

Quality Management System and School Innovation Practices Correlates to Leadership Support in Public Junior High Schools in the Division of Quezon City: Basis for a Proposed Localized Continuous Development Program

Jennifer G. Hinolan

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

jengalanhinolan@gmail.com

Date Submitted:

March 16, 2026

Date Accepted:

June 26, 2026

Date Published:

August 12, 2026

DOI:

10.5281/zenodo.21899029

ABSTRACT

This study determined the extent of implementation of the Quality Management System, School Innovation Practices, and Leadership Support in selected public junior high schools in the Division of Quezon City as the basis for a Localized Continuous Development Program. Quality management was assessed through management review, internal quality audit, corrective actions, risk management, documented information management, training advocacy, and knowledge management. School innovation covered curriculum enhancement, technology integration, pedagogical innovation, teacher development, inclusive education, school management innovation, learners' well-being, and governance and policy innovation. Leadership support was examined through strategic direction,

resource mobilization, capacity building, participative decision-making, communication, motivation, and recognition. The study employed a quantitative descriptive-correlational research design. The respondents were 268 supervisors, school administrators, teachers, and non-teaching personnel from eight selected public junior high schools. Data were obtained through a validated researcher-made questionnaire and analyzed using percentage, weighted mean, one-way analysis of variance, Pearson product-moment correlation, and a test of significance for the correlation coefficient. Findings revealed that the Quality Management System was Highly Evident, School Innovation Practices were Highly Practiced, and Leadership Support was Highly Evident. No significant differences were found among the respondent groups in their assessments of quality management and school innovation. Very strong and significant positive relationships existed among the three major variables. Problems were Least Encountered. The proposed Localized Continuous Development Program was rated Highly Suitable, Highly Acceptable, and Highly Feasible, indicating its potential to strengthen institutional capacity, leadership, innovation, and continuous school improvement.

Keywords: *Quality Management System, School Innovation Practices, Leadership Support, Public Junior High Schools, Continuous Improvement, Localized Continuous Development Program*

INTRODUCTION

Quality education requires school systems that are consistent, responsive, and capable of continuous improvement. Quality Management Systems provide a structured approach for reviewing performance, controlling documented information, identifying risks, conducting audits, and implementing corrective actions. In educational institutions, these mechanisms help align daily operations with institutional goals and stakeholder expectations. The Department of Education institutionalized its Quality Management System through DepEd Order No. 009, s. 2021, reinforcing process standardization, accountability, risk-based thinking, and evidence-based improvement in public schools.

School innovation is equally essential as schools respond to curriculum reforms, technology-driven instruction, learner diversity, and changing community needs. Innovation includes curriculum enhancement, new pedagogical approaches, teacher professional development, inclusive education, learners' well-being programs, and improvements in governance and policy. The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (2020) emphasized that technology and innovation become meaningful when they are integrated with teaching practice, organizational capacity, and equitable access rather than treated as isolated projects.

Leadership support connects quality management and innovation by providing direction, resources, professional learning, communication, empowerment, and recognition. Transformational and instructional leadership research shows that leaders influence organizational outcomes by creating shared goals, improving working conditions, and enabling personnel to participate in change. Without sustained leadership support, quality requirements may become compliance exercises, while innovative initiatives may remain fragmented or short-lived.

Public junior high schools in the Division of Quezon City operate within a complex urban environment characterized by large and diverse school communities, varying resource capacities, and continuing demands for digital transformation and inclusive education. Although quality management and school innovation initiatives are already present, localized evidence remains necessary to determine whether these systems are consistently implemented and mutually reinforcing from the perspectives of supervisors, school administrators, teachers, and non-teaching personnel.

Accordingly, this study assessed the Quality Management System, School Innovation Practices, and Leadership Support in selected public junior high schools in the Division of Quezon City. It examined differences among respondent groups, determined the relationships among the variables, identified implementation challenges, and developed a Localized Continuous Development Program intended to strengthen organizational effectiveness, school innovation, and sustainable quality improvement.

METHODS

Research Design

The study used a quantitative descriptive-correlational research design. The descriptive component established the current extent of quality management, school innovation practices, leadership support, challenges encountered, and the evaluation of the proposed program. The correlational component determined the strength and direction of the associations among the major variables without manipulating the school environment. This design was appropriate for examining naturally occurring organizational practices and stakeholder perceptions.

Research Locale

The study was conducted during School Year 2025–2026 in eight public junior high schools in the Division of Quezon City: Bagong Silangan High School, Camp Crame High School, Judge Juan Luna High School, Masambong High School, Ponciano A. Bernardo High School, Pugad Lawin High School, Sergio Osmeña Sr. High School, and Sta. Lucia High School.

Face-to-face and online survey administration were used to accommodate respondent availability while maintaining confidentiality and voluntary participation.

Sampling Technique

Purposive and proportional sampling techniques were employed because the study required personnel who were directly involved in quality management, school innovation, and leadership processes. Complete enumeration was applied to the seven supervisors, while school administrators, teachers, and non-teaching personnel were proportionately represented. The final sample consisted of 268 respondents from a total population of 810 personnel.

Table 1. *Population and Sample of the Study*

Respondents	Sample
Supervisors	7
School Administrators	17
Teachers	213
Non-Teaching Personnel	31
Total	268

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Assessment of the Quality Management System

The Quality Management System was assessed as Highly Evident, with an overall weighted mean of 4.72. Management Review and Knowledge Management obtained the highest composite means of 4.73, followed by Internal Quality Audit, Documented Information Management, and Training Advocacy, with 4.72. Risk Management obtained 4.71, while Corrective Actions received 4.70.

These consistently high ratings indicate that the schools regularly apply review, audit, documentation, capacity-building, risk-control, corrective-action, and knowledge-sharing processes. The findings also reflect a quality culture in which institutional learning and standardized operating procedures support continuous improvement.

Assessment of School Innovation Practices

School Innovation Practices obtained a grand mean of 4.73 and were rated Highly Practiced. School Governance and Policy Innovation ranked first with a composite weighted mean of 4.84, followed by Learners' Well-Being Programs with 4.73. Teacher Professional Development, Inclusive Education Practices, and Leadership and School Management Innovation each obtained 4.72. Curriculum Development and Enhancement and Pedagogical Innovations received 4.71, while Technology Integration obtained 4.67.

The results demonstrate the broad adoption of innovation across governance, teaching, inclusion, staff development, and student support. Although all dimensions were highly practiced, technology integration received the lowest composite weighted mean, indicating that access to digital resources, infrastructure, and technical capability should receive continued attention.

Significant Difference Among Respondent Groups

The computed F-values for all Quality Management System dimensions ranged from 0.055 to 0.092 and were below the critical value of 2.60 at the 0.05 level of significance. Management Review obtained an F-value of 0.092; Internal Quality Audit, 0.081; Corrective Actions, 0.068; Risk Management, 0.055; Documented Information Management, 0.070; Training Advocacy, 0.082; and Knowledge Management, 0.061.

Likewise, the F-values for School Innovation Practices ranged from 0.058 to 0.093 and were below the same critical value. Therefore, no significant differences were found among the assessments of supervisors, school administrators, teachers, and non-teaching personnel.

The similarity of their assessments indicates a shared understanding and relatively consistent experience of quality management and innovation practices across organizational roles. This agreement suggests that institutional policies and initiatives are communicated and implemented throughout the participating schools.

Extent of Leadership Support

Leadership Support for the Quality Management System and School Innovation Practices was rated Highly Evident, with a grand mean of 4.74. Communication and Feedback Mechanism ranked first, with a composite weighted mean of 4.77. Participative Decision-Making and Empowerment and Motivation and Recognition each obtained 4.75. Vision and Strategic Direction received 4.73, while Resource Provision and Mobilization and Professional Development and Capacity Building each obtained 4.71.

These results indicate that school leaders provide clear direction, encourage personnel participation, maintain open communication, recognize contributions, and support staff development. Such practices are essential for sustaining institutional improvement and organizational commitment. Strong leadership support allows personnel to understand their responsibilities, contribute to decisions, and participate actively in quality and innovation initiatives.

Relationships Among Quality Management, Innovation, and Leadership

Very strong and significant positive relationships were established among the three major variables. Correlations between the Quality Management System and School Innovation Practices ranged from 0.878 to 0.957. Correlations between the Quality Management System and Leadership Support ranged from 0.930 to 0.952, while correlations between School Innovation Practices and Leadership Support ranged from 0.919 to 0.961. All reported p-values were 0.001, which were below the 0.05 level of significance.

These findings demonstrate that stronger leadership support is closely associated with stronger quality processes and more sustained school innovation. Effective leadership provides the vision, resources, professional development, communication, and motivation needed to implement quality management practices successfully. Similarly, mature quality systems create favorable conditions for school innovation by establishing clear procedures, systematic monitoring, accountability, and mechanisms for continuous improvement.

Problems Encountered

Problems related to the Quality Management System and School Innovation Practices were rated Least Encountered, with a grand mean of 2.04. Problems associated with the Quality Management System obtained a composite weighted mean of 1.96, while problems related to School Innovation Practices obtained 2.11.

Supervisors assessed the problems as Not Encountered, while school administrators, teachers, and non-teaching personnel rated them as Least Encountered. Despite the generally favorable assessment, remaining concerns involved limited ICT access, differences in teacher readiness, insufficient time for planning and collaboration, limited resources for innovation, inconsistent monitoring, and the need for sustained leadership support.

These findings indicate that serious implementation barriers are uncommon in the participating schools. Nevertheless, preventive and responsive measures remain necessary to ensure that minor constraints do not eventually affect the sustainability of quality management and school innovation initiatives.

Proposed Localized Continuous Development Program

The Proposed Localized Continuous Development Program was developed to address identified gaps and challenges in quality management systems, school innovation practices, leadership support, and organizational effectiveness.

Its major components include continuous professional development, leadership enhancement, stakeholder engagement, improved resource utilization, systematic monitoring and evaluation, recognition of effective

practices, and mechanisms for sharing institutional knowledge. The program promotes collaboration, accountability, innovation, and continuous improvement to enhance school performance, service delivery, and organizational sustainability.

The program is designed to integrate quality assurance and innovation into continuous school improvement rather than treat them as separate, temporary, or compliance-oriented projects. Through localized activities, the program may respond to the specific needs and conditions of participating schools while maintaining alignment with Department of Education policies and quality standards.

Suitability, Acceptability, and Feasibility of the Proposed Program

The proposed intervention program was rated Highly Feasible, with a composite weighted mean of 4.87; Highly Acceptable, with 4.80; and Highly Suitable, with 4.76.

These ratings indicate that the program is responsive to the needs of the participating schools, practical within existing institutional structures, aligned with educational priorities, and capable of obtaining stakeholder support. The results further demonstrate that the proposed program may be effectively implemented to strengthen professional capacity, leadership practices, stakeholder engagement, resource management, monitoring systems, school innovation, and continuous quality improvement.

CONCLUSION

The selected public junior high schools demonstrate well-established Quality Management Systems, widely practiced school innovation, and strong leadership support. Quality management processes are consistently applied in management review, internal quality audit, corrective action, risk management, documented information management, training advocacy, and knowledge management. Innovation is likewise evident in curriculum improvement, technology integration, pedagogical practices, teacher development, inclusive education, learners' well-being, leadership and school management, and governance and policy innovation.

The common assessments of the four respondent groups further indicate that these practices are understood and experienced consistently across organizational roles. The absence of significant differences suggests that supervisors, school administrators, teachers, and non-teaching personnel share similar perceptions regarding the implementation of quality management and school innovation practices.

The very strong positive relationships among quality management, innovation, and leadership confirm that these systems function interdependently. Effective leadership strengthens the implementation of quality processes and enables personnel to adopt and sustain innovative practices. Similarly, effective quality management provides the structure, accountability, and continuous improvement mechanisms needed to support school innovation.

Although problems were encountered only to a limited extent, continuing attention to ICT access, staff readiness, resource availability, collaboration time, and monitoring remains necessary. The Proposed Localized Continuous Development Program offers a highly suitable, acceptable, and feasible framework for strengthening institutional capacity, accountability, leadership support, innovation, and sustainable school improvement in the Division of Quezon City.

References

- Akpan, E. (2020). *Knowledge management practices in Philippine education*. Philippine Education Press.
- Armstrong, M., & Taylor, S. (2020). *Armstrong's handbook of human resource management practice* (15th ed.). Kogan Page.
- Bush, T. (2022). *Educational leadership and management: Theory, policy, and practice* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.

- Day, C., & Sammons, P. (2021). *Successful school leadership: Education Development Trust research review*. Education Development Trust.
- Department of Education. (2020). *Philippine professional standards for school heads* (DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020).
- Department of Education. (2021). *DepEd ISO QMS documentation manual*.
- Department of Education. (2021). *DepEd Order No. 009, s. 2021: Institutionalization of the DepEd Quality Management System*.
- Department of Education. (2022). *PAWIM: Procedures for corrective actions in quality management systems*.
- Department of Education–Information and Communications Technology Service. (2024). *Digital transformation roadmap for Philippine schools*.
- Department of Education–National Capital Region. (2024). *Regional memorandum on communication and feedback mechanisms*.
- European Foundation for Quality Management. (2020). *The EFQM model 2020: A framework for organizational excellence*. EFQM.
- Fullan, M., & Quinn, J. (2020). *Coherence: The right drivers in action for schools, districts, and systems*. Corwin Press.
- Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M. (2020). *Professional capital after the pandemic: Revisiting and renewing the transformation of teaching*. Teachers College Press.
- Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. *School Leadership & Management*, 40(1), 5–22.
- Leithwood, K., & Sun, J. (2020). *Leading with impact: The research base for effective educational leadership*. Springer.
- Mendoza, P., & Calub, R. (2022). *Governance and QMS outcomes in schools*. Philippine School Management Publications.
- Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2020). *Innovating education and educating for innovation: The power of digital technologies and skills*. OECD Publishing.
- Po, L., & Cabral, R. (2024). *Teacher agency and professional growth in school innovation*. Educational Development Press.
- San Antonio, M. (2020). *Project for innovation: Pedagogical innovations in schools*. Philippine Education Press.
- Schools Division Office–Quezon City. (2025). *Project L.E.A.D. handbook: Capacity building and leadership enhancement*.
- Siedlecki, S. L. (2023). *Descriptive-correlational research design in nursing and health studies*. Springer Publishing.
- Smith, P., & Lewis, R. (2024). Quality assurance systems and school performance. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 32(4).
- United Nations Children’s Fund. (2023). *Education in a post-COVID world: Nine ideas for public action*. UNICEF.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2021). *Global education monitoring report 2021: Inclusion and education—All means all*. UNESCO.
- World Bank. (2024). *Systems approach for better education results implementation toolkit*. World Bank.