SCHOOL GOVERNORS' EFFECTIVENESS AND INSTITUTIONAL PERFORMANCE: EVIDENCE FROM A PHILIPPINE STATE HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTION

Michael Joavanni E. Perez
Zamboanga Peninsula Polytechnic State University, Philippines
malorraine428@gmail.com

ABSTRACT: *Effective governance is fundamental to achieving institutional quality, organizational accountability, and sustainable performance in higher education institutions. Despite continuing reforms in educational management, many public higher education institutions encounter governance challenges that adversely affect the delivery of instruction, research productivity, and extension services. This study examined teachers' perceptions of the effectiveness of school governors' roles and determined their influence on the quality of school governance and institutional performance in a Philippine State Higher Education Institution (SHEI). A descriptive-correlational survey design was employed using a researcher-developed and validated questionnaire administered to permanent faculty members. Descriptive statistics and regression analysis were used to analyze the data.Results indicated that respondents generally perceived school governors as ineffective in carrying out several strategic governance functions, particularly in organizational leadership, strategic planning, democratic decision-making, and institutional management. Likewise, school governance and institutional performance were rated relatively low, especially in research and extension. Regression analysis further revealed that the effectiveness of school governors significantly influenced both the quality of school governance and institutional performance. The findings underscore the importance of strategic leadership, participatory governance, and organizational capability in improving institutional outcomes. Strengthening leadership competencies, enhancing stakeholder engagement, and reinforcing governance systems are recommended to promote organizational effectiveness and improve the performance of higher education institutions.*

Keywords: school governance, institutional leadership, higher education, organizational effectiveness, institutional performance

1. INTRODUCTION

Higher education institutions are expected to function as centers of knowledge creation, innovation, and community development while maintaining high standards of academic quality, accountability, and institutional integrity. Achieving these expectations requires governance systems capable of providing strategic direction, ensuring effective resource utilization, promoting stakeholder participation, and sustaining organizational performance. Consequently, institutional governance has become a central concern among policymakers, educational leaders, and researchers seeking to improve higher education outcomes [1,2].

School governance encompasses the structures, policies, processes, and leadership practices through which educational institutions establish priorities, formulate strategic decisions, and monitor organizational performance. Effective governance promotes transparency, accountability, participation, responsiveness, and evidence-based decision-making, all of which contribute to institutional effectiveness and public trust [2,3]. Within higher education institutions, governing officials perform a crucial leadership function by aligning institutional vision with operational priorities while ensuring that organizational resources are utilized efficiently to achieve academic objectives.

Recent educational reforms have increasingly emphasized governance as a critical determinant of institutional quality. International organizations continue to advocate governance systems that promote collaborative leadership, strategic planning, continuous quality improvement, and stakeholder engagement in addressing contemporary educational challenges [1,3]. Similarly, governance research has consistently demonstrated that effective leadership contributes significantly to institutional performance, faculty engagement, organizational innovation, and sustainable educational development [4,5].

In higher education, governance effectiveness extends beyond administrative efficiency. Institutional leaders are expected to provide strategic leadership that supports the uuniversity's three fundamental functions—instruction, research, and extensionwhile fostering an organizational culture characterized by accountability, professionalism, and continuous improvement. Leadership practices influence organizational climate, employee motivation, policy implementation, and institutional responsiveness to emerging educational demands [5,6].

The present study is conceptually anchored on the **McKinsey 7-S Framework**, which emphasizes that organizational effectiveness depends on the alignment of seven interdependent organizational elements: strategy, structure, systems, shared values, style, staff, and skills. Rather than focusing solely on organizational structure, the framework recognizes that effective leadership requires the integration of both structural and human dimensions to achieve institutional excellence. The model has been widely applied in organizational development and educational management to examine leadership effectiveness and organizational change [7,8].

Although governance has received considerable attention internationally, empirical evidence examining teachers' perceptions of school governors' effectiveness within Philippine public higher education institutions remains limited. Faculty members directly experience institutional policies, leadership practices, organizational systems, and governance processes; therefore, their perceptions provide valuable evidence regarding the effectiveness of institutional governance and its contribution to organizational performance.

Specifically, this study sought to determine the perceived effectiveness of school governors' roles, assess the quality of school governance and institutional performance in terms of instruction, research, and extension, and examine whether governors' effectiveness significantly influences governance quality and institutional performance. By providing empirical evidence on governance effectiveness, the study contributes to the growing body of literature on educational leadership

and offers practical insights for strengthening governance practices within Philippine higher education institutions.

II. MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study employed a descriptive-correlational research design to examine the relationship between the perceived effectiveness of school governors' roles, school governance, and institutional performance. The descriptive component was used to determine faculty members' perceptions regarding the effectiveness of institutional leadership and governance practices, while the correlational component investigated whether the effectiveness of school governors significantly influenced school governance and institutional performance.

The study was conducted in a Philippine State Higher Education Institution (SHEI). The respondents consisted of permanent faculty members who possessed substantial experience in institutional operations and governance. Participants were selected through convenience sampling based on their availability and willingness to participate in the survey. Faculty members were considered appropriate respondents because they directly experience institutional policies, leadership practices, governance mechanisms, and academic operations.

Data were collected using a researcher-developed questionnaire adapted from established governance and organizational effectiveness frameworks. The instrument comprised three major sections. The first section assessed the effectiveness of school governors' roles across five governance dimensions: (1) defining organizational roles and responsibilities, (2) leadership, (3) communication of institutional vision and goals, (4) support for the governing body, and (5) monitoring organizational performance. The second section evaluated the quality of school governance, while the third section measured institutional performance in terms of instruction, research, and extension. Responses were measured using a four-point Likert scale, with higher scores indicating more favorable perceptions of governance effectiveness.

To ensure the quality of the instrument, the questionnaire underwent expert validation and pilot testing prior to its administration. Content validity was established through the evaluation of specialists in educational management and research, while internal consistency was assessed using Cronbach's alpha coefficient to determine the reliability of the measurement scales. Only validated items were included in the final instrument.

Prior to data collection, the researcher obtained the necessary administrative approval and informed the respondents of the purpose of the study. Participation was voluntary, and respondents were assured that all information would be treated with strict confidentiality and used solely for academic and research purposes. Ethical principles concerning informed consent, anonymity, and confidentiality were observed throughout the conduct of the study.

The completed questionnaires were encoded and analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Descriptive statistics, including weighted mean and standard deviation, were employed to determine the perceived effectiveness of school governors, the level of school governance, and institutional performance. To determine the influence of school governors' effectiveness on school governance and institutional performance, simple linear regression analysis was performed. Statistical significance was evaluated at the 0.05 level.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Effectiveness of School Governors' Roles

The perceived effectiveness of school governors was evaluated across ten governance indicators representing strategic leadership, organizational management, communication, human resource development, and performance monitoring. The findings are summarized in

Table 1: Faculty Perceptions of the Effectiveness of School Governors' Roles

Governance Indicator	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Employee capability development	2.45	0.51	Very Effective
Hiring based on qualification standards	2.15	0.37	Effective
Organizational structure	2.00	0.00	Effective
Communication of organizational culture	1.85	0.37	Effective
Performance monitoring	1.85	0.37	Effective
Work systems aligned with institutional goals	1.30	0.47	Not Effective
Leadership toward productivity and competitiveness	1.30	0.47	Not Effective
Democratic decision-making	1.30	0.47	Not Effective
Strategic planning for institutional competitiveness	1.15	0.37	Not Effective
Leadership skills and governance competence	1.15	0.37	Not Effective
Overall Mean	1.65	—	Not Effective

The overall weighted mean of 1.65 indicates that faculty members generally perceived school governors as not effective in carrying out their governance responsibilities. The highest-rated indicator was employee capability development (M = 2.45, SD = 0.51), suggesting that respondents acknowledged the institution's efforts to provide faculty development opportunities. Likewise, hiring based on qualification standards (M = 2.15) and organizational structuring (M = 2.00) received favorable evaluations.

In contrast, respondents expressed unfavorable perceptions regarding strategic leadership functions. The lowest mean scores were obtained for strategic planning (M = 1.15, SD = 0.37) and leadership competence in governance (M = 1.15, SD = 0.37). Similarly, leadership toward institutional competitiveness, democratic decision-making, and the establishment of work systems aligned with institutional goals all received mean ratings of 1.30, indicating that these governance functions were perceived as inadequately demonstrated.

These findings suggest that while institutional leaders were viewed positively in faculty development and staffing practices, greater attention is required in strategic leadership, organizational planning, and participatory governance. Recent studies have likewise emphasized that transformational leadership, strategic planning, and stakeholder participation are among the strongest predictors of effective higher education governance [4–6].

Quality of School Governance

Faculty members also assessed the quality of institutional governance across the three core functions of higher education. The results are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Perceived Quality of School Governance

Governance Dimension	Mean	Interpretation
Instruction	1.75	Good
Research	1.55	Poor
Extension	1.45	Poor
Overall Mean	1.58	Poor

The overall mean of 1.58 indicates that respondents perceived the quality of school governance as poor. Governance related to instruction received the highest evaluation (M = 1.75), suggesting that institutional policies and administrative support were relatively more effective in instructional activities than in the institution's other core mandates.

Conversely, governance in research (M = 1.55) and extension (M = 1.45) was rated poor. These findings imply that governance mechanisms supporting knowledge generation and community engagement require substantial improvement. International literature consistently recognizes research and extension as governance-intensive functions requiring strategic leadership, resource allocation, and organizational support [1–3].

Institutional Performance

Faculty perceptions regarding institutional performance are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3. Institutional Performance

Performance Dimension	Mean	Interpretation
Instruction	1.80	Good
Research	1.40	Poor
Extension	1.50	Poor
Overall Mean	1.57	Poor

Institutional performance obtained an overall mean of 1.57, corresponding to a poor rating. Among the three functions, instruction obtained the highest evaluation (M = 1.80), indicating that teaching and learning activities generally met institutional expectations. However, research (M = 1.40) and extension (M = 1.50) remained below the desired level.

The findings suggest that while instructional activities benefited from relatively stronger institutional support, research productivity and extension initiatives continued to lag behind. Similar patterns have been observed in many developing higher education systems, where instructional functions receive greater institutional attention than research and community engagement because of limited resources and governance capacity [2,5].

Influence of School Governors' Effectiveness on School Governance and Institutional Performance

Simple linear regression analysis was performed to determine whether the effectiveness of school governors significantly influenced school governance and institutional performance. The results are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Regression Analysis of School Governors' Effectiveness

Dependent Variable	R	R^2	F	p-value	Decision
School Governance	0.873	0.762	57.635	<0.001	Reject H_0
Institutional Performance	0.825	0.681	38.367	<0.001	Reject H_0

Regression analysis demonstrated a strong positive relationship between school governors' effectiveness and school governance (R = 0.873). The coefficient of determination (R^2 = 0.762) indicates that 76.2% of the variation in school governance can be explained by the effectiveness of school governors. The regression model was statistically significant (F = 57.635, p < 0.001), indicating that improvements in leadership effectiveness are strongly associated with improvements in governance quality.

Similarly, school governors' effectiveness exhibited a strong positive relationship with institutional performance (R = 0.825). The coefficient of determination (R^2 = 0.681) indicates that approximately 68.1% of the variation in institutional performance is explained by the perceived effectiveness of school governors. The model was likewise statistically significant (F = 38.367, p < 0.001).

These findings support the proposition that effective governance is a major determinant of institutional success. Strategic leadership influences organizational direction, policy implementation, resource management, and stakeholder participation, all of which contribute to improved institutional outcomes. The results are consistent with the McKinsey 7-S Framework, which posits that organizational effectiveness depends on the alignment of leadership, systems, strategy, staff, skills, structure, and shared values [7,8]. Likewise, contemporary studies on higher education governance have consistently reported that institutions with stronger governance structures demonstrate better academic performance, organizational adaptability, and sustainable institutional development [1,4,6].

4. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study examined the effectiveness of school governors' roles and their influence on school governance and institutional performance in a Philippine State Higher Education Institution. The findings revealed that institutional leaders were generally perceived as less effective in performing several strategic governance functions, particularly in organizational leadership, strategic planning, democratic decision-making, and governance competence. Although faculty development and personnel management received relatively favorable assessments, these strengths were insufficient to offset deficiencies in broader governance practices.

The study further demonstrated that school governance and institutional performance remained below the desired level, with research and extension identified as the weakest institutional functions. In contrast, instructional activities received comparatively more positive evaluations, suggesting that institutional efforts have been more concentrated on teaching and learning than on research productivity and community engagement. These findings indicate the need for a more balanced governance approach that supports the three core functions of higher education institutions.

Regression analysis confirmed that the effectiveness of school governors significantly influenced both school governance and institutional performance, highlighting the critical role of institutional leadership in achieving organizational effectiveness. The strong relationships observed in the study suggest that improvements in leadership practices are likely to enhance governance quality, strengthen institutional systems, and contribute to better

organizational outcomes. These findings support contemporary perspectives on higher education governance, which emphasize that strategic leadership, accountability, stakeholder participation, and evidence-based decision-making are essential components of institutional success.

The findings have important implications for higher education administrators and policymakers. Institutions should prioritize leadership development programs that strengthen strategic planning, governance competencies, and participatory decision-making among institutional leaders. Greater attention should also be given to reinforcing governance mechanisms that support research and extension activities, ensuring that institutional resources and policies promote balanced development across all academic functions. Furthermore, establishing systematic performance monitoring and continuous governance assessment may help institutions identify organizational gaps and implement timely improvements that enhance institutional effectiveness.

Finally, future studies should expand the scope of investigation by including multiple State Higher Education Institutions and examining additional organizational variables, such as transformational leadership, organizational culture, employee engagement, and innovation. Such studies may provide broader evidence on governance effectiveness and contribute to the development of policies and leadership practices that promote sustainable excellence in Philippine higher education.

4. REFERENCES

[1] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). *Education Policy Outlook 2024*. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2024.

[2] United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). *Global Education Monitoring Report 2024/25: Leadership in Education*. Paris: UNESCO, 2024.

[3] World Bank. *Improving Governance in Higher Education Institutions*. Washington, DC: World Bank, 2023.

[4] Commission on Higher Education (CHED). *Policy Standard to Enhance Quality Assurance (CHED Memorandum Order No. 46, s. 2012).* Quezon City, Philippines.

[5] Accrediting Agency of Chartered Colleges and Universities in the Philippines (AACCUP). *Accreditation Policies and Guidelines*. Latest edition.

[6] Fullan, M. *The New Meaning of Educational Change*. 6th ed. New York: Teachers College Press, 2020.

[7] Bush, T. *Theories of Educational Leadership and Management*. 5th ed. London: Sage Publications, 2020.

[8] Peters, T. J., and Waterman, R. H. *In Search of Excellence*. New York: Harper Business, 2004.

[9] Waterman, R. H., Peters, T. J., and Phillips, J. R. "Structure Is Not Organization." *Business Horizons*. 23(3):14–26, 1980.

[10] Kaplan, R. S., and Norton, D. P. *The Balanced Scorecard: Translating Strategy into Action*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 1996.

[11] Northouse, P. G. *Leadership: Theory and Practice*. 9th ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2022.

[12] Bryson, J. M. *Strategic Planning for Public and Nonprofit Organizations*. 6th ed. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley, 2024.

[13] Kotter, J. P. *Leading Change*. Boston: Harvard Business Review Press, 2012.

[14] Robbins, S. P., and Judge, T. A. *Organizational Behavior*. 19th ed. Pearson Education, 2023.

[15] Senge, P. M. *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization*. Revised ed. New York: Doubleday, 2006.