

# Professional Accountability Of Secondary School Heads Towards Quality Assurance

Angelica F. Olaso, Randy M. Baja

Batangas State University, 278Zablan St., Fernando Air Base  
Lipa City .Batangas  
*angelica.olaso@deped.gov.ph*

Batangas State University, Blk. 3, Lot 14, Orchid Street Sampaguita Country Homes  
Gulod Itaas, Batangas City  
*barma\_stcbauan@yahoo.com*

**Abstract:** The study aimed to describe the professional accountability of administrators towards quality assurance in the Division of Lipa City. It examined the extent of the school heads professional accountability in the areas of teachers' performance, student achievement, staff development and learning environment. At the end, this paper proposed a quality assurance project. It utilized a descriptive research design and used the triangulation method of data analysis, questionnaire and focus group discussion as tools to be able to gather pertinent data. With the inclusion of 36 school heads and 259 teachers from the public secondary schools of the Division of Lipa City, results were obtained. In assessing the school heads' professional accountability towards teachers' performance, student achievement, staff development and learning environment, both the administrators and the teacher- respondents gave a perception that their school administrators' accountability is highly evident. Hence, in testing the hypothesis, it was found out that there is no significant difference between the perceptions of the administrators and the teachers on the administrators' professional accountability. Data also revealed that the implementation of policies that would govern both students' and staffs' behavior and support to ICT integration in the teaching-learning process and other school transactions are some of the issues and concerns school heads are facing. Taking into consideration these findings, the researcher proposed a quality assurance project that can help improve the administrators' accountability and thereby, improve the quality of education that the school offers.

**Keywords:** professional accountability, quality assurance, secondary public schools, school heads,

## 1. Introduction

School leaders have an array of responsibilities. From school maintenance, to staff development, to producing quality graduates, to linking with stakeholders; the busy-ness of schooling requires that its leaders pay attention to an array of activities that is historically unprecedented. School principals are now under constant pressure to provide an account of all school policies and practices to anyone and everyone: government, the Department of Education, faculty and staff, parents, students, community groups and the like. In the Philippines, the introduction and adoption of a new educational agenda – the K to 12 Basic Education Program – added a new dimension and intensity to the already monumental responsibility on the shoulders of the school head. To answer the K-12 challenge, to create a functional basic education system that will produce productive and responsible citizens equipped with the essential competencies and skills for both life – long learning and employment requires school principals to be more innovative and skilful than ever. In a nutshell, it is the school heads obligation to make sure that teachers are competent to give quality education to the learners while professionally establishing themselves, as well. The school heads should see to it that all teachers will be properly guided in the performance of their duties. At the same time, they should also see to it that the educational objectives of the school concerning its students will likewise be satisfactorily met. With these two scenarios, the nation have their eyes on the public education institutions. The growing expectation of the community and the various stakeholders call for an authority in the school level that can firmly hold the rein that would lead the horse in the right track. The question of who is accountable falls on the shoulder of the school principal. In schools, principals act as administrators or managers,

pursuant to Section 6.1 rule VI of the Implementing Rules and Regulations of the Republic Act No. 9155. They are the ones holding reins in the lower stratum of the educational bureaucracy. In practice, the role of a school principal is sometimes quite diverse. The school head takes the lead to set and improve the school curriculum, guides the teachers in determining the best objectives for the students, chooses high quality learning opportunities for the students to attain those objectives, and helps select reliable assessment methods to determine whether or not the aims have been met, and many more. In fact, in Deped Order No.32, S. of 2010 or the National Adoption and Implementation of the National Competency-Based Standards for School Heads, the Department of Education emphasized seven domains of competencies that the school heads should possess in order to fulfil its responsibilities to the fullest extent expected of them. These are school leadership, instructional leadership, creating learner-centered learning climate, HR management and professional development, parent involvement and community partnerships, school management and operations, and personal and professional attributes. This standard of performance for the school heads is anchored on the core principle that school heads are competent, committed and accountable in providing access to quality and relevant education for all through transformational leadership and high degree of professionalism. Hence, the professional accountability of the school principals towards quality assurance requires them to function in a multi-faceted and diverse platform. Working under the supervision of the Division of Lipa City, it absolutely adheres to the Department of Education, Region IV-A CALABARZON mantra that every school should practice transparency, ethical and accountable governance to ensure the quality service with commitment and excellence. In managing the

schools, the school heads should be accountable in assuring the quality of delivering the values, philosophies and principles articulated in the mission statements, strategic plans, and curriculum and pedagogy frameworks. Lipa City has been one of the most outstanding divisions nationwide based on the latest performance review and evaluation. The schools division is also currently applying for ISO certification, a move that definitely aims to provide quality assurance to the community it serves. This move endeavours to closely examine the different aspects of school management of the individual school within the division, paying close attention to how the teaching-learning process is being managed. It is, of course, an assumption that if the school is providing quality education, it is a clear manifestation of the school head's performance of professional accountability. However, both the academic community and the scrutinizing stakeholders are still using student academic achievement as the main tool to measure quality education. What the test results say is still the most crucial manifestation of how the school administrators manage their school. Though considered as an outstanding division, the mean and mean percentage score of the quarterly tests of the public secondary schools do not seem to agree. Data for the past three years – SY 2015-2016, SY 2016-2017, and SY 2017-2018 – revealed that in all subject areas, students are starting with a mean as low as 23.27 and an MPS of 46.54 percent. On the positive note, this very low result tend to go higher as every year progresses. Records showed that overall MPS of the public secondary schools in the Division of Lipa is pegged at 71.90, 73.19 and 74.05 for the past 3 years mentioned. Although there are schools that registered a passing MPS, the low results of the remaining schools pulled down the overall performance of the Division. (Annual Report of the Quarterly Test, Public Secondary Schools Division of Lipa City) With this kind of result, everybody is questioning the professional accountability of the school head since raising the academic performance of the school and promising quality assurance to the public lie on their hands. All school heads are mandated to exercise accountable governance and thereby ensuring quality assurance in the services they rendered. It is in this premise that the researcher conducted a study on the accountability of the school heads. Being a school head herself, the researcher described the extent of professional accountability of the secondary school heads in her division. This paper aimed to provide a view of how school administrators are accountable on providing quality education and on what can be done to promote an environment that can assure quality education, gather issues and concerns met by the school heads on accountability which led to a proposed quality assurance measures that help promote quality education.

## 2. Statement of the Problem

The study aimed to describe the professional accountability of administrators in the Division of Lipa City towards quality assurance. Specifically, it sought answers to the following questions:

1. How may the accountability of school administrators be described?
2. To what extent is professional accountability evident in the following areas as assessed by teachers and school administrators?
  - 2.1 Teachers' performance
  - 2.2 Student achievement
  - 2.3 Staff development
  - 2.4 Learning environment

3. How do the assessments by the two groups of respondents compare?
4. What are the issues and concerns on school administrators' accountability?
5. What quality assurance measures may be proposed?

## 3. Scope, Delimitation and Limitation of the Study

The study was undertaken to assess the accountability of public secondary school administrators in the Division of Lipa City towards quality assurance. For this purpose, the accountability of the school heads was assessed. The manifestation of the school heads' accountability was based upon the perceptions of the both the teachers and the school administrators themselves. The study also discussed the issues, concerns and challenges of the school heads in holding up to their accountability in delivering quality assurance. As an output of the study, a quality assurance measures was proposed. The study used the descriptive method of research with the questionnaire as the main data gathering instrument and use of documentary analysis and data from the focus group discussion. The study was limited to 36 school administrators - full-pledged principals, designated Officers-in-Charge, head teachers- and 259 teachers of the 15 secondary high schools of the Division of Lipa City during the SY 2018-2019. This was delimited to the school heads and teachers of the private secondary schools in the division, as well as those of the public elementary schools of both public and private were not included in the study. Furthermore, it delimited other variables of the school heads' accountability as well as other problems expressed by the school administrators not listed in the paper's Statement of the Problem and its questionnaire.

## 4. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The different studies relevant to the present work were presented in this portion of the paper. The findings of the study will give support to the present work. In 2015, Argon found out in his study the most frequently repeated teacher and administrators' views on principal's professional accountability. These are the ability to explain decisions, displaying transparent and open management, having a sense of responsibility, providing a democratic environment, providing accurate information to superiors, and undertaking tasks and procedures that are in line with the law and its regulations. Furthermore, his study undermined that their sense of accountability are manifested if they are accepting responsibility for any negative situation that can result from school principals' authority and responsibilities. Some teachers also declared that school administrator shows professional responsibility when they follow the desired behaviors and rules specified in the law and regulations. Others opined that the responsibility of school principal towards superiors and subordinates who may be affected by the tasks or duties the school principal undertakes, while others suggested that accountability is in regard to the decisions made in the school for all individuals and organizations that receive services or that are affected by the school in the framework of the law and its regulations based on the general goals of education. On the other hand,

according to administrators, their sense of accountability is related to undertaking tasks correctly, the ability to explain (their decisions), the examination of their actions in terms of appropriateness to the set mission and vision of the school, and being held accountable for these actions. Some of the views of the administrators includes the idea that a school principal should be accountable to all stakeholders in all issues related to authority, responsibility and duties, and being transparent to parents and superiors about the procedures at school and the ability to explain things. Other administrators defined their professional accountability as the examination of decisions made by the principal in line with the law and regulations and accepting responsibility for all types of negative outcomes (failures, physical deficits, absenteeism, and so forth). At the same time, Rubinos (2009) investigated the professional accountabilities of the school head that they believe is directly related to students' performance in secondary schools in the Division of Mandaluyong, Pasig and San Juan. According to the investigation, in terms of professional accountability, the teacher respondents strongly agree that the principal should foster shared beliefs and a sense of community and cooperation; be knowledgeable about curriculum, instruction and assessment practices; and be an advocate and spokesperson for the school to all stakeholders. Their professional accountability extends from internal to the external stakeholders of the school. Also, they moderately agree that the principal should establish a set of standard operating procedures and routines ;protect teachers from issues and influences that would detract them from their teaching time or focus; provide teachers with the material and professional development necessary for the successful execution of their jobs; directly involve in the design and implementation of curriculum, instruction and assessment practices, establish clear goals and keep these goals in the forefront of the school's attention; recognize and reward individual accomplishment; demonstrate an awareness of the personal aspects of teachers and staff, ensure that faculty and staff are aware of the most current theories and practices; monitor effectiveness of school practices and their impact on student learning. The teacher respondents moderately agree that in order for the principal to be a good leader, he must have a good working condition with his or their teachers and staff; should have focus on the instruction and should focus on the physical environment of the school. The school climate in terms of working conditions and leadership, instructional focus and physical environment were significant predictors of NAT performance. Similarly, Cruz, Villena, Navarro, Belecina & Garvida ( 2016) investigated the managerial accountability of school heads. They found out that as perceived by the school heads themselves, teachers and senior students, the level of accountability in managerial performance of secondary school heads is very satisfactory in the different areas of school management. Vision, mission and goals garnered the highest grand mean while financial and budgeting management got the lowest grand mean. Furthermore, the perceptions of the three (3) groups of respondents on the accountability of the school heads in the different management areas such as Vision-Mission- Goals, Financial and Budgeting, School Plant and Facilities, Community Relations and School Improvement Plan were found significantly different from each other. While the administrators believed that their accountability towards vision-mission-goal and school improvement plan is

very satisfactory, both the teachers and the students perceived it to be just satisfactory. Whereas in the areas of Curriculum and Instruction and Student Services, their perceptions did not differ. They all agree that school heads' accountability is very satisfactory. The result of their investigation further revealed that the school heads way of managing their schools can be described differently depending on various indicators. Interview with the respondents also revealed similarities in themes and issues. Over-all, all groups of respondents considered in the study viewed the school heads' professional accountability as very satisfactory. On a similar theme, a descriptive research of Omalin (2012) assessed the leadership and management accountability of school administrators considering fifteen domains of total quality assurance. Results of the study generally revealed the school administrators' high level of leadership and management accountability in terms of vision, mission and goals, communication, organizational management, values and ethical leadership, instructional leadership and management, diversity leadership, safety and security judgement, problem solving and decision making strategies, managing the learning environment, managing student learning, community relations and stakeholders partnership, technology, human resource development and management, leadership, and curriculum planning and development. More specifically, school administrators were found to have the highest performance of accountability on the domain community relations and stakeholders partnership. It also discovered that the school administrators were performing less effectively on the domain of communication. They were also less effective in their performance of accountability towards technology. On a similar note, Sindhyad (2011) looked into the accountability of the principals. Findings revealed the capacity of the school heads to lead the school to a quality performance. In the study, factor analysis of the 19 items composing the accountability scale yielded three factors: professional development, instructional supervision, and classroom resources. On these three themes, the professional accountability of the school administrators was assessed. Each factor reflects a set of leadership practices that have incentive value for improving classroom instruction. Professional development is composed of items that measure the extent of principals' perceived accountability to perform tasks related to providing teachers with professional development opportunities, expanding teachers' role to include curriculum development, and fostering a professional learning community among teachers. Instructional supervision is composed of items that measure the extent of principals' perceived capacity to perform tasks related to mentoring teachers on classroom instruction and supervising teachers. Lastly, classroom resources is composed of items that measure the extent of principals' perceived capacity to perform tasks related to making classroom resources available. Furthermore, in the study conducted by Kwok Pak Keung (2011), he investigated how school administrators perceive education quality and accountability and how their concepts are shaped by the relationship to different stakeholders to whom they are accountable. The responses of the school administrators themselves revealed that they see their accountability towards stakeholders in the form of answering their questions and being obliged to inform to inform them what has been done and what the results are. Additionally, they described their accountability towards

reporting to stakeholders and community to be satisfactory. Findings of the same study also revealed that school administrators' accountability towards their teachers includes not only giving them technical support to improve the teaching-learning process, but also coaching and mentoring them to create a stronger parent-teacher partnerships. The administrators assessed that their accountability towards their teachers was very satisfactory. Meanwhile, Erdag (2016) conducted a study on the path of the accountability policies of schools in Turkey. Results revealed that the pressure of students' academic performance results significantly effects the perceived accountability of school principals. Stakeholders tend to measure the principals' accountability by the way the students are performing academically and producing higher educational achievement. Academic performance pressure that comes from the social environment prompts school staff to give an account to both the local society and bureaucracy of students' achievement levels and self-justify their deeds. On the other hand, Erdag found out that bureaucracy-based academic performance pressures push the school teaching staff to try to justify and explain their academic performance results to the upper bureaucracy. This explanation also dictates the upper management's view of the school principals' professional accountability. Their description of how accountable a school head is is directly related to how well their students performed in certain bureau-constructed assessment tools. When considering the research findings as a whole, this research has been designed in a causative pattern to discover the how the principal's accountability can be described. First, account-giving behaviors related to teaching activities among school teachers and administrators directed at themselves and created by academic performance pressures coming from school shareholders, the local socio-environment, and upper bureaucracy respectively were discovered to be the means of describing the administrators' professional accountability. Second, academic performance pressures from school shareholders create more support for schools' policy on educational accountability, whereas bureaucratic performance pressures create resistance to the policy on performance accountability. Moreover, Batsell (2013) pointed out accountability areas such as report generation, better student achievement and managing of the school staff. Relying on the perceptions of three groups of respondents – the teachers, the principals themselves and the supervisors – the researcher found out that principals need to extend hours of work just to be able to comply with necessary paper works. Regarding added accountability responsibilities, principals tended to add more hours rather than cut anything else out of their schedule. However, this work schedule came at the cost of their private lives or health. At the same time, it was clear in both districts, and among all interview groups that student achievement was a critical principal job accountability. While some district leadership might downplay the importance of the state test scores philosophically, student achievement nevertheless came down to the state test scores, and those scores were the indicators of a school's success or failure. Student outcome and achievement is a gauge of the school administrator's professional accountability. Another related accountability area that some principals assumed was mitigating the pressure to achieve by shielding their schools' teachers from increased work and negative accountability labels. In general, principals used accountability policies to drive

positive changes to their school structure, services for students, and curricula. In a sense, these policies bolstered their ability to rationalize and sell change to their staffs, whether the changes were due to accountability policy or not. The study of Laceda(2009) examined how school principals in the schools noted in the study manages or administers to their school which can easily translate to a higher student achievement. Specifically, the investigation centered on the principals' administration principles and strategies concerning student development and staff development which translates to his/her professional accountability Data gathered indicated that not all principals put into action the leadership practices for student development. There are schools without a clear plan for student development and could hardly respond to the academic and non-academic needs of the students. Moreover, the data validated that not all principals apply the leadership practices for teacher development. As such, some principals failed to identify the needs of teachers; in effect, some principals are poorly guided on what training and symposia should a teacher be sent to. Their failure to address both the students' and the teachers' needs translates to a poor manifestation of their accountability as a school head. Findings intensified the principals' practices in student and in teacher development – when implemented - create a positive effect to the performance of the school. However, as the study suggested, not all principals are taking serious considerations of the importance to develop both their teachers and their students. The administration strategies of some principals lack the requisite to uplift the achievement of their learners. In addition, a descriptive study of Babao (2017) on the accountability of public elementary school administrators revealed that as a human resource manager, learning leaders acknowledged that it is their greatest accountability to mentor and coach employees and facilitate the induction of new once. They also divulged that they also assess and analyse the needs and interests of teachers and other school personnel with great accountability and transparency. Conversely, learning leaders assessed themselves to be employing the least accountability in recognizing potential of staff and providing them with opportunities for professional development. At the same time, they are also manifesting the least accountability in assisting and monitoring the development of Individual Plan for Professional Development (IPPD). On the other hand, Ball (2017) in his study bared indicators of principal accountability. Using school principals as a subject of a qualitative study, results revealed that the principals in the study reported feeling accountable to complete substantial amounts of policy-based work that must be managed within their school sites on a daily basis. Fulfilling these aspects of their work comprises a significant amount of time, which often takes them away from other things they value. According to the same study, professional accountability is a reflection of the principal and how he/she models and encourages leadership in her school. She recognized the responsibility of elementary principals for setting the tone for the school site and the importance of being viewed as an active member of the team by supporting the teachers on their work. Their professional accountability specifically focuses on the academic achievement of the student body. They acknowledged the faith they have in their teaching staff, but indicated that they are always thinking about what else can be done to make learning more relevant to students today. All principals who participated in this

study articulated a common theme: the struggle to find balance between participating in school life and ensuring their work— comprised of the mandated legal policies and procedures through bureaucratic, legal, and professional accountability—is complete. The principals expressed a strong desire to be present in the school hallways, attend learning engagements within the school, and be visible among the student body. Most principal participants acknowledged the importance of giving technical support to their teachers in order to better their teaching performance. In addition, in a study of governance, assessment and accountability in schools of the member countries of PISA in 2012, it was found out that on average across OECD countries, 72 percent of students are in schools whose principals reported that the school gives staff opportunities to make decisions concerning the school at least once a month. Furthermore, 29 percent of students are in schools whose principal reported that teachers are asked to review management practices at least once .With this kind of involving the teachers in crucial decision making and careful review of curriculum policies, the school heads believe their accountability towards staff empowerment can be described as great extent. In the same study, principals' responses are combined to develop a composite index of professional accountability towards teacher development. This index has an average of zero and a standard deviation of one for OECD countries. Higher values indicate greater teacher participation. In Turkey, Brazil, Jordan and Malaysia, principals reported that teachers are involved in managing school a greater extent, which in turn reflected that the principal's accountability towards teacher development is a great extent as well. Meanwhile, a study of Bandur (2008) revealed that there are four key issues in administration of public secondary schools namely: degree of power and authority vested on the school teachers; improvements in student achievements resulting from the implementation of SBM, which are correlated to major factors that influence the improvements in student achievements and improvements in teaching-learning environments; problems and issues confronted with the implementation of SBM and measures needed to minimize the problems; new challenges faced by school leaders in implementing SBM and how they are coping with the challenges. Data shows, 61.7 percent of the respondents considered the power and authority vested in school teachers as adequate, while 12.7 percent considered it more than adequate whereas 20.4 percent considered it as barely adequate. A tiny minority of school council members considered the power and authority of the school council as either inadequate or absolutely inadequate. The study also revealed that 17.9 percent of the council members viewed the improvements in student achievements resulting from the implementation of SBM as excellent, while another 36.9 percent viewed this as very good, and 27.0 percent as good. Also, as revealed in this study, there were several indicators of parental and community participation in schools, including: financial contributions to the schools; contribution of materials for new school buildings and school building renovations; voluntary labour for new school buildings and school building renovations; voluntary work for building houses for teachers; participation in school decision-making; parental groups who actively involved in helping teachers in literacy activities in classrooms; and even facilitating teaching-learning activities outside classrooms -in the houses of parents. At the same time, the researcher indicated many

problems and issues in administration of a public secondary school. Data gathered shows that lack of appropriate professional development for school leaders was a problem. Lack of school facilities ,lack of knowledge about SBM and inadequate finances were the problems confronted in managing a school. On a different concern of accountability, Olurunsola and Belo (2018) in their study of administrator's challenges towards accountability revealed that a significant relationship exists between a principals' administrative challenges and their managerial effectiveness. The study found out that there is a great variety of challenges and problems that confronts a school administrator. Among the indicators considered in their study are concerns towards physical plant improvement, coping up with the technology in education, providing adequate support for teachers' training and education, dealing with unresponsive parents and community, low student performance and improper student behaviour. The study further revealed that there is a significant positive relationship between ill-equipped school libraries and other school facilities and principals' managerial accountability. It is also very evident that principals are facing problems in terms of improving the physical plant. The same is true with regards to teachers' training and education and unresponsive parents and community. Also, a significant relationship between finance and principals' managerial effectiveness was also suggested. Finally, the hypothesis which sought to find the best predictor of principals' managerial effectiveness among the variables of administrative challenges relating to accountability found out that finance is the best predictor with a beta weight of 0.121 while physical facilities with a beta weight of 0.006 is the least predictor. Meanwhile, Shadreck and Herbert (2013) came up with suggested quality assurance measures that may help other public secondary schools. They stated that quality assurance and accountability can be enhanced in an environment where there are healthy relationships between school management and teachers. The school heads further identified that enabling relationships result in a climate of trust and mutual respect. This was followed by promoting professional growth and development. The role of the school head is to provide support, assistance and advice to teachers that promote professional growth and development. The school heads noted the importance of training of both school heads and teachers as a precondition for the successful implementation of quality assurance and accountability in education. In conclusion, the findings of the study revealed that in order for school heads to create an environment that is conducive for assuring and quality and accountability in education they should maintain positive relationships with members of staff, provide training to staff members, and provide material and financial resources as well as promoting professional growth and development of their teachers. School heads should also form partnerships with the private sector in order to secure funding. And in line with the findings made in this study, the author proposes that the following recommendations need to be considered to enhance quality assurance and accountability in the education system: Raise educator awareness on the necessity of quality assurance and accountability in schools and the ministry of education should provide further training and encourage educators to improve their qualifications.

## 5. RESEARCH METHOD AND PROCEDURE

The descriptive research design was applied in this study to describe the professional accountability of public secondary school heads in the Division of Lipa City. As defined by Penwarden (2014), descriptive method is a method of research used to gather quantifiable information for statistical inference through data analysis. It can define and measure the significance of something about a group of respondents and the population they represent and may reveal strengths of a targeted group's opinions, attitudes, and behaviors with regard to a given subject. This method was best to be employed in the conduct of this study since it described some phenomenon such as the perception of the teachers and the school heads themselves as well as some issues and concerns being encountered by the school heads. The respondents of the study were the 36 school administrators and 259 teachers of the secondary high schools in the Division of Lipa City. Since there are only 15 public high schools in the division, there was no need to use any sampling procedure to get a sample size of the school administrator respondents. All the 36 school administrators served as respondents. On the other hand, Slovin's formula was used to determine the sample size of 259 from the total 742 teachers from the 15 public secondary schools in the division. Slovin's Formula is random sampling technique formula to estimate sampling size. At the same time, stratified random sampling was utilized to arrive at the number of teacher-respondents that will participate in each of the school

### 5.1 Data Gathering Instrument

This study utilized a questionnaire as key instrument, focus group discussion, and documentary analysis.

**Questionnaire.** The researcher utilized a self-constructed questionnaire to gather data and information about the accountability of school heads under study. It was consisted of three parts: Part I described the accountability of the school administrator; Part II dealt with the extent of the school administrators' professional accountability; Part III dealt with the issues and concerns of the school administrators on accountability.

**Construction:** The researcher used Deped Memos and Orders on accountability as a basis in drafting the questionnaire. Consultations with the adviser were undertaken to ensure that no item was similar or duplicated.

**Validation.** After integrating the suggestions of the adviser and securing the final approval for the draft, the researcher requested the assistance of the practitioners to validate the questionnaire. Checking and revision were done through the expertise of the members of the panel. All the suggestions for the improvement of the instrument were properly considered and were incorporated.

**Administration.** The researcher asked for the approval of the Schools Division Superintendent in the Division of Lipa City in the conduct of her study. Upon receiving the approval, the researcher administered the questionnaire to the respondents.

**Scoring of Responses.** The data gathered from the respondents were given weights ranging from one to four with one as the lowest and four as the highest scale. The

responses correspond to the verbal interpretation as reflected in the following continuum.

Option Scale	Range	Verbal Interpretation
4	3.5 – 4.00	Highly Evident/Strongly Agree
3	2.50 – 3.49	Moderately Evident/ Moderately Agree
2	1.50 – 2.49	Slightly Evident/Disagree
1	1.0 -1.49	Least Evident/ Strongly Disagree

**Focus Group Discussion (FGD).** A representative number of respondents from the two groups included in this study was included in focus group discussion. To be specific, three head teachers, two teachers and three principals participated in the focus group discussion. All of them were asked to sit down with the researcher in a discussion revolving on the professional accountability of the school administrator as well as the common challenges they encounter in the performance of their duty. Benchmarking of good practices was also touched in the discussion which became a foundation in formulating a proposed quality assurance measure at the end of this study. At the same time, it was conducted to the verify the responses obtained from the research instrument.

**Documentary Analysis.** To be able to form a conclusive evidence that there is a need to investigate the professional accountability of the school heads, documentary analysis was conducted. As test results are the primary evidence of how a school performs his/her duties to achieve quality assurance, results of the quarterly tests of the secondary schools for the past three years were analyzed. This provided the researcher one of the bases of conducting the study.

## 6. PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

### 6.1 Description of School Administrators' Accountability

The accountability of the school administrator may manifest in the various actions and decisions that he/she performs on a daily basis. In this study, both the teachers and the administrators themselves described the accountability of the administrators using 15 indicators concentrating on professional accountability.

*Table 1 Accountability of School Administrators*

Items	School administrator		Teacher	
	WM VI	SA	WM VI	SA
1. Plan, organize and implement policies and strategies of action	3.92	SA	3.72	SA
2. Perform a community – level accountability system that is evolving from school – led initiatives	3.72	SA	3.62	SA
3. Practice a community – accepted performance accountability, recognition and incentive system	3.58	SA	3.59	SA
4. Articulate the accountability assessment framework	3.50	SA	3.64	SA
5. Practice accountability system that is owned by the community and is continuously enhanced	3.72	SA	3.59	SA
6. Review collaboratively and enhances accountability systems; educational processes, mechanisms and tools	3.67	SA	3.67	SA
7. Develop clear, transparent, inclusive and responsive accountability system in collaboration with the school community	3.81	SA	3.70	SA

8.Engage in and implements a collaboratively developed system of monitoring, evaluation and reporting	3.80	SA	3.68	SA
9.Ensure that values, philosophies and principles are enacted in the day – to – day reality of schooling practices	3.75	SA	3.66	SA
10.Are liable to all financial funds that are issued to them by submitting financial reports periodically	3.81	SA	3.71	SA
11.Are accountable for the performances of teachers and learners toward quality teaching and learning as articulated in the quality assurance system	3.86	SA	3.73	SA
12. Lead school reform through a shared vision within the school community that would raise student achievement	3.86	SA	3.76	SA
13. Facilitate school's interactions with parents and others in the school community	3.81	SA	3.71	SA
14.Exercise the due diligence expected to prevent damage or injury to life or property inside or outside the campus	3.83	SA	3.70	SA
15.Address issues inherent to school improvement which responds to the demand for accountability	3.86	SA	3.73	SA
<b>COMPOSITE MEAN</b>	<b>3.77</b>	<b>SA</b>	<b>3.69</b>	<b>SA</b>

Legend: WM-weighted Mean VI-verbal Interpretation, SA-strongly agree

Table 1 presents how both the administrators and the teachers assessed the accountability of the school administrators. It can be gleaned upon that according to the administrators, they strongly agree that they plan, organize and implement policies and strategies of action so that each component unit of the school can direct its efforts toward the attainment of its approved objectives with a weighted mean of 3.92. This can be attributed to the fact that as the highest authority in the school, the administrators believe that their main function is to direct the school towards the realization of the organizational objectives. As they pointed out during the focused group discussion, their greatest accountability is towards putting together all decisions and actions into a unified whole that would lead to the success of their respective schools. In summary, the administrators assessment of their accountability is marked at a composite mean of 3.77 which is interpreted as strongly agree. The result reflects that the school administrators perceived that they are being accountable in the performance of their functions in their respective schools. As the leader of their schools, they are concentrating their efforts towards the realization of the organizational goal. Clear vision is being conveyed to every member of the school community and they are guided towards quality teaching and learning. Meanwhile, the table also showed the accountability of the administrators as perceived by the teachers. Among the indicators noted in the study is the one relating to leading the school reform through a shared vision within the school community which received the highest weighted mean of 3.76 which in turn is interpreted as strongly agree. This explains the accountability of the administrators to lead the school towards better performance. Their actions, decisions and judgements are always pointing out to the direction of quality education. This is parallel to the study of Sindhyad which revealed that one of the accountabilities of the school head is their capacity to lead the school to a quality performance. Overall, the assessment of the teachers on the administrators' accountability received a composite mean of 3.69 with a verbal interpretation of strongly agree. This shows that based on the teachers assessment, their leaders are manifesting accountability towards the attainment of quality education. They observed that the extent to which principals have a shared vision and deep understanding of high-quality

teaching is translated to the extent to which they can lead for instructional improvement. Also, they believe that the extent to which principals learn how to seize upon their emerging understanding of quality teaching to differentiate support to teachers and orchestrate teachers' professional learning is the extent to which they can help teachers improve their practice. This includes improving the physical facilities the can aid teachers to improve their craft as well.

### 6.2 Evidence of Professional Accountability of School Administrators in Different Areas

The professional accountability of the school administrators is divided in to four (4) areas of manifestation in this study. These are teachers' performance, student achievement, staff development and learning environment. The extent of the school administrators' professional accountability towards each of these areas was measured. The perceptions of the two sets of respondents were again considered.

**6.2.1 Teachers' performance.** It has been noticeable that the education profession has been under attack as of late. The brunt of these attacks has been aimed at the very professionals who are tasked with positively impacting the lives of children each and every day – the teachers. This places the teachers at the forefront of molding young minds into the next generation of doers, thinkers, creators, leaders, and entrepreneurs.

Table 2: Professional Accountability Relative to Teachers' Performance

Items	School administrator		Teacher	
	WM VI	HE	WM VI	HE
1. See to it that the preparation of the faculty as a whole is well matched to the requirements of the curriculum to effect better performance	3.78	HE	3.64	HE
2. Ensure that the teaching loads of the faculty members allow sufficient time for preparation of classes, adequate evaluation of student achievement and professional growth	3.72	HE	3.62	HE
3. Provide expert technical assistance and instructional support to teachers	3.53	HE	3.56	HE
4. Assist and monitor the development of IPPD of each teacher	3.39	E	3.59	HE
5. Assess and evaluate performance of teaching vis – a - vis targets	3.75	HE	3.58	HE
6. Provide meaningful professional development program	3.75	HE	3.62	HE
7. Establish a culture of professional reflection, inquiry and learning within and across schools	3.53	HE	3.61	HE
8. Increase teacher and school ownership of accountability	3.81	HE	3.56	HE
9. Observe and evaluate teachers' classroom	3.72	HE	3.58	HE
10. Allow teachers flexibility in the selection of teaching methodology	3.67	HE	3.67	HE
11. Encourage teachers to utilize guidance data and other related research	3.58	HE	3.57	HE
12. Implement policies that elicit the ability of teachers to diagnose general and specific weaknesses of students	3.64	HE	3.57	HE
13. Involve teachers in the planning, implementation and evaluation of school programs and policies	3.81	HE	3.59	HE
14. Promote awareness and understanding of national, global, socio-political and environmental issues and educational trends and the integration of such in their instruction	3.72	HE	3.60	HE
15. Implement guidelines that concretely carry out the philosophy, vision, mission and objectives of the school and the specific objectives of the basic education	3.74	HE	3.65	HE
<b>COMPOSITE MEAN</b>	<b>3.68</b>	<b>HE</b>	<b>3.60</b>	<b>HE</b>

Legend: WM-weighted Mean VI-verbal Interpretation, HE-highly evident, E-evident

Table 2 presents the perceptions of the administrators and the teachers to the extent of the administrators' accountability in relation to teachers' performance. Results revealed that administrators view their accountability towards increasing teacher and school ownership of accountability as a support for their professionalism and teaching performance to be highly evident at a weighted mean of 3.81. This was strengthened by School-Based Management. As the principals become empowered, they are likewise empowering those who they supervise. The teachers are not just given freedom to choose the best pedagogical approach they see fit to implement in their classrooms, but they are also given participation in deciding on matters that will help improve student achievement. This finding is similar to that of Bandur 's where he revealed that 61.7 percent of the respondents considered the power and authority vested in school teachers as adequate. In totality, the administrators assessed that their professional accountability towards teachers' performance is manifested as Highly Evident with a composite mean of 3.68. These results mean that school administrators give their teachers an opportunity to participate actively in the decision-making of policies or changes that are crucial to their performance as a teacher. They are given their important space in a participatory type of management in order to effect quality teaching. This is parallel to the result of Laceda's study which revealed that the principles and strategies concerning staff development translates to the administrators' professional accountability. On the other hand, the teacher-respondents gave the indicator that pertains to allowing teachers flexibility in the selection of teaching methodology in order to develop creativity in classroom procedures and pedagogical practices the highest weighted mean of 3.67 which is interpreted as highly evident. This is the administrators' accountability that is most felt by the teachers. They are not put in a box but rather, are encouraged to be creative and innovative in the delivery of their lessons. The administrator-respondents in an interview confirmed that their teachers are free to use the best pedagogy they see fit their students. They did not meddle in this matter for they believe teachers know their students better than they do. They allowed the teachers to practice creativity and encourage them to be innovative in their approach. All the administrators can do was support the teachers. In summary, the perceived extent of the administrators' professional accountability towards teachers' development according to the teachers is highly evident with a composite mean of 3.60. Administrators play a crucial role in teachers' professional life. Their improvement and progress can best be achieved if their administrators will provide them with the opportunities for growth and development. This result was similar to the study of Bandur where data showed that 61.7% of the respondents considered the power and authority vested in school teachers as adequate. At the same time, result can also find support in the findings of the OECD or among PISA-member countries which found out that on average across OECD countries, 72% of students are in schools whose principals reported that the school gives staff opportunities to make decisions concerning the school at least once a month. Teachers are empowered specifically in their own classrooms.

**6.2.2. Student achievement.** Student achievement is at the heart of the goal of any educational institution. Everything that the school does gear towards improving the performance

of their learners. At the same time, most accountability systems looked at student performance as the primary indicator of quality assurance. Table 3 presents the assessment of both the administrators and the teachers on the professional accountability of the administrator towards student achievement. As reflected on the table, school administrators manifest high regard for protecting and promoting the education of students both within the school and across the schools system. This gained a weighted mean of 3.84. It is loud and clear in the Deped's mission statement that they will provide a learning environment that is gender sensitive, culture-based, safe and friendly. As one of the school administrators passionately explained during the focused group discussion, before any kind of learning take place, the students, along with their parents/guardians, must feel that they are safe in school. Any insecurity towards their safety in school may result to anxiety that would definitely hinder them from learning.

**Table 3 Professional Accountability Relative to Student Achievement**

Items	School administrator		Teacher	
	WM VI	HE	WM VI	HE
1. Protect and promote the education of student	3.84	HE	3.67	HE
2. Implement policies that provide learning activities which are relevant to the maturity, interest, needs and daily lives of the students	3.75	HE	3.63	HE
3. Institute guidelines that recognize individual differences and diverse learning styles of the students	3.67	HE	3.59	HE
4. Provide a learning atmosphere that is maintained in all classes through sound classroom management	3.72	HE	3.58	HE
5. Consider adequate learning experiences which allow the development of positive values and attitudes of students	3.69	HE	3.63	HE
6. Provide students opportunities for individual as well as group work activities	3.78	HE	3.62	HE
7. Give the students chances to develop their 21 <sup>st</sup> century skills in the context of globalized education	3.72	HE	3.68	HE
8. Conduct dialogues, meetings or conferences for the development and welfare of the students	3.67	HE	3.62	HE
9. Support students' participation in academic and non-academic competitions within and outside DepEd	3.81	HE	3.71	HE
10. Utilize assessment results to improve students achievement	3.58	HE	3.62	HE
11. Assist in implementing an existing, coherent and responsive school-wide curriculum	3.64	HE	3.61	HE
12. Prioritize students needs over others in spending the MOOE	3.83	HE	3.61	HE
13. Disseminate information, memoranda, advisories and issuances from DepEd that concern students' welfare and development	3.81	HE	3.66	HE
14. Respect the rights of students by considering provisions stipulated in the legal mandates of DepEd	3.78	HE	3.71	HE
15. Provide safe, healthy, engaging and collaborative environment conducive to excellent learning	3.79	HE	3.69	HE
<b>COMPOSITE MEAN</b>	<b>3.74</b>	<b>HE</b>	<b>3.64</b>	<b>HE</b>

*Legend: WM-weighted Mean VI-verbal Interpretation, HE-highly evident*

In general, the administrators' assessment of their accountability towards students' achievement is pegged at 3.74 and is interpreted as highly evident. This means that the administrators feel that their actions and decisions towards projects, programs and policies are reflective of them being accountable towards the improvement of student achievement. This finding was similar to the works of Erdag



which emphasized that the highest accountability rating of a school administrator is towards the academic achievement of the students and the work of Batsell which revealed that accountability towards student achievement is one of the 3 major accountabilities of a school head. Meanwhile, taking into account the assessment done by the teachers, data showed that supporting students' participation in academic and non-academic competitions within and outside DepEd garnered a weighted mean of 3.72. As mentioned earlier, administrators are always supportive in terms of student participation to contests within and outside of DepEd because this is a means of making the school known by others. It is a very good opportunity to showcase the quality of students that the school has. In summary, the teachers' assessment of the administrators' accountability towards student achievement is highly evident at 3.64 composite mean. The same result was found out in the study of Edag and the study of Basell – both of which reiterated the accountability of the school head towards improving student outcomes.

**6.2.3. Staff development.** The school administrator is both a manager and a leader. He/She manages a flock of teachers and leads them towards the path that leads to the realization of both the organizational and individual goals. Table 4 features the assessment of the two sets of respondents of the study on the administrators' accountability towards staff development. As can be gleaned upon based on the administrators, to create an atmosphere that promotes professionalism for all members of the faculty and staff is on top of their accountability which was rated 3.89. It is apparent that the administrators view this to be the most evident. Aside from the efforts exerted by school administrators to improve the school's physical facility to answer the demand of professionalism, there is also a conscious effort to implement policies and guidelines that would govern the attitude, manners, etiquette and the over-all manner by which the teachers should perform their tasks. In doing so, they will be elevated to that status of being real professionals. This was echoed by the work of Ball which emphasized that the professional accountability of the principal is manifested in how he/she models and encourages leadership in her school through setting the tone for the school site making the teachers feel that they are active members of the team by supporting the teachers on their work.

**Table 4 Professional Accountability Relative to Staff Development**

Items	School administrator WM VI		Teacher WM VI	
	WM VI	HE	WM VI	HE
1. Create a supportive working environment for all staff in the school fostering their career development	3.86	HE	3.63	HE
2. Handle relevant disciplinary measures and grievance procedures for staff	3.78	HE	3.61	HE
3. Review staff job performance vis – a – vis mission, vision and goals of the school	3.61	HE	3.58	HE
4. Articulate the school's vision, mission and objectives for a sound staff development program	3.72	HE	3.65	HE
5. Institutionalize programs and projects for continuing personal and professional development	3.78	HE	3.64	HE
6. Create an atmosphere that promotes professionalism for all members of the faculty and staff	3.89	HE	3.68	HE
7. Initiate trainings and capacity building activities	3.81	HE	3.71	HE

8. Ensure that working conditions of the non-academic personnel contribute to their effective performance	3.75	HE	3.60	HE
10. Provide the staff opportunities to participate in policy formulation and decision-making	3.75	HE	3.59	HE
11. Give feedback on the team's performance using performance – based assessment tool of quality assurance	3.67	HE	3.62	HE
12. Assess and analyze the needs and interests of the teachers and other personnel	3.75	HE	3.59	HE
13. Ensure that school development plan objectives are supported with resources for training and development programs	3.81	HE	3.64	HE
14. Practice decentralization to train faculty and staff in responsibility, decision-making and accountability	3.79	HE	3.61	HE
<b>COMPOSITE MEAN</b>	<b>3.77</b>	<b>HE</b>	<b>3.63</b>	<b>HE</b>

*Legend: WM-weighted Mean VI-verbal Interpretation, HE-highly evident*

The overall assessment of the administrators on their accountability towards staff development is highly evident with a composite mean of 3.77. While the learners are the center of any teaching-learning process, it cannot be denied that the teachers play a crucial role. Among educational policy makers, researchers and practitioners, there is an emerging consensus that teacher professional development is vitally important to educational reform in this new millennium. In fact, it seems trite to assert that teacher professional development is critically important to school improvement focused on enhanced student learning outcomes. This result was parallel to the study of Laceda where he inferred that the success of the school or organization is due to proper development of the people that inhabit it. He asserted that it follows that a school in order to perform should invest in its greatest resource, human or teachers. It is imperative therefore that schools prepare a clear plan that would respond to the needs of its faculty in order to improve the school performance. On the other hand, based on the teachers' assessment of the accountability of the school administrators towards staff development initiating trainings and capacity building activities to further enhance staff's potentials and skills is a crucial manifestation of the administrator's accountability. At a weighted mean of 3.71, teachers gave this indicator a high rating because they strongly feel its effect through the numerous capacity building activities they are asked to attend – from local INSET to GAD trainings and other trainings and seminars from the Division and Regional Offices. This result bared the findings of Sindhyad that the accountability of a school head in terms of the teachers' professional development is measured by providing teachers with professional development opportunities. In totality, the assessment of the teachers on the administrators' accountability towards staff development received a composite mean of 3.63. As the most important resource in any organization, the human resources must be prioritized in terms of developmental plans. The complexity of dealing with the human quotient should be well understood by all school administrators. Their accountability towards them should be out on top of the list. It should be remembered that the quality of education cannot exceed the quality of the teachers who serve our institutions. The same result was manifested in the study of Sindhyad where data gathered revealed that professional development is composed of items that measure the extent of principals' perceived accountability to perform tasks related to providing teachers with professional development opportunities, expanding teachers' role to include curriculum

development, and fostering a professional learning community among teachers.

**6.2.4. Learning environment.** Included in the DepEd Mission is the statement that students learn in a child-friendly, gender-sensitive, safe, and motivating environment. It is imperative that this condition be met for better student outcomes. And the accountability of improving and sustaining this safe and child-friendly learning environment falls on the shoulder of the school administrator. Table 5 reflects the view of both the teachers and the administrators on the administrators' accountability towards learning environment. According to the data gathered and based on the administrators own assessment, ensuring that there are security and safety measures in place at school received a weighted mean of 3.69. The highest priority of a school administrator is to ensure the safety of every son and daughter entrusted to them. They implement policies, rules and regulations that would safeguard the physical well-being of the students. During the focused group discussion with the school administrators, some common themes were noted. Among these is the support that school administrators school clinic and nurse, Guidance and Counseling office, security guards and other personnel that could assist the school in keeping the learners safe at all times.

**Table 5 Professional Accountability Relative to Learning Environment**

Items	School administrator WM VI		Teacher WM VI	
	WM VI	HE	WM VI	HE
1.Ensure that there are security and safety measures	3.69	HE	3.68	HE
2. See to it that the campus is well-kept and well-maintained	3.62	HE	3.61	HE
3.Check that the construction and electrical installations meet building code requirements	3.58	HE	3.58	HE
4. Ensure that there are adequate provisions for safe and fast evacuation in case of emergency (e.g. fire extinguishers, escape routes, signs, etc.)	3.59	HE	3.57	HE
5. See to it that all classrooms and instruction areas are well-ventilated	3.39	HE	3.50	HE
6. Assure that there are sufficient comfort rooms and lavatory facilities for students and personnel	3.44	HE	3.50	HE
7. Ascertain periodic surveys that the buildings are not damaged by termites and other pests	3.61	HE	3.58	HE
8.Ensure that classroom furniture is adequate, in good condition and conforms to the needs of the students	3.56	HE	3.58	HE
9. See to it that the school has provisions for safe entry and exit in case of emergencies	3.59	HE	3.60	HE
10. Maintain classroom interiors that are pleasant, and conducive to the teaching-learning process	3.50	HE	3.54	HE
11. Ensure that there is a maintenance staff for emergency services such as carpentry, plumbing and electricity	3.44	HE	3.54	HE
12.See to it that there are readily accessible fire extinguishers and other firefighting equipment	3.58	HE	3.70	HE
13.Implement a child – friendly campus where every learner is safe from bullying and other discriminations	3.50	HE	3.59	HE
14. Make sure that covered walks protect students during inclement weather	3.53	HE	3.58	HE
<b>COMPOSITE MEAN</b>	<b>3.55</b>	<b>HE</b>	<b>3.59</b>	<b>HE</b>

*Legend: WM-weighted Mean VI-verbal Interpretation, HE-highly evident*

In summary, the administrators' assessment of their accountability towards learning environment received a composite mean of 3.55. This is a result mirrored in the study of Cruz, Villena, Navarro, Belecina and Garvida and that of Badarna and Shour. Both of these works revealed that the accountability of the administrators towards learning environment is described as to a very great extent. Meanwhile looking at the result of the assessment of the

teacher respondents, the table revealed that seeing to it that there are readily accessible fire extinguishers and other firefighting equipment at 3.70 is manifested by their school heads. According to the view of the teachers, the most felt accountability of the administrators is towards provision of adequate fire extinguisher and other firefighting equipment. This can be attributed to the fact that fire extinguishers are always visible to the teachers and since they are found in strategic locations, they are well aware that they are regularly checked and maintained. Administrators, on the other hand, reinforced this view by emphasizing that they regularly check and maintain their fire extinguishers. In summary, according to the teachers, the professional accountability of the administrators towards learning environment is pegged at a composite mean of 3.59. The old time manifestation of good school management is a clean, well-managed and well-kept physical plant. Although the accountability system at work now a days includes a bigger demand from school principals, this aspect of attending to the learning environment will never be lessened. Since a well-kept learning environment is almost synonymous to an environment conducive to learning, it is imperative that administrators answer the call for a safe and nurturing learning environment. This result was echoed in the study of Cruz, Villena, Navarro, Belecina & Garvida (2016) which examined the level of managerial performance of secondary school heads as perceived by the school heads themselves, teachers and senior students. They researchers found out that the level of accountability manifested by the school heads is very satisfactory in the different areas of school management, particularly School Plant and Facilities.

### 6.3. Comparison on the Assessments by the Respondents

Table 6 presents the comparison between the responses of the teacher-respondents and the administrator-respondents on their perceptions on the administrators' professional accountability towards teachers' performance, student achievement, staff development and learning environment.

**Table 6 Difference on the Assessment on Professional Accountability Between Teachers and School Administrators**

Variables	p-values	Computed t-values	Decision on Ho	Verbal Interpretation
Teachers performance	.22	1.233	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
Student achievement	.12	1.566	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
Staff development	.995	-0.006	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
Learning environment	.65	-0.456	Failed to Reject	Not Significant

The sample t-test was used to examine whether there is statistically significant difference between the responses of the two sets of respondents used in the study. With variable no.1, which is teachers' performance, the t-test revealed a  $t = 1.233$  and  $p = .22$ , signifying that there is no significant difference ( $p\text{-value} > 0.05$ ) on the responses of the teachers and the administrators. At the same time, in relation to student achievement, the t-test showed a computed t value of 1.566, and a p value of .12. This result also means that there is no significant difference on the responses of the two groups. Moreover, when it comes to staff development, data revealed a computed t value  $= -0.006$  and a  $p = .995$  ( $p\text{-value} > 0.05$ ). This indicates that there is no significant relationship that exist between the perceptions of the teachers and the administrators on the professional accountability of

the administrator towards staff development. Also, when the responses on the perceived accountability towards learning environment of the two groups under study were compared, it was found out that the computed t-value is pegged at -0.456 and the p-value is at .65. This is interpreted as no significant difference since p-value is greater than 0.05. In summary, considering all the variables of an administrator's professional accountability noted in this study, there is no significant difference between the perceptions of the teachers and the administrators, which also means that the null hypothesis is accepted.

### 6.5. Issues and Concerns on School Administrators' Accountability

The demands of accountability for school administrators produces challenges that needs to be addressed. Table 7 presents the issues and concerns on the administrators' professional accountability as assessed by the teachers and the administrators themselves. According to the administrators, support to ICT integration in the teaching-learning process and other school transactions is the top issue that they are experiencing as school heads. This garnered a weighted mean of 3.89. Indeed, ICT support presents an equivocal challenge to administrators. The Department of Education as a whole, in order to push the country to the center of globalization, is making its move towards the digital phasing. From school reports and data management to classroom instruction, ICT integration is the new name of the game. However, the financial requirement of this endeavor is quiet burdensome. In the public school setting, it is the job of the administrator to show support to ICT integration given the constraint of financial availability. To truly support ICT, this would require resourcefulness and a keen sense of partnership with stakeholders. This result draws a parallel with the study of Olurunsola and Belo which found out that among the grave issues faced by administrators is coping up with the technology in education.

**Table 7** Issues and Concerns on School Administrators' Accountability

Issues and concerns	School administrator WM VI		Teacher WM VI	
	WM VI	SA	WM VI	SA
1. Transparency in liquidating funds	3.78	SA	3.69	SA
2. Delegation of tasks to teachers	3.69	SA	3.67	SA
3. Decision on the allocation of funds	3.75	SA	3.61	SA
4. Implementation of DepEd Orders, Memoranda and other issuances	3.83	SA	3.73	SA
5. Recommendation of faculty and staff for promotion	3.75	SA	3.73	SA
6. Assistance to faculty and staff in the formulation of clear goals	3.69	SA	3.70	SA
7. Implementation of policies that would govern both students' and staff's behavior	3.89	SA	3.66	SA
8. Approval of activities that can promote student learning and development	3.86	SA	3.69	SA
9. Establishment of a strong partnership with other stakeholders	3.72	SA	3.66	SA
10. Evaluation of teacher and staff performance	3.69	SA	3.71	SA
11. Confidentiality in the records of both the students and the teachers	3.69	SA	3.70	SA
12. Establishment of a strong support system from parents	3.69	SA	3.66	SA
13. Manifestation of the characteristics of an instructional leader	3.72	SA	3.70	SA
14. Support to ICT integration in the teaching-learning process and other school transactions	3.89	SA	3.71	SA
15. Sufficiency of school facilities	3.69	SA	3.66	SA
<b>COMPOSITE MEAN</b>	<b>3.76</b>	<b>SA</b>	<b>3.68</b>	<b>SA</b>

Legend: WM-weighted Mean VI-verbal Interpretation, SA-strongly agree

Over-all, there is a composite mean of 3.76. It can be assumed that according to the assessment of the administrators, the items considered in this study are actual issues and concerns that they deal with in the performance of their responsibility as a school administrator. However, the teachers perceived that the gravest issue and concern on their administrators' accountability are related to implementation of DepEd Orders, Memoranda and other issuances which was pegged at 3.74 weighted mean. Notably, the teachers view that one of the greatest challenge of the administrators is in relation to implementation of the DepEd Memo and the likes. As the major steward of the institution, administrators are held accountable for implementing policies from the higher offices. Studies show that principals are being subjected to increasing demands to supply data to a range of stakeholders and to meet many regulatory requirements of both the Department and the government. Anecdotal feedback to date suggest that the role of the principal is changing due to increased demands external to the school and is placing leaders more as administrative agents of governments and taking them away from the crucial roles of school leader and the driver of education leadership within the school. Because of this, the item was considered as the most common issue or concern of the administrator. Overall, the perception of the teachers on the administrators' professional accountability towards issues and concerns is pegged at 3.68. This result was similar to the work of Sriran 2016 when he reiterated that every principal faces some of the biggest frustrations to control student behavior, recruiting teachers and staff, promote personalized learning, improved teaching effectiveness, student retention, parent support, and more. Probably foremost among these is the integration of technology that translates into enhanced student achievement

### 6.5. Proposed Quality Assurance Measures

After careful analysis of the results of this study, all variables are pointing out to the importance of improving the accountability of the school administrators so as to answer the demand of quality assurance. Quality assurance is important for accountability as well as to support ongoing development of schools and of teaching and learning. Well-functioning systems have mechanisms to support and balance vertical and horizontal, internal and external accountability. Quality assurance that is focused on development supports schools to adapt to the changing needs of learners. The focus is not only on improvement but also innovation – that is, the development or experimental testing of approaches in different contexts -- to support quality, equity and efficiency. Approaches to quality assurance may need to be adapted over time to better meet needs for feedback and decision-making across systems. In this context, the researcher would like to propose a project that could serve as a quality assurance measure of the public secondary schools through the improvement of school administrators' accountability

## PROPOSED ASSURANCE MEASURES PROJECT

### I. Introduction

The Department of Education places an undeniably heavy load on the shoulders of the school principals. Particularly with the advent of decentralization through SBM, principals become the key leaders in our educational system. It is their

responsibility to carry out the school vision and mission. They likewise play integral roles in making schools function smoothly. They are involved in all aspects of the school's operation. They are the leaders responsible in providing leadership in the development and implementation of all educational programs and projects in the school. They play a vital role in achieving the government's aim to provide quality basic education, which for most part is measured by student achievement. It is evident that the quest for quality education has resulted in a number of initiatives which have made significant demands on principals in public schools to transform leadership towards improved school performance. School principals have to face new challenges brought forth by advances in technology and higher expectations on education from the community, which include the use of information technology to support teaching and learning; adaptation of the school curriculum to suit the ability and disposition of the young children as to maximize their potential and not to give up on each individual pupil; increasing community expectations for improvements to the educational system and the quality of learning processes and outcomes; a growing awareness of teacher professionalism; globalization of the world economy and the emergence of a knowledge-based economy which demands workers with multiple intelligence and creativity; life-long learning and the notion of school as a learning organization. All of these things are believed to be key components in attaining quality education. These new challenges require school principals to take on new leadership skills in quality development and quality assurance. They also highlight the need for more focused and systematic school leadership training and development programs to enhance the quality of school leadership they already possess. They are held accountable to make sure that a quality- real-life learning is taking place on a daily basis. The issue of quality assurance enters the scene when there seem to be a lack of accountability among administrators and the organizational goal is not met. Hence, as part of the quality assurance measure of the school, the researcher came up with **PROJECT G.O.L.D. (Gearing for Outstanding Leadership and Development) TOWARDS QUALITY ASSURANCE**. This project was conceptualized based on the results arrived at after conducting this particular study. The assessment of the school administrators' performance towards their professional accountability dictated that the school heads must take a closer look on how they manage the school as whole. From analysing their part they play towards students achievement to realizing their pivotal role in their teachers professional and personal growth to their participation in improving and maintaining the physical plant, administrators have on their lap a gargantuan accountability to answer for.

## II. Objectives

This intervention program aims to assure quality of education through an improved professional accountability of the school heads in the public secondary schools of the Division of Lipa City. Believing that the school administrators' accountability is directly equitable to quality assurance, this proposal focuses on the weak points of the school administrators as revealed of this investigation. It is beyond doubt Specifically, **PROJECT G.O.L.D. (Gearing for Outstanding Leadership and Development) TOWARDS QUALITY ASSURANCE** aims to:

- 1) Create an accountability framework that will be accepted by all stakeholders of the school;
- 2) Strengthen the involvement of the community and other stakeholders in the practice of a system of accountability;
- 3) Provide a more detailed and subjective technical support and assistance to each individual teacher based on their needs;
- 4) Institute guidelines and policies that would consider individual differences and diversity of culture in a school-wide implementation of the curriculum;
- 5) Ensure a safe learning environment where life-long learning can take place.

## III. Persons Involved

School Division Office Personnel  
Local Government Units  
Private Institutions  
Community and Other Stakeholders  
Principals  
Teachers

## IV. Funding Source

Maintenance and Other Operating Expenses (MOOE)  
Local Funds  
Sponsorship/Donations

## V. Project GOLD Towards QA Implementation

### A. Teachers' Performance and Development

Teacher is a pivot of the education system for the transformation of intellectual and technical skills from one generation to next. Being the focal person inside the classroom, they are considered to be in the frontline in the battlefield – the very first people to receive the arrows of the advancing enemy. True enough, the teachers are the very first people to receive complaints from all directions of the compass. The disgruntled parents who are not happy with their children's grades, the parents seeking accountability towards the non-accomplishment of a Parent-Teacher Association (PTA), the parents questioning a certain activity promulgated by the school all come to baffle the integrity of a teacher – all because the teachers are the ones who are having a constant interaction with the learners. There is no question as to the importance of the role teachers play in quality assurance. The equation good teacher equals good students is a very plain and simple truth. If the teacher is performing well, the learners will come up with better output and achieve higher marks. In this era where quality assurance seem to be evolving around National Achievement Test (NAT) results and Mean Percentage Scores (MPS), educational experts are seriously looking at the numbers. And the first people they will blame for low performance is the teacher. In a broader scene, the growth and development of any nation depends upon education system. The most important factor in the educational development is the teacher who is professionally equipped with various skills, competencies, determination and accountability to give his best to the individual as well as society.

**Strategies:**

1. Encourage teachers to pursue post graduate studies
2. Initiate mentoring or coaching programs to assist teachers in their IPPD
3. Provide trainings that will upgrade and update the teachers' pedagogical skills as well as their competency in their content areas
4. Establish partnerships with private institutions, Local Government Units, Higher Education Institutions and other stakeholders to provide scholarship or tuition fee discounts for teachers who would like to pursue post graduate studies.
5. Create a system of reward and incentive that will recognize teachers' efforts in fulfilling their duties and walking the extra mile to be of service to their students
6. Encourage a culture of professional reflection, self-initiative inquiry and continuous learning through researches, fora, colloquiums and other venues where teachers can be inquisitive in order to improve their craft and provide financial to them by tapping sponsors from external stakeholders.
7. Introduce the importance of utilizing various student data available in school (such as research results, guidance office data, PHIL-IRI results, etc.) in designing learning programs and activities for the students.

**Expected Output:**

1. Increased number of teachers with post graduate degree
2. Better crafted teachers' IPPD which will lead to more appropriate trainings and seminars to be designed for teachers' professional growth
3. Teachers equipped with 21<sup>st</sup> century skills who are ready to handle the 21<sup>st</sup> century learners
4. Available scholarship programs for teachers pursuing higher education
5. Teachers will feel appreciated and recognized for their efforts and will continue to be motivated
6. More teachers will be involved in research writing and participate in research related activities
7. Well-utilized school records and interventions strongly anchored on school records

**B. Student Achievement**

Over the past decades, education reforms have spread from country to country in a global policy infatuation with education reform (Hallinger, 2015). Educational institutions the world over have adopted a platform of education reforms with the intention of improving student learning outcomes and global competitiveness. These reforms have included student-centered learning, accelerated schools, curriculum standards, education quality assurance, school-based management, information and communication technologies, and parental involvement (Cheng & Walker, 2008). Notably, the implementation of these policy reforms, both globally and regionally, has been scaffolded on new accountability frameworks that seek to justify increased government investments in quality education. In the context of this global quest for education reform, we have also witnessed over the years a remarkable effort to transform the primary role of the school principal from organizational managers into leaders of learning. Although the origins of this shift can be traced to

North America during the 1980s and 1990s, the global discourse on 'principals as leaders of learning' has since penetrated most other regions. Hence, in the perspective of the experts, the role of the principal as a leader of learning can best be described based on the level of the students' achievement. Standardized test in the global arena are anticipated every year because it stabilizes the name of the academic institution. As previously emphasized, the importance of standardized test results is becoming more prevalent in the structure of classroom instruction and the operation of schools throughout the nation due to pressure on educators and students from various levels of authority. The demand of any nation for quality education is screaming for higher student achievements.

**Strategies:**

1. Implement policies that would even out the learning opportunities for the diverse learners
2. Support activities/programs aligned with the current curriculum that integrates values formation
3. Benchmark on other schools' best practices in addressing the various difficulties of the learners
4. Initiate a well-structured program that would help students with academic difficulties to cope up with the rest
5. Involve the family and the community in improving student achievement
6. Immerse the students in real-life situations where they can learn the important values and skills necessary to be useful citizens of the country

**Expected Outputs**

1. A body of rules and regulations that will be give academic freedom to all kinds of learners
2. A detailed work plan of activities for student development
3. New and better practices to improve student achievement
4. More students to be promoted to the next level, lesser dropout rate
5. A more engaged family and community in developing learners
6. Well-honed individuals

**C. Learning Environment**

Quality learning environment is critical to quality education. A quality learning environment must be designed to support all students in their learning process, and teachers and education support personnel in their missions. It contributes to well-being and health, and forms the basis for a positive environment where everyone can reach their full potential. The inclusion of the phrase "where students learn in a child-friendly, gender-sensitive, safe and motivating environment" in the DepEd Mission is a clear manifestation that it is indeed essential to the quality of education we foresee for our students. The quality of the learning environment is determined by a number of physical, psychological and social factors. Public authorities must provide the necessary and relevant infrastructure and resources. Education support personnel, including school nurses, ICT technicians, librarians, guards, drivers and others play a pivotal role in ensuring a healthy, safe and supportive learning environment to children and students. The local community, including

parents, also plays an important role in fostering and supporting a quality learning environment.

1. Prioritize ventilation of classrooms and all learning areas along with construction and maintenance of sufficient comfort rooms and lavatory services in designing the school's SIP/AIP
2. Embark on finding personnel or external support that would readily answer the school's call for emergency needs related to electrical, carpentry, plumbing and other related issues.
3. Strengthen the school's program against bullying
4. Enlist the help and support of the parents, community and other stakeholders in ensuring the safety of the students in going to and from the school.
5. A well-structured DRRMC Program must be in place to ensure the safety of the students in cases of calamities

#### Expected Output

1. Well-planned AIP and SIP
2. Available personnel in cases of emergency repairs
3. Lesser victims of bullying
4. A more engaged and involved body of stakeholders to support the development of a safe environment in school
5. The school, as a whole, will be prepared during calamities
6. Parents and children will be assured of their safety while in school

## 7. Summary Of Findings, Conclusions And Recommendations

This chapter presents the summary, findings, conclusions and recommendations arrived at after careful analysis of data gathered.

### Findings

The following were the significant findings of the study

#### 1. Description of School Administrators' Accountability

Based on the administrators' assessment, their accountability is marked at a composite mean of 3.77 which is interpreted as strongly agree. At the same time, the assessment of the teachers on the administrators' accountability received a composite mean of 3.69 with a verbal interpretation of Strongly Agree.

#### 2. Evidence of Professional Accountability of School Administrators in Different Areas

The extent of the professional accountability of the school administrators is divided in to four (4) areas of manifestation in this study. The perceptions of the two sets of respondents were again considered.

**2.1. Teachers' performance.** Administrators view the totality of their accountability towards teachers' performance is highly evident with a composite mean of 3.68. Meanwhile, the teacher-respondents assessment revealed that administrators' professional accountability towards teachers' development is highly evident with a composite mean of 3.60.

**2.2. Student achievement.** As reflected the results of the study revealed, administrators believe that their accountability towards students' achievement is pegged

at 3.74 and is interpreted as highly evident. On the other hand, based on the teachers' perspective on this matter, the accountability of the school administrators' towards student achievement is highly evident at 3.64 composite mean.

**2.3 Staff development.** Based on the administrators' assessment, their accountability towards staff development is highly evident with a composite mean of 3.77. On the other hand, the assessment of the teachers' perception on the accountability of the school administrators towards staff development revealed a composite mean of 3.63 and a verbal interpretation of highly evident.

**2.4 Learning environment.** According to the data gathered and based on the administrators own assessment, their accountability towards learning environment received a composite mean of 3.55 or highly Evident. On the other side, after careful analysis of the responses of the teacher-respondents, the study revealed that the accountability of the administrators in relation to learning environment is highly evident at a composite mean of 3.59.

## 3. Comparison on the Assessments by the Respondents

There is no significant difference between the perceptions of the administrators and the teachers on the administrators' professional accountability.

## 4. Issues and Concerns on School Administrators' Accountability

According to the administrators, considering the items that were included in this study they strongly agree that they are issues and concerns that they face every day as evidenced by the composite mean of 3.76. On the other hand, the teachers have a similar assessment that the items included in this investigation are real challenges being faced by their school administrators at a composite mean of 3.68 and an interpretation of strongly agree.

## 5. Proposed Quality Assurance Measures

The proposed quality assurance project can help improve the administrators' accountability and thereby, improve the quality of education that the school offers.

### Conclusions

After a thorough analysis of all data gathered in this study, the researcher arrived at the following conclusions:

1. Both the teachers and the administrators described the accountability of the school heads as strongly agree.
2. Both sets of respondents expressed the same assessment on the administrators' accountability towards teachers' performance, student achievement, staff development and learning environment. They both agree that the administrators' accountability towards these areas is manifested in a high degree.
3. The researcher failed to reject the hypothesis tested in the study as it was revealed that there is no significant difference on the assessments of the two sets of respondents in terms of the school administrators' accountability.

4. The implementation of policies that would govern both students' and staff's behavior and the support to ICT integration in the teaching-learning process and other school transactions are among the top issues and concerns on the administrators' accountability.
5. The proposed project on quality assurance offered in this study can serve as a reliable and objective quality assurance measure that may improve school heads performance of accountability towards quality assurance.

### Recommendation

From the findings and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations were offered.

1. A clear accountability framework for school administrators must be put in place.
2. A system of accountability monitoring and evaluation for school administrators must be standardized to establish a fair and just accountability mechanism.
3. Stakeholders must be well-informed of the how the administrator answers for his or decisions and actions.
4. Quality assurance measures must be strictly implemented in schools.

### BIBLIOGRAPHY

#### A. BOOKS

- [1]. Bilbao, Corpus B. (2006). *The Teaching Profession*. Quezon City: Lorimar Publishing Company.
- [2]. Watt, Richards P. (2002). *Public administration in Northern Ireland*. Capetown Publishing.

#### B. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

- [3]. Abag, C. D. (2014). "Financial Management Role And Accountability Of Public Secondary School Managers In The Three Cities Of Batangas Province". (Unpublished Dissertation). Batangas State University
- [4]. Adaya, R. M. (2003). "Allocation of the funds for Social services in the context of Local Autonomy: An analysis ". (Unpublished Dissertation) PNU, Manila.
- [5]. Agamata, B. (2014). *Toward A Proposed Quality Assurance Framework For Teacher Education Institution*. (unpublished dissertation). Philippine Normal University, Philippines
- [6]. Armedilla, M.M. (2001) *Community Problems and Needs: Bases for Development of Prototype Networking Activities among School Linkages*.(Unpublished Dissertation),PNU.
- [7]. Babao, W.M. (2017). *Accountability of Learning Leaders in Selected Public Elementary Schools in the Three City Divisions of Batangas: A Basis for a Proposed Management Plan*. Unpublished Dissertation. St. Jude College
- [8]. Barroga, L.R.A. (2006) *the administrative Accountability of Educational Managers of the Divine Word Colleges of Northern Province*.(unpublished dissertation) Univertisty of Northern Philippine, Vigan City, Ilocus Sur
- [9]. Batsell, H. (2013). *High School Principals in the Vortex: Accountability, Autonomy, and Social*

Justice. (Unpublished Dissertation). Arizona University.

- [10]. Briones, E.B. (2012) *Managing The Learning Environment In Public Elementary Schools In The Division Of Batangas City*. (unpublished dissertation) University of Sto. Tomas, Manila
- [11]. Bunquin, B.C. (2012). *Towards The Development Of A Management Operational Plan To Attain Institutional Quality Assurance* (unpublished dissertation). Philippine Normal University, Philippines
- [12]. Garcia, J.A. (2015) *Status of School-Based Management Practices of School Heads In Secondary Schools in a Historical City*. (Unpublished Dissertation), University of the Philippines. Manila
- [13]. Laceda, E. (2009). *Principal's Leadership Practices And School Performance Of Selected Secondary Public Schools*. (unpublished dissertation). Up Diliman Quezon City, Philippines
- [14]. Kowk Pak Keung, P. (2011). *Learning Leaders Perception of Quality and Accountability: A Study of Lasallian Schools in Hong Kong*. Unpublished Dissertation. University of Leicester
- [15]. Laraya, A.P. (2015) *Accountability Of The Public Secondary School Heads In The Division Of Quezon* (unpublished dissertation). Batangas State University, Philippines
- [16]. Omalin, C.T. (2012). *Proposed Guidelines in Leadership and Management Accountability of Learning Leaders: For Managing For Excellence*. Unpublished Dissertation. Philippine Normal University
- [17]. Rubinos, M.C.M. (2009). *Principals' Leadership Responsibilities, School Climate and other Factors Affecting students' performance in the National achievement test in Secondary Schools in the division of Mandaluyong, Pasig and San Juan*. Unpublished dissertation. Polytechnic University of the Philippines, Manila
- [18]. Sindhvad, S.P. (2011). *School Principals as Instructional Leaders: An Investigation of School Leadership Capacity in the Philippines*. (unpublished dissertation).

#### C. ELECTRONIC SOURCES

- [19]. Aboki, M. (2016). *School administration problems: 7 ways to ensure accountability*. Retrieved from <https://blogs.flexisaf.com/school-administration-problems-7-ways-ensure-accountability>
- [20]. Amirul,N.J.(2015) *the Physical classroom environment*. retrieved from <http://www1.curtin.edu.my/tl2015>
- [21]. Argon, T. (2015). *Teacher and Administrator Views on School Principals' Accountability*. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov>
- [22]. Australia Department of Education (2010). *Evaluation and Accountability*. Retrieved from [det.wa.edu.au/accountability](http://det.wa.edu.au/accountability)

- [23]. BAGI, S. (2016). CHALLENGES FACED BY BEGINNING PRINCIPALS. RETRIEVED FROM [HTTP://BLOG.CIRCLE. EDUCATION/GREATEST-CHALLENGES-FACED](http://blog.circle.education/greatest-challenges-faced)
- [24]. Ball, C.M. (2017). How Elementary School Principals Manage Accountability Expectations. Retrieved from <http://ir.lib.uwo.ca/cgi.viewcontent.cgi?article=6013&Content=etd>
- [25]. Basillote, L.D. (2017) Decentralizing Philippine Education. Retrieved from <https://www.manilatimes.net/decentralizing-philippine-education/335467/>
- [26]. Boven, M. (2010). Public Accountability. Retrieved from [www.qub.ac.uk/polproj/renege/.../Bovens\\_PublicAccountability.ccnex2](http://www.qub.ac.uk/polproj/renege/.../Bovens_PublicAccountability.ccnex2).
- [27]. BUCKNER JR., K.G. (2003). The Role of Elementary and Secondary School Principals, Principal Duties and Responsibilities, Principal Qualifications. Retrieved from <https://education.stateuniversity.com/pages/2333/Principal-School.html>
- [28]. Bruens,R. (2012)Educational admionistrator..retrieved from<https://education.cu-portland.edu/blog/teaching-careers>
- [29]. Cranston, J. (2014). Two sides of professional: professional accountability and professional learning community. Retrieved from <https://www.umanitoba.ca/faculties/education/media/Cranston>
- [30]. Cruz, C.D., Villena, D.K., Navarro, E.V., Belecina, R.R.& GarvidaM.D. (2016). Towards Enhancing the Managerial Performance of School Heads. Retrieved from [www.irmbrjournal.com/papers/](http://www.irmbrjournal.com/papers/)
- [31]. Doyle, L. (2017). Quality assurance in education: are you Meeting standards?. Retrieved from <https://edtechnology.co.uk/Blog/quality-assurance-in-education-are-you-meeting-standards/>
- [32]. Döş,I & Savaş, A. C. (2015). Elementary School Administrators and Their Roles in the Context of Effective Schools. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244014567400>
- [33]. Erdag, C. (2017). Accountability Policies at Schools: A Study of Path Analysis. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov>
- European Commission (2018). Quality assurance for school development. Retrieved from <http://www.schooleducationgateway.eu/.../2018-wgs2-quality-assurance-school.en.p>
- [34]. Forbes, M. (2011). Trends and Issues: Roles of School Heads as Instructional Leader, Administrator and Manager. Retrieved from [school-principal.blogspot.com/2011/02/trends-and-issues-roles-of-school-heads.html](http://school-principal.blogspot.com/2011/02/trends-and-issues-roles-of-school-heads.html)
- [35]. Fuller, J.B. (2015). 7 Ways to enhance quality education. Retrieved from <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/7-ways-enhance-quality-education>
- [36]. Gallup, E. (2016). What Are the Biggest Problems Faced by Public School Principals? Retrieved from [administration/resource/what-are-the-biggest-problems-faced-by-public-school-](https://www.waldenu.edu/education-specialist/eds-in-educational-leadership-and-administration/resource/what-are-the-biggest-problems-faced-by-public-school-)
- [37]. Gamage, D. & San Antonio D. (2014). ffective Participatory School Administration, Leadership, and Management: Does It Affect The Trust Levels of Stakeholders?. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1066691.pdf>
- [38]. Hult, A. (2016). Balancing managerial and professional demands: school principals as evaluation brokers. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.3402/edui.v7.29960>
- [39]. Manalo, E. (2014). Teaching and Learning in Higher Education. Retrieved from <https://researchmap.jp/read0151030/?lang=english>
- [40]. Mansbridge, J. (2018). Contingency Theory of Accountability. Retrieved from <http://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/>
- [41]. Mulder,P. (2017).Transformational Leadership. Retrieved from ToolsHero: <https://www.toolshero.com/leadership>
- [42]. MURING, L.(2014). THE CHALLENGING ROLES OF A SCHOOL PRINCIPAL. RETRIEVED FROM <HTTP://WWW.DEPEDMALAYBALAY.NET/ARTICLE/THE-CHALLENGING-ROLES>
- [43]. Olorunsola E.O and Belo F.A (2018). Administrative challenges and principals' managerial effectiveness in Ogun State public secondary schools. International Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies source Retrieved from <http://www.academicjournals.org/IJEAPS>
- [44]. Penwarden, R. (2014). Defining your Respondents and Drawing Conclusions. Retrieved from [fluidsurvey.com/university](http://fluidsurvey.com/university)
- [45]. Onuselogu, A.P. (2008). Analysis Of Principals' Accountability In Managing Secondary Schools Funds In Anambra State. Retrieved from [www.globalacademicgroup.com/journals](http://www.globalacademicgroup.com/journals)
- [46]. Romualdez, R. (2016). Professional Accountability and Ethics. Retrieved from <https://www.123helpme.com/the-importance-of-education>
- [47]. Schoech, D. (2006). Contingency Theory. Retrieved from <https://web.uta.edu/projects/sswtech/6371/coursepack>
- [48]. Shadreck, M. & Herbert C. (2013). Quality And Accountability In Education: What Saythe School Heads? Retrieved from [www.erint.savap.org.pk/PDF/Vol.2\(2\)/ERInt.2013\(2.2-20\).pdf](http://www.erint.savap.org.pk/PDF/Vol.2(2)/ERInt.2013(2.2-20).pdf)
- [49]. Sriram, B. (2016). Top 10 challenges faced by 21st century principals. Retrieved from <https://www.creatrixcampus.com/blog>
- [50]. Vance, A. Lowry, P.V. and Eggert, D. (2015). Theory of Accountability. Retrieved from <https://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=2871318>
- [51]. Wilson, E. (2015). Accountability and Leadership. Retrieved from <https://www.ojs.unisa.edu.au/index.php/>

#### D. OTHER SOURCES

- [52]. Deped Order No. 32, series 2010
- [53]. Handbook on IcExcels,2010
- [54]. Republic Act 9155



- [55]. Q & A on Selected Laws and regulations for Public and Private Schools European Commission, 2017  
[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/44841566\\_Quality\\_assurance\\_in\\_education](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/44841566_Quality_assurance_in_education)

### Author Profile

**Angelica F. Olaso:** Received the B.S. degree in Secondary Education, major in English from the Saint Brigitte's College. She taught in public secondary school in the Division of Lipa City before she was promoted as a Head Teacher of the Language Department. After successfully passing the National Qualifying Examination for School Heads, she started serving the Division as a Secondary School principal. Currently, she is a Principal II at Bulacnin Integrated National High School.

**Randy M. Baja, Ph.D.:** A professor of Education teaching the graduate school of the Batangas State University. A research enthusiast, adviser and consultant.