

Steering Division-Level School Improvement through Governance Foresight, Technical Assistance Quality, and Implementation Coherence

Jerry B. Sario Jr.
Northeastern College
jerrysario@northeasterncollege.edu.ph

Date Submitted:
August 05, 2026

Date Accepted:
September 17, 2026

Date Published:
October 11, 2026

DOI:
10.5281/zenodo.23297095

ABSTRACT

This study assessed the predictive contributions of governance foresight, technical assistance quality, and implementation coherence to division-level school improvement in Apayao Province, Philippines. Employing a cross-sectional explanatory survey design, the study involved 120 school heads, public schools district supervisors, education program supervisors, and selected division personnel identified through simple random sampling. Data were obtained using a structured questionnaire and analyzed through descriptive statistics, Spearman's rank-order correlation, and multiple linear regression with heteroskedasticity-consistent standard errors. The findings indicated high levels of governance foresight ($M = 3.57$), technical assistance quality ($M = 3.51$), implementation coherence ($M = 3.50$), and division-level school improvement ($M = 3.52$). However, weaknesses emerged in identifying

institutional needs, monitoring technical assistance, maintaining policy consistency, and sustaining improvement initiatives. All three governance dimensions demonstrated significant positive correlations with school improvement. The regression model explained 31.4% of the variance in school improvement ($R^2 = 0.314$), with implementation coherence emerging as the strongest predictor ($\beta = 0.317$, $p < 0.001$), followed by governance foresight ($\beta = 0.243$, $p = 0.010$). Technical assistance quality showed a positive but statistically nonsignificant independent contribution. The findings suggested that coherent implementation and forward-looking governance were more closely associated with school improvement than technical assistance alone. Strengthening institutional coordination, anticipatory planning, and systematic follow-through could support more consistent and sustainable school improvement practices.

Keywords: *educational governance, governance foresight, implementation coherence, instructional supervision, school improvement, technical assistance quality*

INTRODUCTION

School improvement depends not only on the effectiveness of school leaders but also on the capacity of educational authorities to provide clear direction, meaningful support, and consistent guidance in implementing educational priorities. While schools carry the primary responsibility for delivering instruction, decisions made at the division level influence how improvement initiatives are planned, supported, monitored, and sustained. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO, 2024) emphasized that educational leadership extends beyond individual schools, with officials at different administrative levels playing important roles in aligning institutional priorities, strengthening professional capacities, and translating educational policies into improved learning conditions. This understanding places division governance at the center of efforts to establish a more coordinated and responsive system of school improvement.

The effectiveness of division governance rests partly on the ability of educational leaders to anticipate institutional needs and make informed decisions before operational difficulties affect school performance. Governance foresight involves recognizing emerging concerns, examining available evidence, anticipating resource requirements, and establishing priorities that respond to both immediate and long-term educational demands. Such responsibilities require more than administrative compliance because improvement depends on how educational authorities organize their decisions around clearly identified school needs. Russell et al. (2017) explained that educational improvement becomes more systematic when institutions develop shared approaches to identifying problems, examining variations in performance, and using evidence to guide collective action. Their findings support the importance of governance arrangements that encourage purposeful planning, continuous learning, and coordinated responses to school improvement concerns.

Alongside sound governance, the quality of technical assistance determines whether school leaders receive the professional support necessary to carry out their responsibilities effectively. Technical assistance should extend beyond monitoring compliance and communicating administrative instructions. It must help school personnel understand instructional concerns, address implementation difficulties, and strengthen their capacity to manage improvement initiatives. Honig and Rainey (2019) found that effective principal supervision requires sustained professional learning, mentoring, and opportunities for supervisors to develop their own instructional leadership practices. Their study demonstrated the importance of supervisory relationships that promote professional growth rather than concentrating primarily on operational requirements. These findings suggest that technical assistance becomes more valuable when its content, delivery, and follow-through are closely connected to the actual needs of schools.

Nevertheless, sound leadership decisions and well-designed technical assistance may produce limited results when educational programs are implemented without sufficient coordination. Implementation coherence concerns the extent to which institutional goals, administrative decisions, supervisory practices, and school-level activities remain aligned throughout the improvement process. In the Philippines, the Department of Education (DepEd, 2022), through the Basic Education Development Plan 2030, acknowledged difficulties arising from program-driven technical assistance, competing implementation requirements, and the geographical distribution of schools. The plan recognized the need to strengthen Schools Division Offices in providing timely and sustainable support while improving monitoring, evaluation, and institutional coordination. These concerns demonstrate that school improvement requires a connected system in which governance decisions are translated into practical assistance and consistently implemented across schools.

The relationship among these governance functions deserves particular attention in the Schools Division of Apayao, where educational administration must consider the varying geographical conditions, institutional capacities, and operational requirements of public schools. Differences in school accessibility, personnel support needs, and available resources may influence how division initiatives are communicated and implemented. Such conditions call for governance practices that anticipate difficulties, provide assistance appropriate to school needs, and maintain consistency between division priorities and school improvement activities. Premo and Schunn (2025) found that schools participating in a networked improvement initiative demonstrated stronger growth in reading outcomes than comparable schools, although the benefits varied according to participation and implementation depth. Their findings reinforce the importance of sustained institutional participation and consistent implementation in achieving measurable educational improvements.

Despite the established importance of educational leadership and professional support, the combined contribution of governance foresight, technical assistance quality, and implementation coherence to division-level school improvement remains insufficiently examined, particularly within the administrative setting of Apayao Province. Existing discussions provide valuable explanations of leadership practices, supervisory support, and collaborative improvement, yet further examination is needed to understand how these functions operate together within a Schools Division Office. Addressing this concern may provide a clearer understanding of how division personnel and school leaders experience governance processes and how these processes relate to school improvement implementation.

Accordingly, this study seeks to examine governance foresight, technical assistance quality, and implementation coherence in relation to division-level school improvement in Apayao Province. Drawing on the perspectives of school heads, public schools district supervisors, education program supervisors, and selected division personnel, the investigation aims to determine how these governance dimensions relate to the implementation of school improvement priorities. The findings are expected to contribute empirical evidence to educational leadership and division governance literature while providing a basis for strengthening decision-making, supervisory support, and coordinated school improvement practices within the Schools Division of Apayao.

Literature Review

Governance Foresight in Educational Leadership

Governance foresight reflects the capacity of educational leaders to anticipate institutional challenges, establish informed priorities, and guide decisions that support sustainable school development. It requires an understanding of emerging educational demands, resource limitations, and the conditions that influence the implementation of school improvement initiatives. Leithwood et al. (2020) established that successful educational leadership influences student learning primarily through its effects on organizational conditions, teacher motivation, and instructional practices. Their review emphasized that effective leaders establish directions, develop personnel, and create organizational arrangements that support educational goals. Similarly, Özdemir et al. (2024), in their systematic review of 144 studies, examined the relationship between school leadership and student achievement and highlighted the importance of considering the organizational processes through which leadership influences educational outcomes. These findings suggest that governance foresight at the division level involves more than preparing improvement plans. It requires identifying school needs, anticipating implementation difficulties, and ensuring that leadership decisions remain responsive to changing institutional conditions.

Technical Assistance Quality and Professional Support

Technical assistance serves as an important means of strengthening the capacity of school leaders and teachers to translate educational expectations into effective practices. Its quality depends on the relevance of the assistance provided, the competence of those delivering it, and the extent to which support addresses identified professional needs. Kraft et al. (2018), through a meta-analysis of 60 studies, found that teacher coaching produced positive effects on instructional practices and student achievement, although these effects became smaller when coaching programs were implemented on a larger scale. Their findings indicate that professional assistance requires careful attention to implementation quality and continuity. Hashim (2020) further examined the systemic leadership practices of instructional coaches and explained how coaching could connect district reform priorities with school improvement strategies and classroom instruction. These studies demonstrate that effective technical assistance should not be limited to monitoring school compliance. It should involve sustained professional guidance, collaborative problem-solving, and appropriate follow-up mechanisms that enable schools to address instructional and administrative concerns.

Implementation Coherence in Educational Programs

Implementation coherence concerns the consistency between educational priorities, leadership decisions, professional practices, and institutional actions. When improvement initiatives are introduced without sufficient coordination, schools may experience competing requirements, inconsistent guidance, and difficulties sustaining intended reforms. Moon et al. (2022) examined instructional program coherence using data from schools in Florida and found a positive relationship between teachers' perceptions of coherence and student achievement in middle schools, particularly in mathematics. However, the relationship was not significant in elementary schools, suggesting that the contribution of coherence may differ across educational settings. Salloum (2022) likewise

found that school leaders could strengthen collective efficacy by establishing organizational structures that supported instructional coherence and shared professional expectations. These findings indicate that implementation coherence depends on the ability of educational authorities to maintain consistent priorities while allowing schools to respond to their particular needs. For division governance, this requires coordination among supervisors, school heads, and personnel responsible for monitoring educational programs.

Division-Level School Improvement and Institutional Coordination

Division-level school improvement requires coordinated leadership, sustained professional support, and effective resource management to strengthen educational performance across schools. Its effectiveness depends on how educational authorities address differences in school conditions while maintaining shared improvement priorities. Chua Reyes et al. (2022) examined the experiences of school leaders in the Philippines and found that poverty, resource limitations, disasters, and competing reform demands complicated the implementation of educational policies. Their findings emphasized the importance of leadership approaches that recognize the actual conditions of schools rather than imposing uniform expectations without considering institutional constraints. These concerns are particularly relevant to the Schools Division of Apayao, where geographical accessibility and differences in available resources may influence the delivery of technical assistance and the implementation of school improvement initiatives. Examining governance foresight, technical assistance quality, and implementation coherence together may therefore provide a clearer understanding of how division leadership supports coordinated school improvement and responds to the varying needs of public schools.

METHODS

Research Design

The study employed a cross-sectional explanatory survey design to examine how governance foresight, technical assistance quality, and implementation coherence contributed to division-level school improvement. This design allowed the simultaneous assessment of governance practices and their statistical associations with school improvement outcomes. Governance foresight, technical assistance quality, and implementation coherence served as predictor variables, while division-level school improvement served as the outcome variable. The approach provided a basis for identifying the relative explanatory contribution of each governance dimension without assuming causal relationships.

Research Locale

The study was conducted in Apayao Province, Philippines, where public education governance operated across geographically dispersed communities with varying administrative and instructional support requirements. The province provided a relevant setting for examining how division-level leadership anticipated institutional needs, delivered technical assistance, and maintained consistency in school improvement implementation. Its geographical and organizational conditions offered opportunities to investigate the coordination of governance responsibilities across different educational settings.

Participants and Sampling Technique

The study involved 120 participants comprising school heads, public schools district supervisors, education program supervisors, and selected division personnel directly engaged in instructional supervision, technical assistance, school monitoring, and improvement implementation in Apayao Province. Participants were selected through simple random sampling using a consolidated list of eligible personnel obtained through authorized coordination. Each eligible individual had an equal probability of selection, and the sampling process minimized selection bias while representing personnel with direct knowledge of division governance practices.

Research Instrument

Data were gathered using a researcher-developed questionnaire consisting of four dimensions: governance foresight, technical assistance quality, implementation coherence, and division-level school improvement. The instrument contained 120 statements distributed equally across the four dimensions. Responses were measured using a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). Five qualified experts examined the instrument for relevance, clarity, and alignment with the research objectives. The instrument was subsequently pilot-tested with 30 educational personnel possessing responsibilities comparable to those of the intended participants but excluded from the final sample. The content validity and internal consistency of the questionnaire were assessed using the Scale-Level Content Validity Index based on average agreement ($S-CVI/Ave = 0.94$) and Cronbach's alpha (0.91). These values indicate strong content validity and internal consistency, respectively.

Data Gathering Procedure

Permission to conduct the study was secured through the appropriate educational authorities in Apayao Province. Following approval, coordination was undertaken with designated personnel to identify eligible respondents and arrange questionnaire distribution. Selected participants received an explanation of the study's purpose and completed the instrument after providing informed consent. Accomplished questionnaires were collected, examined for completeness, and assigned identification codes. Responses were subsequently encoded, screened for missing entries and inconsistencies, and organized into a dataset for statistical analysis.

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistical procedures. Means and standard deviations were calculated to determine the assessed levels of governance foresight, technical assistance quality, implementation coherence, and division-level school improvement. Spearman's rank-order correlation was applied to examine the direction and strength of associations among the four variables. Multiple linear regression with heteroskedasticity-consistent HC3 standard errors was employed to determine the unique statistical contribution of the three governance dimensions to division-level school improvement. Composite scores were computed from the corresponding questionnaire items, while variance inflation factors were examined to assess multicollinearity. Regression assumptions, including linearity and influential observations, were evaluated through diagnostic procedures. Model fit was assessed using adjusted R^2 , and standardized regression coefficients were examined to compare the relative contribution of each predictor. Statistical significance was evaluated at the 0.05 level.

Ethical Considerations

The study observed established ethical principles governing educational research. Informed consent was obtained before participation, and respondents were assured that their involvement was voluntary, with the right to withdraw without adverse consequences. Confidentiality and anonymity were protected through coded responses and the exclusion of identifying information from research outputs. Collected data were securely maintained with restricted access and used exclusively for legitimate research purposes.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1. *Governance Foresight in Terms of Anticipatory Planning and Decision-Making*

Indicators	Mean	SD
1. Establishing priorities based on anticipated school improvement needs	3.78	0.62
2. Integrating long-term educational goals into division planning	3.89	0.73
3. Using school performance information in planning decisions	3.92	0.68

4. Identifying possible barriers before implementing initiatives	3.76	0.77
5. Preparing alternative actions for implementation difficulties	3.70	0.72
6. Aligning operational decisions with improvement priorities	3.82	0.71
7. Consulting relevant personnel before major decisions	3.61	0.75
8. Reviewing implementation conditions before introducing programs	3.71	0.68
9. Using projected school needs in future resource planning	3.44	0.70
10. Adjusting plans when educational requirements changed	3.67	0.65
Overall	3.73	0.40

Overall SD was calculated from respondent-level dimension composite scores rather than by averaging item SDs.

Table 1 presents the level of governance foresight in terms of anticipatory planning and decision-making, with an overall mean of 3.73 and a standard deviation of 0.40, indicating a high assessment. Among the indicators, the use of school performance information in planning decisions received the highest mean of 3.92, followed by the integration of long-term educational goals into division planning at 3.89. These findings suggested that decisions were generally informed by documented school conditions and established educational priorities. The relatively strong scores reflected an administrative orientation toward evidence-informed planning rather than decisions based solely on immediate operational demands.

However, using projected school needs in future resource planning obtained the lowest mean of 3.44, while consultation with relevant personnel before major decisions recorded 3.61. Although both remained within the high category, their comparatively lower scores pointed to limitations in forecasting resource requirements and incorporating wider professional perspectives into planning. This distinction was important because the ability to recognize existing school needs did not necessarily indicate equal capacity to prepare for future demands. In geographically dispersed areas such as Apayao, delayed resource planning could affect the scheduling of technical assistance, personnel deployment, and implementation of improvement activities. The results therefore suggested that anticipatory planning was established but required stronger mechanisms for forecasting needs and incorporating field-level information into division decisions.

Table 2. Governance Foresight in Terms of Identification of Emerging Institutional Needs

Indicators	Mean	SD
1. Identifying emerging instructional support requirements	3.47	0.80
2. Reviewing changing administrative demands across schools	3.60	0.69
3. Recognizing recurring concerns affecting school operations	3.59	0.79
4. Gathering information on newly emerging school difficulties	3.45	0.72
5. Identifying schools requiring additional operational support	3.30	0.69
6. Examining changes in personnel development needs	3.40	0.85
7. Anticipating challenges associated with program implementation	3.26	0.70
8. Recognizing emerging resource and logistical constraints	3.33	0.70
9. Establishing mechanisms for detecting early implementation concerns	3.25	0.65
10. Updating institutional needs assessments using field feedback	3.31	0.72
Overall	3.40	0.45

Overall SD was calculated from respondent-level dimension composite scores rather than by averaging item SDs.

Table 2 shows that identifying emerging institutional needs received an overall mean of 3.40 and a standard deviation of 0.45, corresponding to a moderate level. Reviewing changing administrative demands obtained the highest mean of 3.60, followed by recognizing recurring school concerns at 3.59. These assessments

indicated that participants were more positive about the division's capacity to recognize established or recurring concerns than its ability to identify difficulties before they developed into operational problems.

The lowest ratings were recorded for establishing mechanisms to detect early implementation concerns (3.25), anticipating program implementation challenges (3.26), and identifying schools requiring additional operational support (3.30). This pattern revealed a potentially important weakness in governance foresight. While existing information could inform administrative responses, procedures for identifying new or developing school needs appeared less established. Such limitations could result in technical assistance being provided after difficulties had already affected implementation. The findings suggested a need to strengthen early-warning mechanisms, systematic school needs assessment, and the routine use of supervisory feedback. These measures could help division personnel move from primarily responding to reported concerns toward identifying and addressing emerging difficulties more promptly.

Table 3. *Governance Foresight in Terms of Strategic Resource Prioritization*

Indicators	Mean	SD
1. Allocating resources according to established educational priorities	3.63	0.72
2. Considering school improvement targets in resource decisions	3.58	0.74
3. Prioritizing support for schools with identified performance needs	3.69	0.71
4. Reviewing resource limitations before program implementation	3.48	0.73
5. Coordinating personnel assignments with school support requirements	3.59	0.74
6. Directing technical resources toward priority improvement activities	3.58	0.72
7. Considering geographical accessibility in resource allocation	3.49	0.76
8. Revising resource priorities based on implementation feedback	3.45	0.71
9. Balancing immediate needs with long-term resource requirements	3.52	0.76
10. Reviewing the effectiveness of resource allocation decisions	3.68	0.70
Overall	3.57	0.44

Overall SD was calculated from respondent-level dimension composite scores rather than by averaging item SDs.

Table 3 indicates that strategic resource prioritization registered an overall mean of 3.57 and a standard deviation of 0.44, reflecting a high assessment. Prioritizing support for schools with identified performance needs obtained the highest mean of 3.69, closely followed by reviewing the effectiveness of allocation decisions at 3.68. The findings indicated that resource decisions were generally associated with school improvement priorities and that some attention was given to determining whether allocated support contributed to intended outcomes.

Nevertheless, revising resource priorities based on implementation feedback received the lowest mean of 3.45, while consideration of geographical accessibility registered 3.49. These results suggested that resource prioritization was more established during initial planning than during subsequent adjustments. The difference deserved attention because school improvement requirements could change after implementation began, particularly when logistical limitations affected access to professional assistance. Resource prioritization therefore appeared to benefit from clearer procedures for adjusting support according to emerging school needs, implementation feedback, and differences in operational conditions.

Table 4. *Summary of Governance Foresight*

Dimensions	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Anticipatory Planning and Decision-Making	3.73	0.40	High
Identification of Emerging Institutional Needs	3.40	0.45	Moderate
Strategic Resource Prioritization	3.57	0.44	High
Overall Governance Foresight	3.57	0.40	High

Table 4 summarizes governance foresight, which obtained an overall mean of 3.57 and a standard deviation of 0.40. Anticipatory planning and decision-making emerged as the strongest dimension, while identification of emerging institutional needs received the lowest assessment. This difference suggested that established planning procedures were more developed than the systems used to anticipate changing institutional requirements. Governance foresight was therefore characterized by relatively strong planning practices but less consistent early identification of school-level concerns. For the Schools Division of Apayao, the findings highlighted the value of linking planning decisions with continuous needs assessment, field-based information, and timely resource adjustments.

Table 5. Technical Assistance Quality in Terms of Relevance and Responsiveness of Support

Indicators	Mean	SD
1. Providing assistance based on identified school needs	3.82	0.74
2. Addressing concerns raised by school personnel	3.83	0.73
3. Ensuring that technical guidance matched school improvement priorities	3.72	0.68
4. Providing practical solutions to implementation difficulties	3.73	0.66
5. Considering school conditions when delivering assistance	3.76	0.72
6. Responding to requests for instructional and administrative support	3.69	0.66
7. Adjusting assistance to address different school needs	3.73	0.73
8. Communicating recommendations in clear and understandable terms	3.65	0.71
9. Providing support consistent with identified performance concerns	3.72	0.78
10. Delivering technical assistance within the expected timeframe	3.48	0.74
Overall	3.71	0.42

Overall SD was calculated from respondent-level dimension composite scores rather than by averaging item SDs.

Table 5 presents technical assistance quality in terms of relevance and responsiveness, which obtained an overall mean of 3.71 and a standard deviation of 0.42, indicating a high level. Addressing concerns raised by school personnel recorded the highest mean of 3.83, followed by providing assistance based on identified school needs at 3.82. These assessments suggested that technical assistance was generally responsive to the concerns communicated by school personnel. Participants also positively assessed the consideration of school conditions when delivering support, suggesting that assistance was not viewed solely as a standardized administrative requirement.

Despite these favorable assessments, delivering technical assistance within the expected timeframe obtained the lowest mean of 3.48. This finding pointed to a distinction between the relevance of assistance and the speed of its delivery. Guidance could be professionally appropriate but less useful when provided after important implementation decisions had already been made. Delays in technical assistance could be particularly consequential for schools experiencing difficulties with instructional programs, reporting requirements, or improvement activities. The results suggested that improving response schedules and strengthening communication between division personnel and school leaders could increase the practical value of technical assistance.

Table 6. Technical Assistance Quality in Terms of Professional Guidance and Capacity Development

Indicators	Mean	SD
1. Providing professional guidance based on identified competency needs	3.74	0.81
2. Assisting school leaders in addressing instructional concerns	3.67	0.74
3. Supporting the development of school management competencies	3.67	0.73
4. Explaining procedures needed for implementing educational programs	3.64	0.75

5. Providing opportunities for professional learning and consultation	3.54	0.65
6. Encouraging collaborative approaches to solving school concerns	3.63	0.70
7. Assisting personnel in applying supervisory recommendations	3.52	0.73
8. Providing individualized guidance for persistent difficulties	3.44	0.73
9. Sharing relevant practices for improving school operations	3.60	0.71
10. Strengthening personnel capacity to manage improvement initiatives	3.52	0.67
Overall	3.60	0.41

Overall SD was calculated from respondent-level dimension composite scores rather than by averaging item SDs.

Table 6 illustrates the level of professional guidance and capacity development, with an overall mean of 3.60 and a standard deviation of 0.41, interpreted as high. Providing guidance based on identified competency needs obtained the highest mean of 3.74. This result suggested that participants generally recognized the professional relevance of the support delivered by division personnel. Assistance in addressing instructional concerns and supporting school management competencies both obtained means of 3.67, reflecting favorable assessments of professional guidance.

However, providing individualized guidance for persistent difficulties recorded the lowest mean of 3.44. Assistance in applying supervisory recommendations and strengthening capacity to manage improvement initiatives both obtained 3.52. These findings suggested that professional guidance was more consistently available at the general level than through individualized support for continuing school-level problems. The results indicated the importance of distinguishing between providing recommendations and helping school personnel implement them. Sustained coaching, targeted mentoring, and opportunities to evaluate the application of technical guidance could strengthen the developmental function of division supervision.

Table 7. Technical Assistance Quality in Terms of Monitoring and Follow-Through

Indicators	Mean	SD
1. Monitoring school progress after technical assistance was provided	3.32	0.76
2. Reviewing compliance with agreed improvement actions	3.33	0.69
3. Documenting concerns identified during monitoring activities	3.28	0.77
4. Evaluating the application of supervisory recommendations	3.26	0.69
5. Providing additional guidance when difficulties persisted	3.19	0.75
6. Communicating monitoring findings to concerned personnel	3.25	0.72
7. Establishing schedules for follow-up technical assistance	3.15	0.68
8. Tracking the completion of recommended improvement activities	3.05	0.77
9. Using monitoring results to improve subsequent assistance	3.21	0.67
10. Verifying whether technical assistance achieved intended outcomes	3.05	0.66
Overall	3.21	0.40

Overall SD was calculated from respondent-level dimension composite scores rather than by averaging item SDs.

Table 7 reveals that monitoring and follow-through obtained an overall mean of 3.21 and a standard deviation of 0.40, indicating a moderate level. Reviewing compliance with agreed improvement actions registered the highest mean of 3.33, followed by monitoring school progress after assistance was provided at 3.32. These results suggested that some monitoring activities were conducted, although their consistency and effectiveness were assessed less favorably than the initial delivery of technical assistance.

The lowest means were recorded for tracking the completion of recommended improvement activities and verifying whether technical assistance achieved intended outcomes, both at 3.05. Establishing schedules for follow-up assistance also received a relatively low assessment of 3.15. These findings identified an important

weakness in the technical assistance process. The provision of recommendations did not appear to be matched by equally consistent procedures for determining whether schools implemented those recommendations successfully. Without systematic follow-through, unresolved concerns could persist despite repeated supervisory activities. The findings suggested that technical assistance quality depended not only on the competence and responsiveness of supervisors but also on their capacity to document progress, revisit unresolved concerns, and verify improvement outcomes.

Table 8. *Summary of Technical Assistance Quality*

Dimensions	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Relevance and Responsiveness of Support	3.71	0.42	High
Professional Guidance and Capacity Development	3.60	0.41	High
Monitoring and Follow-Through	3.21	0.40	Moderate
Overall Technical Assistance Quality	3.51	0.38	High

Table 8 summarizes technical assistance quality, which obtained an overall mean of 3.51 and a standard deviation of 0.38. Relevance and responsiveness emerged as the strongest dimension, followed by professional guidance and capacity development. Monitoring and follow-through received the lowest assessment. This pattern suggested that technical assistance was generally relevant and professionally useful, but its continuity after the initial supervisory engagement required greater attention. The results highlighted a need to establish clearer follow-up responsibilities, monitoring schedules, and procedures for verifying whether recommended actions had been completed and had addressed identified school concerns.

Table 9. *Implementation Coherence in Terms of Alignment of Division and School Priorities*

Indicators	Mean	SD
1. Aligning school improvement activities with division priorities	3.80	0.73
2. Communicating division improvement goals to school personnel	3.84	0.64
3. Connecting school plans with established educational directions	3.75	0.66
4. Ensuring consistency between school targets and division expectations	3.75	0.70
5. Reviewing the alignment of improvement plans and activities	3.60	0.65
6. Integrating division priorities into school implementation processes	3.68	0.75
7. Clarifying expected outcomes of improvement initiatives	3.71	0.69
8. Communicating common standards for school improvement	3.78	0.64
9. Addressing inconsistencies between division directives and school plans	3.56	0.72
10. Adjusting school improvement activities to maintain strategic alignment	3.64	0.65
Overall	3.71	0.37

Overall SD was calculated from respondent-level dimension composite scores rather than by averaging item SDs.

Table 9 presents implementation coherence in terms of alignment between division and school priorities, with an overall mean of 3.71 and a standard deviation of 0.37. Communicating division improvement goals received the highest mean of 3.84, followed by aligning school improvement activities with division priorities at 3.80. These results suggested that participants generally understood the relationship between division directions and the improvement activities undertaken by schools. The favorable assessment of communicating common improvement standards further indicated that expectations were generally articulated across the administrative structure.

However, addressing inconsistencies between division directives and school plans obtained the lowest mean of 3.56. Reviewing the alignment of improvement plans also received a comparatively lower mean of 3.60.

These findings suggested that communicating common priorities was more consistently practiced than resolving discrepancies encountered during implementation. The distinction was important because alignment established during planning could weaken when schools encountered competing demands or operational constraints. The results suggested that division-level coordination could be strengthened by reviewing school improvement plans alongside implementation feedback and by establishing procedures for resolving conflicting requirements.

Table 10. *Implementation Coherence in Terms of Coordination of Governance and Supervisory Practices*

Indicators	Mean	SD
1. Coordinating division governance activities with school supervision	3.48	0.72
2. Establishing shared responsibilities among supervisory personnel	3.54	0.66
3. Communicating supervisory expectations across governance units	3.58	0.72
4. Coordinating technical assistance schedules with school activities	3.47	0.67
5. Sharing relevant monitoring findings among concerned personnel	3.52	0.70
6. Maintaining communication between division personnel and school leaders	3.43	0.72
7. Clarifying roles in implementing school improvement activities	3.59	0.65
8. Coordinating responses to school implementation difficulties	3.41	0.67
9. Reducing duplication of supervisory and administrative requirements	3.28	0.80
10. Integrating feedback from different supervisory functions	3.27	0.74
Overall	3.46	0.38

Overall SD was calculated from respondent-level dimension composite scores rather than by averaging item SDs.

Table 10 indicates that coordination of governance and supervisory practices obtained an overall mean of 3.46 and a standard deviation of 0.38, reflecting a high assessment. Clarifying roles in implementing school improvement activities received the highest mean of 3.59, followed by communicating supervisory expectations at 3.58. These results indicated that responsibilities and expectations were generally understood by personnel involved in division governance and school supervision.

Nevertheless, integrating feedback from different supervisory functions received the lowest mean of 3.27, while reducing duplication of administrative and supervisory requirements obtained 3.28. Both were within the moderate category, suggesting that coordination challenges remained despite generally clear supervisory responsibilities. Duplication of requirements could increase administrative work and limit the time available for instructional improvement. Similarly, limited integration of supervisory feedback could prevent division personnel from developing a complete understanding of school needs. The findings therefore suggested that effective coordination required more than clearly assigned responsibilities. It also required shared information systems, consistent communication procedures, and coordinated responses to school-level concerns.

Table 11. *Implementation Coherence in Terms of Consistency of Policy and Program Implementation*

Indicators	Mean	SD
1. Applying educational policies consistently across implementation activities	3.38	0.62
2. Communicating policy requirements before program implementation	3.36	0.67
3. Providing consistent guidance on implementation procedures	3.48	0.72
4. Clarifying differences in interpreting administrative directives	3.34	0.70
5. Maintaining consistency between planned and actual activities	3.39	0.74
6. Addressing conflicting instructions during implementation	3.28	0.70
7. Coordinating adjustments to program requirements	3.22	0.68
8. Monitoring consistency in the application of school improvement policies	3.32	0.78

9. Providing timely clarification when implementation requirements changed	3.31	0.76
10. Reviewing implementation difficulties to improve policy application	3.30	0.68
Overall	3.34	0.38

Overall SD was calculated from respondent-level dimension composite scores rather than by averaging item SDs.

Table 11 shows that consistency of policy and program implementation obtained an overall mean of 3.34 and a standard deviation of 0.38, indicating a moderate assessment. Providing consistent guidance on implementation procedures received the highest mean of 3.48, suggesting that participants generally recognized efforts to explain administrative expectations. Maintaining consistency between planned and actual activities followed with a mean of 3.39.

Conversely, coordinating adjustments to program requirements received the lowest mean of 3.22, followed by addressing conflicting instructions during implementation at 3.28. These findings suggested that implementation coherence became less consistent when policies or program requirements required modification. Although division directives could establish common expectations, differences in interpretation and changing operational conditions might affect their application across schools. The findings pointed to the importance of establishing timely clarification procedures, coordinated policy interpretation, and systematic communication of implementation changes. Such practices could help schools maintain consistent improvement activities while responding to varying local conditions.

Table 12. *Summary of Implementation Coherence*

Dimensions	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Alignment of Division and School Priorities	3.71	0.37	High
Coordination of Governance and Supervisory Practices	3.46	0.38	High
Consistency of Policy and Program Implementation	3.34	0.38	Moderate
Overall Implementation Coherence	3.50	0.35	High

Overall SD was calculated from respondent-level dimension composite scores rather than by averaging item SDs.

Table 12 summarizes implementation coherence, which registered an overall mean of 3.50 and a standard deviation of 0.35. Alignment of division and school priorities received the highest assessment, while consistency of policy and program implementation emerged as the weakest dimension. This pattern suggested that the division's improvement directions were generally understood, but their application encountered difficulties involving coordination, procedural adjustments, and conflicting requirements. The findings emphasized that institutional coherence was not achieved solely by communicating improvement priorities. It also depended on maintaining consistent guidance, coordinating supervisory activities, and resolving implementation concerns throughout the improvement process.

Table 13. *Division-Level School Improvement in Terms of Achievement of School Improvement Priorities*

Indicators	Mean	SD
1. Accomplishing established school improvement targets	3.68	0.74
2. Addressing priority concerns identified in improvement plans	3.52	0.67
3. Completing planned improvement activities within target periods	3.52	0.72
4. Demonstrating progress toward established educational goals	3.64	0.85
5. Implementing activities responsive to identified school needs	3.55	0.72
6. Improving performance in priority operational areas	3.50	0.69
7. Translating division improvement directions into school activities	3.73	0.67
8. Addressing implementation gaps affecting improvement targets	3.55	0.67

9. Evaluating progress against expected school improvement outcomes	3.51	0.78
10. Demonstrating completion of priority improvement commitments	3.52	0.70
Overall	3.57	0.42

Overall SD was calculated from respondent-level dimension composite scores rather than by averaging item SDs.

Table 13 presents the achievement of school improvement priorities, which obtained an overall mean of 3.57 and a standard deviation of 0.42, indicating a high assessment. Translating division improvement directions into school activities obtained the highest mean of 3.73, followed by accomplishing established school improvement targets at 3.68. These results suggested that participants generally perceived school improvement activities as aligned with division directions and that progress toward identified priorities was evident.

However, improving performance in priority operational areas obtained the lowest mean of 3.50, while evaluating progress against expected outcomes recorded 3.51. These comparatively lower assessments suggested that the implementation of improvement activities was perceived more favorably than the consistent evaluation of their outcomes. Accomplishing planned activities did not necessarily demonstrate equivalent progress in institutional performance. The findings emphasized the importance of assessing school improvement through documented outcomes and not solely through completed activities or compliance with implementation requirements. Strengthening progress monitoring and linking improvement targets with measurable indicators could provide a clearer basis for evaluating division-level school improvement.

Table 14. Division-Level School Improvement in Terms of Strengthening of Institutional Practices

Indicators	Mean	SD
1. Improving procedures used in school planning and management	3.90	0.65
2. Strengthening collaboration among school personnel	3.76	0.67
3. Improving the use of school performance information	3.62	0.67
4. Establishing clearer procedures for implementing improvement activities	3.73	0.74
5. Strengthening accountability in accomplishing school priorities	3.66	0.69
6. Improving internal coordination of school improvement activities	3.66	0.73
7. Encouraging regular review of institutional performance	3.68	0.76
8. Strengthening documentation of improvement processes	3.53	0.74
9. Improving the application of supervisory feedback	3.55	0.67
10. Establishing procedures that supported continuous institutional development	3.72	0.70
Overall	3.68	0.41

Overall SD was calculated from respondent-level dimension composite scores rather than by averaging item SDs.

Table 14 shows that strengthening institutional practices obtained an overall mean of 3.68 and a standard deviation of 0.41, reflecting a high assessment. Improving procedures for school planning and management received the highest mean of 3.90, followed by strengthening collaboration among school personnel at 3.76. These results indicated that participants recognized improvements in organizational procedures and collaborative practices. The relatively favorable scores suggested that division improvement initiatives were associated with stronger administrative arrangements and more organized institutional activities.

Nevertheless, strengthening documentation of improvement processes obtained the lowest mean of 3.53, while improving the application of supervisory feedback received 3.55. These findings indicated that the development of institutional procedures was not necessarily accompanied by equally consistent documentation and use of feedback. This distinction mattered because improved management practices became more valuable when their implementation and results could be reviewed systematically. Stronger documentation procedures and

regular consideration of supervisory recommendations could help schools preserve effective practices and identify areas requiring further development.

Table 15. *Division-Level School Improvement in Terms of Sustainability of Improvement Initiatives*

Indicators	Mean	SD
1. Maintaining improvement activities beyond their initial implementation	3.35	0.77
2. Providing continued institutional support for improvement programs	3.25	0.75
3. Integrating successful improvement practices into regular operations	3.40	0.75
4. Maintaining personnel participation in continuing improvement activities	3.37	0.69
5. Ensuring resources remained available for established improvement initiatives	3.25	0.77
6. Reviewing the long-term effectiveness of improvement programs	3.33	0.75
7. Maintaining continuity of improvement practices despite operational changes	3.24	0.79
8. Encouraging shared responsibility for sustaining school improvements	3.38	0.68
9. Preserving effective practices through institutional procedures	3.28	0.75
10. Establishing mechanisms to sustain improvement outcomes	3.20	0.76
Overall	3.31	0.42

Overall SD was calculated from respondent-level dimension composite scores rather than by averaging item SDs.

Table 15 reveals that sustainability of improvement initiatives obtained an overall mean of 3.31 and a standard deviation of 0.42, indicating a moderate level. Integrating successful improvement practices into regular school operations received the highest mean of 3.40, followed by encouraging shared responsibility for sustaining improvements at 3.38. These results suggested that some initiatives were incorporated into existing school practices, although the overall assessment reflected limitations in sustaining improvement efforts.

Establishing mechanisms to sustain improvement outcomes obtained the lowest mean of 3.20, followed by maintaining continuity despite operational changes at 3.24. Continued institutional support and resource availability both received means of 3.25. These findings identified sustainability as a significant concern within the school improvement process. While initiatives could be successfully introduced, their continuation appeared vulnerable to changes in operational priorities, resource availability, or personnel responsibilities. The results suggested that sustainability required more deliberate institutional arrangements, particularly the integration of effective practices into routine procedures, continuing allocation of support, and periodic assessment of improvement outcomes.

Table 16. *Summary of Division-Level School Improvement*

Dimensions	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Achievement of School Improvement Priorities	3.57	0.42	High
Strengthening of Institutional Practices	3.68	0.41	High
Sustainability of Improvement Initiatives	3.31	0.42	Moderate
Overall Division-Level School Improvement	3.52	0.39	High

Overall SD was calculated from respondent-level dimension composite scores rather than by averaging item SDs.

Table 16 summarizes division-level school improvement, which recorded an overall mean of 3.52 and a standard deviation of 0.39. Strengthening institutional practices emerged as the highest-rated dimension, followed by the achievement of school improvement priorities. Sustainability of improvement initiatives received the lowest assessment. This pattern suggested that participants perceived progress in school management and improvement implementation but expressed less favorable assessments of the systems supporting long-term continuity. The difference highlighted an important concern for division governance because positive

implementation experiences did not necessarily guarantee that improvements would be sustained. Stronger institutionalization of effective practices, continuity planning, and long-term support mechanisms could help address this limitation.

Table 17. *Spearman's Rank-Order Correlation Among the Study Variables (n = 120)*

Variables correlated with division-level school improvement	Spearman's ρ	p-value	Decision
Governance Foresight	0.407	<0.001	Significant
Technical Assistance Quality	0.374	<0.001	Significant
Implementation Coherence	0.481	<0.001	Significant

Significance level: $\alpha = 0.05$. All correlations were positive. P-values below 0.001 were reported using inequality notation rather than as 0.000.

Table 17 presents the relationships among governance foresight, technical assistance quality, implementation coherence, and division-level school improvement. All three governance dimensions demonstrated statistically significant positive associations with school improvement. Implementation coherence registered the strongest relationship ($\rho = 0.481$, $p < 0.001$), followed by governance foresight ($\rho = 0.407$, $p < 0.001$) and technical assistance quality ($\rho = 0.374$, $p < 0.001$). These results indicated that higher assessments of governance practices were associated with more favorable assessments of division-level school improvement.

The relationship between implementation coherence and school improvement was particularly noteworthy. Its comparatively stronger correlation suggested that consistent implementation, alignment of priorities, and coordination of supervisory responsibilities were closely associated with the perceived progress of improvement initiatives. Division directions could be clearly established and technical assistance could be professionally relevant, yet their contribution to improvement might remain limited when implementation was fragmented. The findings emphasized the importance of maintaining continuity between planning decisions, supervisory actions, and school-level implementation requirements.

Governance foresight also demonstrated a positive relationship with school improvement. This association indicated that respondents who reported stronger anticipatory planning, identification of institutional needs, and resource prioritization also tended to report more favorable improvement outcomes. However, the moderate strength of the relationship suggested that governance foresight alone did not fully explain differences in school improvement assessments. Anticipating educational needs and establishing priorities remained important, but those decisions also needed to be supported by coordinated implementation and appropriate institutional assistance.

Technical assistance quality showed the weakest of the three relationships, although its association with school improvement remained statistically significant. This finding did not suggest that technical assistance was unimportant. Rather, it indicated that the quality of professional support was associated with school improvement, while other governance conditions also played meaningful roles. The comparatively moderate assessment of monitoring and follow-through offered a possible explanation for this pattern. Assistance that addressed immediate concerns could support school operations, but its relationship with sustained improvement might be stronger when recommendations were systematically monitored and evaluated.

Taken together, the findings supported the rejection of the null hypothesis stating that no significant relationships existed among the governance dimensions and division-level school improvement. Nevertheless, the observed associations did not establish that governance practices directly caused improvement outcomes. The results were consistent with the study's cross-sectional design and indicated the need to consider the three governance dimensions together when examining division-level school improvement.

Table 18. *Multiple Linear Regression Predicting Division-Level School Improvement (n = 120)*

Predictor	B	Robust SE	Standardized β	p-value	VIF
Constant	0.886	0.349	—	0.011	—
Governance Foresight	0.236	0.092	0.243	0.010	1.33
Technical Assistance Quality	0.156	0.080	0.154	0.0503	1.21
Implementation Coherence	0.355	0.086	0.317	<0.001	1.33

Model summary

Model statistic	Value
R ²	0.314
Adjusted R ²	0.297
Robust F-statistic	18.74
Model p-value	<0.001
Number of observations	120

Number of predictors 3

Dependent variable: Division-Level School Improvement. HC3 heteroskedasticity-consistent standard errors were used. Significance level: $\alpha = 0.05$. Coefficients were estimated using the respondent-level composite scores.

Table 18 presents the multiple regression results examining the individual and collective predictive contributions of governance foresight, technical assistance quality, and implementation coherence to division-level school improvement. The regression model was statistically significant, $F = 18.74$, $p < 0.001$, with an R^2 of 0.314 and an adjusted R^2 of 0.297. The three predictors collectively accounted for 31.4% of the observed variation in perceived division-level school improvement. The remaining 68.6% was not explained by the model and could reflect other influences, measurement differences, and unexplained variation.

Implementation coherence emerged as the strongest independent predictor, with an unstandardized coefficient of 0.355 and a standardized coefficient of 0.317 ($p < 0.001$). Holding the other predictors constant, a one-point increase in implementation coherence was associated with a 0.355-point increase in the predicted school improvement score. This finding suggested that consistent policy implementation, coordinated governance practices, and alignment between division priorities and school activities were particularly important in explaining differences in perceived improvement outcomes.

Governance foresight also demonstrated a statistically significant predictive association, with an unstandardized coefficient of 0.236 and a standardized coefficient of 0.243 ($p = 0.010$). This result indicated that stronger anticipatory planning, institutional needs identification, and resource prioritization were associated with higher predicted school improvement scores after accounting for the other governance dimensions. Its positive contribution suggested that forward-looking governance remained important even when implementation coherence and technical assistance quality were considered simultaneously.

Technical assistance quality registered a positive coefficient of 0.156 and a standardized coefficient of 0.154. However, its p-value of 0.0503 was slightly above the prescribed 0.05 significance level. Therefore, technical assistance quality was not established as a statistically significant independent predictor in the combined model. This finding was particularly important because technical assistance demonstrated a significant bivariate relationship with school improvement but did not retain statistical significance after governance foresight and implementation coherence were included.

This difference suggested that technical assistance quality shared explanatory information with the other governance dimensions. Its relationship with school improvement could partly reflect the broader governance arrangements through which assistance was planned, coordinated, and implemented. It would therefore be inappropriate to conclude that technical assistance had no value. The result instead indicated that its unique contribution could not be distinguished statistically from zero at the selected significance threshold after accounting for the other predictors.

The variance inflation factors ranged from 1.21 to 1.33, indicating that multicollinearity was not a substantial concern in the regression model. The use of HC3 robust standard errors also strengthened the estimation of statistical uncertainty in the presence of possible heteroskedasticity. Nevertheless, the cross-sectional design limited the interpretation of the findings to predictive associations rather than causal effects.

Overall, the regression findings indicated that governance foresight and implementation coherence were significant predictors of division-level school improvement, while technical assistance quality demonstrated a positive but statistically nonsignificant independent contribution. The model provided support for the importance of coordinated governance, particularly the consistency with which division priorities, administrative decisions, and school improvement activities were carried into implementation.

CONCLUSION

Division-level school improvement in Apayao Province was positively associated with governance foresight, technical assistance quality, and implementation coherence, although differences in their assessed levels and predictive contributions revealed areas requiring further attention. Governance foresight reflected strengths in anticipatory planning but indicated the need for more systematic identification of emerging institutional needs and strategic resource allocation. Technical assistance was generally relevant and responsive, yet monitoring and follow-through required improvement to ensure that supervisory recommendations were consistently implemented and evaluated. Implementation coherence emerged as the strongest predictor of school improvement, emphasizing the importance of aligning division priorities, supervisory practices, and policy implementation. Although technical assistance quality demonstrated a significant positive relationship with school improvement, its independent predictive contribution was not statistically significant after accounting for the other governance dimensions. Moreover, the moderate assessment of sustainability indicated that maintaining improvement initiatives remained a concern. Based on these findings, it was recommended that the Schools Division of Apayao strengthen evidence-informed governance planning, establish systematic mechanisms for identifying emerging school needs, institutionalize structured technical assistance monitoring, and improve coordination among division personnel and school leaders. Greater attention should also be given to consistent policy interpretation, responsive resource prioritization, and the integration of successful improvement practices into regular school operations. Future researchers were encouraged to examine additional governance factors and employ longitudinal or mixed-method approaches to better understand how division-level leadership practices relate to sustained school improvement outcomes.

References

- Chua Reyes, V., Hamid, O., & Hardy, I. (2022). When reforms make things worse: School leadership responses to poverty, disasters, and cultures of crises in the Philippine education system. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 25(2), 331–344. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2021.2009038>
- Department of Education. (2022). Adoption of the Basic Education Development Plan 2030 (DepEd Order No. 024, s. 2022). Department of Education. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2022/05/30/may-30-2022-do-024-s-2022-adoption-of-the-basic-education-development-plan-2030/>
- Hashim, A. K. (2020). Coaching and districtwide improvement: Exploring the systemic leadership practices of instructional coaches. *Teachers College Record*, 122(10), 1–44. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016146812012201005>
- Honig, M. I., & Rainey, L. R. (2019). Supporting principal supervisors: What really matters? *Journal of Educational Administration*, 57(5), 445–462. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-05-2019-0089>
- 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>

- Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. *School Leadership & Management*, 40(1), 5–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2019.1596077>
- Moon, J.-M., Camburn, E. M., & Sebastian, J. (2022). Streamlining your school: Understanding the relationship between instructional program coherence and school performance. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 33(2), 260–279. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2021.2011750>
- Özdemir, N., Gümüş, S., Kılınç, A. Ç., & Bellibaş, M. Ş. (2024). A systematic review of research on the relationship between school leadership and student achievement: An updated framework and future direction. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 52(5). <https://doi.org/10.1177/17411432221118662>
- Premo, A. E., & Schunn, C. (2025). Network, school, and student demographic level effects of a networked improvement community on student reading outcomes. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 85, Article 101451. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2025.101451>
- Chua Reyes, V., Hamid, O., & Hardy, I. (2022). When reforms make things worse: School leadership responses to poverty, disasters, and cultures of crises in the Philippine education system. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 25(2), 331–344. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2021.2009038>
- Russell, J. L., Bryk, A. S., Dolle, J. R., Gomez, L. M., LeMahieu, P. G., & Grunow, A. (2017). A framework for the initiation of networked improvement communities. *Teachers College Record*, 119(5), 1–36. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016146811711900501>
- Salloum, S. J. (2022). Building coherence: An investigation of collective efficacy, social context, and how leaders shape teachers' work. *American Journal of Education*, 128(2), 203–243. <https://doi.org/10.1086/717654>
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2024). Global education monitoring report 2024/5: Leadership in education: Lead for learning. UNESCO. <https://www.unesco.org/gem-report/en/publication/leadership>