 = 0.50$). Instructional leadership emerged as the stronger predictor, highlighting the critical role of academic leadership in enhancing institutional outcomes. These findings support Systems Theory, which posits that organizational effectiveness is achieved through the interaction of interconnected organizational components, including leadership, governance, human resources, and operational processes. Similar conclusions were reported by Hermanu and Sari, who found that institutional effectiveness is strongly influenced by leadership quality, governance structures, and organizational support systems. The results therefore suggest that effective leadership and adaptive change management function as complementary mechanisms that strengthen institutional performance.

The study also identified several facilitating factors that support instructional leadership, change management, and institutional effectiveness, including supportive leadership, stakeholder collaboration, effective communication, resource availability, and stakeholder participation. These factors create an environment conducive to organizational improvement and institutional growth. Conversely, hindering factors such as insufficient funding, workload concerns, limited resources, weak monitoring mechanisms, and low stakeholder involvement were also identified. These challenges are consistent with findings in higher education literature indicating that resource constraints and limited stakeholder engagement can impede the successful implementation of institutional initiatives and organizational reforms.

Overall, the findings provide strong empirical support for the LEAD-CHANGE Framework. The framework was specifically designed to address the identified strengths, challenges, and perceptual differences among stakeholder groups. Its components on leadership enhancement, stakeholder engagement, adaptive change management, capacity building, and continuous improvement directly respond to the factors found to influence institutional effectiveness. The favorable ratings for suitability, acceptability, and feasibility further suggest that the framework is responsive to institutional needs and can serve as a practical mechanism for strengthening

instructional leadership, improving change management strategies, and enhancing institutional effectiveness among Philippine SUCs with Level I status. Through the integration of leadership development, organizational adaptability, and stakeholder participation, the LEAD-CHANGE Framework provides a systematic approach to achieving sustainable institutional improvement and organizational excellence.

CONCLUSION

The implementation and assessment of the LEAD-CHANGE Framework demonstrated its potential as an effective institutional development intervention for Philippine State Universities and Colleges with Level I status. The framework was developed based on empirical evidence showing that instructional leadership practices and change management strategies significantly contribute to institutional effectiveness. The favorable assessments of suitability, acceptability, and feasibility further indicate that stakeholders recognize the framework as relevant, practical, and responsive to institutional needs.

The framework effectively addresses identified developmental concerns in leadership, organizational change, stakeholder engagement, research productivity, and institutional coordination. By integrating leadership enhancement, adaptive change management, and continuous improvement processes, the LEAD-CHANGE Framework provides a systematic approach for strengthening institutional effectiveness and promoting sustainable organizational development.

The findings suggest that the framework has strong potential to support institutional transformation efforts and may serve as a strategic guide for SUCs seeking to improve governance, academic quality, organizational responsiveness, and long-term institutional performance.

References

- Hallinger, P. (2011). Leadership for learning: Lessons from 40 years of empirical research. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 49(2), 125–142. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578231111116699>
- DeWitt, P. M. (2020). *Instructional Leadership: Creating Practice Out of Theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Hallinger, P. (2010). Developing instructional leadership. In B. Davies & M. Brundrett (Eds.), *Developing Successful Leadership* (pp. 61–76). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-9106-2_5
- He, Y., Guo, X., & Abazie, P. (2024). Instructional leadership and teacher professional development: Emerging perspectives in educational leadership. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 52(1), 45–63.
- Lewin, K. (1951). *Field Theory in Social Science: Selected Theoretical Papers*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Kotter, J. P. (1996). *Leading Change*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Von Bertalanffy, L. (1968). *General System Theory: Foundations, Development, Applications*. New York, NY: George Braziller.
- Austin, I., & Jones, G. A. (2024). *Governance of Higher Education: Global Perspectives, Theories, and Practices* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Ahmad, N. (2024). Application of Cronbach's Alpha in educational and social science research. *International Journal of Educational Research and Innovation*, 12(2), 45–58.
- Akao, Y. (2020). *Hoshin Kanri: Policy Deployment for Successful Total Quality Management*. New York, NY: Productivity Press.
- Hermanu, B., & Sari, N. (2022). Leadership, governance, and institutional effectiveness in higher education institutions. *Journal of Educational Management Studies*, 14(3), 201–218.
- Gopez, R., Santos, J., & Mendoza, P. (2024). Research productivity and institutional support among higher education institutions in developing countries. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Educational Research*, 8(1), 35–52.
- Lizada, J., & Anonas, P. (2021). Research capability, institutional support, and knowledge production in Philippine higher education institutions. *Philippine Journal of Higher Education Research*, 18(2), 77–95.

-
- Gonzales, M. (2023). Organizational effectiveness and stakeholder collaboration in higher education institutions. *International Journal of Educational Leadership and Management*, 11(4), 301–320.
- Lemana, A., & Ahmad, R. (2024). Stakeholder engagement and perception alignment in organizational change initiatives. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 37(2), 145–162.