ISSN: 3116-3475
International Journal
of Education, Research, and Innovation Perspectives
Volume 2 Issue 7 (July 2026)

Implementation of the Basic Education Development Plan and Instructional Governance in Non-Sectarian Schools in Dasmariñas City: Basis for Enrichment Intervention Program

Brenda Marquez
Eulogio "Amang" Rodriguez Institute of Science and Technology
brenmay272@gmail.com

Date Submitted:
March 21, 2026

Date Accepted:
May 19, 2026

Date Published:
July 22, 2026

DOI:
10.5281/zenodo.21502937

ABSTRACT

This study assessed the implementation of the Basic Education Development Plan (BEDP) and instructional governance in non-sectarian schools in Dasmariñas City as a basis for an enrichment intervention program. A quantitative descriptive-correlational design was used involving 112 respondents composed of 12 school heads, seven subject coordinators, two grade-level coordinators, and 91 teachers from 12 schools. Data were gathered through a validated researcher-made questionnaire and analyzed using frequency, percentage, weighted mean, analysis of variance, and Pearson product-moment correlation. The results showed that BEDP implementation was Highly Evident (M = 4.41). Learning environment and well-being obtained the highest domain mean (M = 4.49), followed by governance and accountability (M = 4.47), equity and inclusion (M = 4.44), curriculum and learning outcomes (M = 4.39), digitalization and innovation (M = 4.34), and teacher quality and development (M = 4.33). Significant differences were found among the four respondent groups across all BEDP domains ($p < .05$). Instructional governance was also Highly Evident (M = 4.53), with policy and standards alignment receiving the highest mean (M = 4.55). BEDP implementation and instructional governance had a strong positive and statistically significant relationship ($r = .88$, $p < .001$). Implementation concerns were Moderately Challenging (M = 2.70), particularly in lesson alignment, instructional resources, sustained professional development, differentiated planning, and policy communication. The proposed enrichment intervention program was Highly Acceptable (M = 4.21). The findings indicate that strong instructional governance supports effective BEDP implementation, while targeted improvements in mentoring, digital capability, resource provision, differentiated instruction, monitoring, and stakeholder collaboration are necessary to sustain school improvement.

Keywords: Basic Education Development Plan, instructional governance, non-sectarian schools, distributed leadership, school improvement, enrichment intervention program

INTRODUCTION

Education remains a primary foundation of national development because it equips learners with the competencies, values, and dispositions needed to participate productively in a rapidly changing society. Yet educational systems continue to confront persistent learning gaps, unequal access to resources, uneven teacher support, and governance limitations. Global evidence has shown that improved learning requires coherent policy implementation, capable school leadership, effective teaching, and sustained accountability rather than access expansion alone (World Bank, 2018; World Bank et al., 2022).

ISSN: 3116-3475
International Journal
of Education, Research, and Innovation Perspectives
Volume 2 Issue 7 (July 2026)

In the Philippines, the Department of Education adopted the Basic Education Development Plan 2030 as the long-term strategic roadmap for improving access, quality, equity, resilience, and learner outcomes across the basic education system (Department of Education, 2022). The plan calls for reforms in curriculum and learning outcomes, teacher quality and development, learning environment and well-being, governance and accountability, digitalization and innovation, and equity and inclusion. These reform priorities require schools to translate national directions into coherent institutional policies, instructional programs, resource decisions, and monitoring systems.

The need for effective implementation is particularly urgent amid concerns over learning recovery and systemic educational performance. The Second Congressional Commission on Education (2024) identified continuing weaknesses in learning outcomes, teacher preparation, governance, accountability, and resource allocation. These conditions show that the success of a strategic plan is determined not merely by its formal adoption but by the capacity of schools to implement its priorities consistently and responsively.

Instructional governance provides the organizational mechanism through which school reforms are converted into classroom practice. It includes policy and standards alignment, leadership and decision-making, curriculum and instructional planning, teacher collaboration and capacity building, resource allocation and support, monitoring and evaluation, and stakeholder engagement. Under the Governance of Basic Education Act, schools are expected to exercise shared responsibility, transparency, and accountability while responding to local learning needs (Republic Act No. 9155, 2001).

Non-sectarian schools in Dasmariñas City serve diverse learner populations and operate within organizational settings that require both compliance with national education standards and adaptation to local institutional conditions. School heads, coordinators, and teachers may perceive reform implementation differently because their roles expose them to distinct aspects of policy, planning, resource management, and classroom delivery. Examining these perspectives is essential for identifying strengths, inconsistencies, and practical implementation gaps.

This study assessed the implementation of the BEDP and instructional governance in selected non-sectarian schools in Dasmariñas City. It determined the extent of BEDP implementation, examined differences among school heads, subject coordinators, grade-level coordinators, and teachers, assessed instructional governance, tested the relationship between the two principal variables, identified implementation challenges, and evaluated the acceptability of a proposed enrichment intervention program. The study provides evidence for strengthening school-level governance and sustaining reform implementation.

Literature Review

Basic Education Development Plan and Educational Reform

The BEDP 2030 provides an integrated framework for addressing access, quality, equity, and resilience in Philippine basic education. It recognizes that improved learning outcomes depend on aligned curriculum, capable teachers, safe and supportive learning environments, responsive governance, appropriate technology, and inclusive support systems (Department of Education, 2022). The plan is complemented by the National Learning Recovery Program, which prioritizes foundational learning, targeted intervention, assessment, remediation, and teacher support (Department of Education, 2023a).

Educational reform succeeds when strategic priorities are understood and implemented across organizational levels. OECD (2022) emphasized that curriculum relevance, teacher quality, educational investment, and governance are interconnected drivers of educational performance. Similarly, Schleicher (2018) explained that high-performing systems combine ambitious standards with professional capacity, intelligent accountability, and local responsibility. These perspectives support the need to examine both the formal implementation of BEDP priorities and the governance arrangements through which they are carried out.

System-level reform also requires continuous attention to inclusion and learning inequality. UNESCO (2020) emphasized that inclusive education involves removing barriers to participation and achievement for learners across differences in ability, socioeconomic status, gender, culture, and background. Accordingly, BEDP

ISSN: 3116-3475
International Journal
of Education, Research, and Innovation Perspectives
Volume 2 Issue 7 (July 2026)

implementation should be assessed not only through curricular compliance but also through learner well-being, targeted support, accessible materials, and equitable participation.

Instructional Governance and Distributed Leadership

Instructional governance concerns the structures, decisions, and collaborative processes that guide teaching and learning. Republic Act No. 9155 (2001) established shared governance as a central principle of Philippine basic education, assigning responsibilities across national, regional, division, district, and school levels. School improvement planning further requires evidence-based priorities, stakeholder participation, resource alignment, and progress monitoring (Department of Education, 2015).

Distributed Leadership Theory explains why school improvement cannot depend solely on the school head. Spillane (2006) conceptualized leadership practice as distributed among leaders, followers, routines, and organizational situations. Subject coordinators, grade-level coordinators, and teachers therefore participate in curriculum interpretation, collaborative planning, professional learning, monitoring, and problem-solving. Differences in their assessments may reflect their distinct responsibilities and proximity to classroom implementation.

Shared leadership strengthens reform implementation when roles are clear, communication is consistent, and staff have meaningful opportunities to contribute to decisions. It can also improve organizational learning by connecting policy direction with classroom evidence. Instructional governance is therefore both an accountability system and a professional collaboration process that supports coherent implementation.

Teacher Development, Digitalization, and Inclusive Learning

Teacher quality is a decisive component of educational reform. Effective professional development is sustained, content-focused, collaborative, practice-based, and supported by feedback and reflection (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). Teacher coaching has also demonstrated positive effects on instructional practice and learner achievement, particularly when it is embedded in daily work and maintained over time (Kraft et al., 2018). These findings support the assessment of training, mentoring, classroom observation, and collaborative planning under the BEDP.

Digitalization requires more than the provision of devices. The revised Department of Education Computerization Program recognizes infrastructure, equipment, access, and capacity building as interconnected requirements for effective technology use (Department of Education, 2023b). The OECD (2023) similarly argued that effective digital education depends on capable teachers, accessible infrastructure, interoperable systems, responsible governance, and evidence-informed implementation.

The 2023 Global Education Monitoring Report cautioned that technology should support, rather than replace, human interaction and sound pedagogy (Global Education Monitoring Report Team, 2023). The Southeast Asia report further highlighted unequal infrastructure, uneven digital competence, and context-dependent implementation across the region (Global Education Monitoring Report Team & Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization, 2023). Consequently, digital readiness should be evaluated through both access and teachers' ability to use technology for instruction, assessment, learner engagement, and inclusion.

Organizational Resilience and Sustainable Implementation

Organizational Resilience Theory provides a useful lens for understanding how schools sustain reform amid changing requirements, resource limitations, and learner needs. Duchek (2020) described resilience as a capability involving anticipation, coping, and adaptation. In the school context, anticipation includes planning and risk recognition; coping involves coordinated response and resource use; and adaptation requires learning from implementation evidence and improving organizational practice.

BEDP implementation requires this cycle of continuous adjustment. Schools must interpret new policies, support teachers, monitor learner progress, evaluate programs, and revise strategies when outcomes are below expectations. Governance systems that encourage collaboration and evidence use make such adaptation more

ISSN: 3116-3475
International Journal
of Education, Research, and Innovation Perspectives
Volume 2 Issue 7 (July 2026)

likely, while weak communication, limited mentoring, resource shortages, and inconsistent monitoring can prevent formal plans from becoming stable practice.

The reviewed literature indicates that educational reform, instructional governance, teacher development, digital capability, and inclusion are mutually reinforcing. However, evidence from non-sectarian schools in Dasmariñas City remained limited. The present study addressed this gap by examining how multiple stakeholder groups assessed BEDP implementation and instructional governance, and by using their responses to design a targeted enrichment intervention program.

METHODS

Research Design

The study employed a quantitative descriptive-correlational research design. The descriptive component measured the extent of BEDP implementation, instructional governance, implementation challenges, and program acceptability as they naturally occurred. The correlational component tested the association between BEDP implementation and instructional governance without manipulating the variables. This design was consistent with survey-based educational research that combines descriptive statistics and relationship testing (Cohen et al., 2018; Creswell & Creswell, 2023).

Research Locale

The research was conducted in 12 selected non-sectarian schools in Dasmariñas City, Cavite. These schools implemented national basic education policies while maintaining their respective institutional governance structures. The setting allowed the study to examine BEDP implementation across schools with varied organizational arrangements and respondent roles.

Participants and Sampling Technique

The population consisted of 237 school personnel: 12 school heads, seven subject coordinators, two grade-level coordinators, and 216 teachers. Total enumeration was applied to all school heads, subject coordinators, and grade-level coordinators. The teacher sample was determined using Slovin's formula and 91 teachers were selected through simple random sampling. The final sample comprised 112 respondents who were directly involved in planning, implementing, monitoring, or supporting BEDP-related school programs.

Table 1. *Distribution of participants*

Respondent Group	Population	Sample	Coverage
School heads	12	12	100%
Subject coordinators	7	7	100%
Grade-level coordinators	2	2	100%
Teachers	216	91	42%
Total	237	112	

Research Instrument

A researcher-made survey questionnaire served as the primary instrument. It gathered respondent profile information and assessed six BEDP domains: curriculum and learning outcomes, teacher quality and development, learning environment and well-being, governance and accountability, digitalization and innovation, and equity and inclusion. It also measured seven instructional governance domains: policy and standards alignment, leadership and decision-making, curriculum and instructional planning, teacher collaboration and capacity building, resource allocation and support, monitoring and evaluation, and stakeholder engagement. Separate sections assessed implementation challenges and the acceptability of the proposed intervention program.

ISSN: 3116-3475
International Journal
of Education, Research, and Innovation Perspectives
Volume 2 Issue 7 (July 2026)

The questionnaire underwent adviser review, face validation, and content validation by Graduate School faculty members with expertise in educational management and research. Suggestions were incorporated to improve the clarity, relevance, and alignment of the items with the study objectives.

Data Gathering Procedure

Permission to conduct the study was secured from the Office of the Schools Division Superintendent of Dasmariñas City and from the heads of the participating schools. The survey was administered through Google Forms and printed questionnaires, depending on respondent preference and internet access. Responses were retrieved, checked, classified according to the research questions, and submitted for statistical processing. The source manuscript reported a complete return of the distributed instruments.

Data Analysis

Frequency and percentage described the respondents' profile. Weighted mean measured the extent of BEDP implementation, instructional governance, challenges, and program acceptability. One-way analysis of variance tested differences among the assessments of school heads, subject coordinators, grade-level coordinators, and teachers. Pearson product-moment correlation determined the strength and significance of the relationship between BEDP implementation and instructional governance. Hypotheses were evaluated at the .05 level of significance.

Ethical Consideration

Administrative authorization was secured before data collection, and respondents completed the questionnaire through the approved school channels. Findings were reported in aggregate form and no individual respondent was identified in the presentation of results. The source manuscript did not specify a formal ethics-review approval number; therefore, no ethics approval identifier is claimed in this article.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Implementation of the Basic Education Development Plan

Table 2. *Summary assessment of BEDP implementation*

BEDP Domain	Composite Mean	Interpretation	Rank
Learning environment and well-being	4.49	Highly Evident	1
Governance and accountability	4.47	Highly Evident	2
Equity and inclusion	4.44	Highly Evident	3
Curriculum and learning outcomes	4.39	Highly Evident	4
Digitalization and innovation	4.34	Highly Evident	5
Teacher quality and development	4.33	Highly Evident	6
Overall	4.41	Highly Evident	

The overall implementation of the BEDP was Highly Evident (M = 4.41). Learning environment and well-being ranked first (M = 4.49), reflecting strong anti-bullying measures, positive school culture, attention to mental health, guidance services, and targeted learner support. Governance and accountability ranked second (M = 4.47), indicating alignment of school policies with DepEd standards, role clarity, compliance, and data-supported decision-making. Equity and inclusion also received a high rating (M = 4.44), particularly in gender-sensitive and culturally responsive practice and equal treatment of learners.

Curriculum and learning outcomes were Highly Evident (M = 4.39). Alignment with prescribed competencies was the strongest indicator, while curriculum review and adjustment ranked lowest within the domain, suggesting that implementation was strong but continuous revision could be more systematic. Teacher quality and development received the lowest domain mean (M = 4.33), principally because coaching and mentoring were less consistent than encouragement for professional growth and the use of evaluation results. This

ISSN: 3116-3475
International Journal
of Education, Research, and Innovation Perspectives
Volume 2 Issue 7 (July 2026)

pattern supports evidence that sustained, job-embedded coaching is necessary for professional learning to influence classroom practice (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Kraft et al., 2018).

Digitalization and innovation were likewise Highly Evident (M = 4.34), but digital-literacy training received a lower rating than technology access and innovative teaching practices. The finding indicates that schools had begun integrating technology but still needed stronger human capacity to maximize its instructional value. This is consistent with national and international evidence that digital transformation depends on infrastructure, teacher preparation, and appropriate governance rather than equipment alone (Department of Education, 2023b; OECD, 2023).

Differences in BEDP Assessments among Respondent Groups

Table 3. *Differences among respondent groups in BEDP implementation assessments*

BEDP Domain	F	p	Decision
Curriculum and learning outcomes	9.31	< .001	Significant
Teacher quality and development	7.45	.001	Significant
Learning environment and well-being	11.12	< .001	Significant
Governance and accountability	5.78	.003	Significant
Digitalization and innovation	8.24	.001	Significant
Equity and inclusion	10.03	< .001	Significant

Significant differences were found among school heads, subject coordinators, grade-level coordinators, and teachers across all six BEDP domains. Learning environment and well-being showed the largest F-value (F = 11.12), followed by equity and inclusion (F = 10.03) and curriculum and learning outcomes (F = 9.31). The null hypothesis of no group difference was therefore rejected for every domain.

Grade-level coordinators and teachers generally gave higher ratings, while subject coordinators tended to provide more conservative assessments. These differences may reflect role-based access to implementation evidence. Classroom-based respondents directly observe teaching, learner support, and daily use of resources, whereas coordinators may evaluate implementation against broader standards and cross-grade consistency. Distributed leadership recognizes that organizational actors experience leadership and reform through different tasks, routines, and situations (Spillane, 2006). The variation does not necessarily indicate contradiction; rather, it underscores the need for shared monitoring tools and regular cross-role dialogue.

Level of Instructional Governance

Table 4. *Summary assessment of instructional governance*

Instructional Governance Domain	Composite Mean	Interpretation	Rank
Policy and standards alignment	4.55	Highly Evident	1
Curriculum and instructional planning	4.51	Highly Evident	2
Stakeholder engagement	4.48	Highly Evident	3
Monitoring and evaluation	4.46	Highly Evident	4
Leadership and decision-making	4.42	Highly Evident	5
Teacher collaboration and capacity building	4.37	Highly Evident	6
Resource allocation and support	4.26	Highly Evident	7
Overall	4.53	Highly Evident	

Instructional governance was Highly Evident (M = 4.53). Policy and standards alignment ranked first (M = 4.55), showing that instructional practices, policy communication, orientation, and curriculum standards were generally coherent. Curriculum and instructional planning ranked second (M = 4.51), indicating strong engagement in lesson planning, curriculum use, assessment design, and adjustment based on learner performance.

ISSN: 3116-3475
International Journal
of Education, Research, and Innovation Perspectives
Volume 2 Issue 7 (July 2026)

Stakeholder engagement also received a high rating (M = 4.48), particularly in parent participation and communication about learner progress.

Resource allocation and support obtained the lowest governance mean (M = 4.26), although it remained Highly Evident. Fair fund allocation and administrative support were relatively weaker than the availability of classroom resources. Teacher collaboration and capacity building also ranked lower (M = 4.37), especially in peer mentoring and team-teaching opportunities. These findings indicate that formal policy alignment was stronger than some enabling conditions required for sustained implementation. Organizational resilience depends on both anticipatory planning and the resources and learning processes necessary to cope and adapt (Duchek, 2020).

Relationship between BEDP Implementation and Instructional Governance

Table 5. *Relationship between BEDP implementation and instructional governance*

Variables	r	Interpretation	p	Decision
BEDP implementation and instructional governance	.88	Strong positive correlation	< .001	Significant; reject H_0

BEDP implementation and instructional governance had a strong positive and statistically significant relationship ($r = .88$, $p < .001$). Higher levels of policy alignment, leadership, planning, collaboration, resource support, monitoring, and stakeholder engagement were associated with higher levels of implementation across the six BEDP domains. The result supports the central assumption of the study that school-level governance is a major enabling condition for educational reform.

The magnitude of the correlation indicates that BEDP implementation and instructional governance are closely connected, although the non-experimental design does not establish causation. Schools that communicate policies clearly, involve staff in planning, analyze data, support teachers, allocate resources, and engage stakeholders are better positioned to translate strategic priorities into institutional and classroom practice. This finding is consistent with the BEDP's emphasis on accountability, shared responsibility, and continuous improvement (Department of Education, 2022).

Challenges in BEDP Implementation and Instructional Governance

Table 6. *Summary of implementation challenges*

Challenge Area	Composite Mean	Interpretation	Rank
Instructional governance challenges	2.77	Moderately Challenging	1
BEDP implementation challenges	2.63	Moderately Challenging	2
Overall	2.70	Moderately Challenging	

The overall challenges were Moderately Challenging (M = 2.70). BEDP-related concerns included difficulty aligning lessons with all required competencies (M = 3.10), limited instructional materials (M = 2.90), and insufficient sustained professional development (M = 2.85). Within instructional governance, the highest concerns involved plans that did not fully address varying learner abilities (M = 2.87), unclear policy communication (M = 2.86), and delayed provision of instructional materials (M = 2.85).

Subject coordinators consistently rated challenges more severely than the other groups. Their cross-classroom and cross-grade responsibilities may make inconsistencies more visible, particularly in policy interpretation, coaching, resources, and monitoring. The findings suggest that schools should not rely solely on high overall implementation ratings. Strong reform systems also need mechanisms for identifying implementation variation and addressing bottlenecks before they become persistent.

ISSN: 3116-3475
International Journal
of Education, Research, and Innovation Perspectives
Volume 2 Issue 7 (July 2026)

Acceptability of the Enrichment Intervention Program

Table 7. *Acceptability of the proposed enrichment intervention program*

Program Criterion	Composite Mean	Interpretation	Rank
Provides comprehensive knowledge for corrective actions	4.29	Highly Acceptable	1
Guides policy development and enhancement	4.26	Highly Acceptable	2
Identifies implementation and governance weaknesses	4.20	Highly Acceptable	3
Provides completeness of relevant facts	4.19	Acceptable	4
Practical for adoption and implementation	4.11	Acceptable	5
Overall	4.21	Highly Acceptable	

The proposed enrichment intervention program was rated Highly Acceptable (M = 4.21). Its strongest feature was the provision of comprehensive knowledge for corrective actions (M = 4.29), followed by its usefulness in developing and enhancing policy guidelines (M = 4.26). The respondents also recognized its value in identifying weaknesses in BEDP implementation and instructional governance (M = 4.20).

The high acceptability indicates that the program was aligned with the implementation needs identified in the study. Its practical focus on teacher development, digital capacity, policy communication, resource support, curriculum differentiation, monitoring, and stakeholder participation reflects the areas where high implementation ratings coexisted with lower-ranked indicators or moderate challenges.

CONCLUSION

The implementation of the Basic Education Development Plan in selected non-sectarian schools in Dasmariñas City was Highly Evident across all six domains. The strongest areas were learning environment and well-being, governance and accountability, and equity and inclusion. Teacher quality and development and digitalization and innovation, while also highly evident, contained the most visible opportunities for improvement, particularly in consistent coaching, mentoring, and digital literacy development.

Instructional governance was likewise Highly Evident, with policy and standards alignment emerging as the strongest domain. Resource allocation and support and teacher collaboration and capacity building received the lowest governance rankings. The significant differences among respondent groups show that school roles shape perceptions of implementation. The strong positive relationship between BEDP implementation and instructional governance confirms that coherent policies, shared leadership, collaborative planning, resource support, monitoring, and stakeholder engagement are closely associated with effective educational reform implementation.

The findings further show that high implementation does not eliminate operational challenges. Lesson alignment, differentiated planning, instructional resources, professional development, policy communication, and monitoring remain areas requiring targeted support. The highly acceptable enrichment intervention program provides a practical mechanism for sustaining strengths while addressing these implementation gaps.

Recommendation

The proposed enrichment intervention program should be considered for implementation in Infant Jesus Montessori Center and other participating non-sectarian schools in Dasmariñas City. School heads and administrators should sustain strong practices in learner well-being, policy alignment, equity, and stakeholder engagement while prioritizing systematic coaching, mentoring, digital capability, and resource provision.

Schools should establish shared monitoring procedures that allow school heads, subject coordinators, grade-level coordinators, and teachers to compare evidence, clarify differences in perception, and agree on

ISSN: 3116-3475
International Journal
of Education, Research, and Innovation Perspectives
Volume 2 Issue 7 (July 2026)

corrective action. Curriculum review should be linked with learner-performance data, differentiated instruction, targeted support for struggling learners, and regular evaluation of implementation outcomes.

Future research should compare public, sectarian, and non-sectarian schools, employ qualitative or mixed-methods approaches to explain role-based differences, and conduct longitudinal studies to determine whether improvements in instructional governance lead to sustained gains in BEDP implementation and learner outcomes.

Table 8. *Proposed Enrichment Intervention Program*

Priority Area	Key Activities	Responsible Persons	Expected Indicator
Policy Alignment and Communication	Conduct quarterly policy briefings; create concise implementation guides; use common school-level BEDP monitoring tools.	School heads, coordinators	Improved role clarity and reduced policy-communication concerns
Coaching, Mentoring, and Professional Growth	Establish mentoring pairs, lesson-study cycles, peer observation, and needs-based professional learning sessions.	School heads, master teachers, coordinators	Regular coaching records and improved teacher-development ratings
Digital Capability and Innovation	Provide digital-literacy training, technology-supported lesson design, and technical assistance for classroom integration.	ICT coordinators, administrators	Higher teacher confidence and consistent instructional technology use
Resource Allocation and Learning Support	Audit instructional resources; prioritize essential materials, ICT maintenance, and support for low-income and struggling learners.	Administrators, finance and learning-resource teams	Timely resource availability and equitable learner support
Curriculum Differentiation and Learning Recovery	Use assessment data to adjust lessons, strengthen remediation, and design differentiated activities for varied learner needs.	Teachers and academic coordinators	Documented curriculum adjustments and improved targeted interventions
Monitoring, Evaluation, and Stakeholder Engagement	Schedule program reviews, document results, provide feedback, and involve parents and community partners in improvement actions.	School improvement teams	Regular evaluation reports and stronger stakeholder participation

References

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). Research methods in education (8th ed.). Routledge.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). Effective teacher professional development. Learning Policy Institute.

Department of Education. (2015). DepEd Order No. 44, s. 2015: Guidelines on the enhanced school improvement planning process and the school report card.

Department of Education. (2022). DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2022: Adoption of the Basic Education Development Plan 2030.

Department of Education. (2023a). DepEd Order No. 13, s. 2023: Adoption of the National Learning Recovery Program in the Department of Education.

Department of Education. (2023b). DepEd Order No. 16, s. 2023: Revised guidelines on the implementation of the Department of Education Computerization Program.

Duchek, S. (2020). Organizational resilience: A capability-based conceptualization. Business Research, 13, 215–246. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40685-019-0085-7

Global Education Monitoring Report Team. (2023). Technology in education: A tool on whose terms? UNESCO.

Global Education Monitoring Report Team, & Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization. (2023). Technology in education: A tool on whose terms? Southeast Asia report. UNESCO.

Kraft, M. A., Blazar, D., & Hogan, D. (2018). The effect of teacher coaching on instruction and achievement: A meta-analysis of the causal evidence. Review of Educational Research, 88(4), 547–588. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654318759268

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2022). Education at a glance 2022: OECD indicators. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/3197152b-en

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2023). OECD digital education outlook 2023: Towards an effective digital education ecosystem. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/c74f03de-en

Republic Act No. 9155. (2001). Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001. Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines.

Schleicher, A. (2018). World class: How to build a 21st-century school system. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264300002-en

Second Congressional Commission on Education. (2024). Miseducation: The failed system of Philippine education.

Spillane, J. P. (2006). Distributed leadership. Jossey-Bass.

UNESCO. (2020). Global education monitoring report 2020: Inclusion and education—All means all.

World Bank. (2018). World development report 2018: Learning to realize education's promise.

World Bank, UNESCO, UNICEF, Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office, United States Agency for International Development, & Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. (2022). The state of global learning poverty: 2022 update.