

## School Heads' Administrative Supervision: Its Relation to the Program Accreditation of Private Higher Education Institutions (PHEIs) in Region XII

Fahad Abdul Salendab<sup>a</sup>, Yolanda Cruspero Dapitan<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a,b</sup> Sultan Kudarat State University

**Article History:** Received: 10 January 2021; Revised: 12 February 2021; Accepted: 27 March 2021; Published online: 4 June 2021

**Abstract:** The study aimed to determine the influence of administrative supervision manifested by the school heads on Private Higher Education Institutions' (PHEIs) performance regarding programs accreditation in Region XII. The research employed ex-post facto research and the descriptive-correlation or the causal-comparative method since researchers investigated accessible documents on the accredited programs of PHEIs. The respondents of this study were the 410 school heads. The collected data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software V.21X64.

School heads of the Private Higher Education Institutions (PHEIs) demonstrated a marked display of their administrative supervision skills to support the school and improve the program accreditation. Also, higher education programs are primarily level 1 and level 2 accredited. Many of these programs are primary education, engineering, accountancy and business, nursing, and graduate degree programs. Few accredited programs were in level 3 and level 4. Most of these accredited programs are nursing, education, arts and sciences, accounting, financial management, and a graduate degree in education. These programs are offered chiefly by autonomous and deregulated PHEIs. A quarter of the 30 PHEIs have no accredited programs or membership in any accrediting agencies.

Although PHEIs obtained lower accredited programs, monitoring and leading administrative supervision are good predictors of program accreditation.

It is recommended that supervision must be sustained and strengthened among the regulated PHEIs to get their programs accredited and level up the accreditation of various programs.

**Keywords:** Administration, Supervision, Accreditation, Region XII, Administrative Supervision, Private Higher Education Institutions, Performance

### 1. Introduction

Education is a long-term infestation in the development of human capital that is essential for the survival of human society. Without education, a country or culture would remain stagnant, resulting in the absence of a civilized community. Almost all countries prioritize education as a critical and primary factor in nation-building, placing education first. When it comes to educational quality, Private Higher Education Institutions (PHEIs) are crucial in preparing a nation to take an active role in developing gifted human capital assets. As a result, each nation contributes to the growth and awareness of citizens through these institutions to ensure the country's future.

It is difficult because PHEIs must constantly monitor themselves against existing criteria or standards and must conform to current labor market demands, which requires significant financial investment to strengthen faculty, research, growth, and extension services. Furthermore, according to Paqueo et al. (2012), most higher education institutions are of low quality, as shown by a lack of or low-level accreditation programs by accrediting agencies. The government has taken steps to increase educational institutions' performance and ensure that they adhere to particular criteria or specifications designed to improve the quality of education.

Reforms such as rationalizing higher education and increasing the budgets of these HEIs have been introduced to ensure that mobilization and cost-effectiveness are not compromised. According to Paqueo et al. (2012), since private higher education institutions are primarily funded by tuition, instituting reforms and implementing innovations to improve educational quality remains a tall order for these institutions.

Further, reforms would be insufficient unless the higher education institutions are continually pushed to change and set higher expectations than a minimum standard. With the country's rising number of PHEIs and the global market's demand for skilled employees, improving education quality is necessary.

On the other hand, school supervision serves as an actual instrument to monitor the overall performance or operation of PHEIs. Yap (2012) claims that the low standard of education hampers economic development. Thus, establishing a supervision mechanism will increase the standard of quality of PHEIs.

Supervision is a critical component of educational organization and management. It is a type of education that seeks to encourage, endorse, and improve educational standards. This supervision would be accurate and responsive to the school personnel's needs. It is the process of creating qualified educators who are capable of adapting to changing circumstances, educational policies, courses, and other factors (Prididilok, K. 2009).

Additionally, supervision takes the lead in enhancing the teaching-learning process, adapting school curricula to meet global market demands, and designing instructional materials for the effective and efficient delivery of lessons (Visco, 2015)

Education stakeholders have recently expressed frustration with educational institutions' few approved programs. These stakeholders placed the blame solely on teachers and administrators, while others placed the blame solely on students and their parents. Regardless of who is to blame, the fact remains that the school and its supervisory management are directly linked to the standard accreditation of the institution's programs.

The researchers determined that further research was necessary and worthwhile in this context.

## 2. Theoretical Framework

### S-R theory (Stimulus-Response)

Edward L. Thorndike's stimulus-response (S-R) theory, based on conditioning principles, was also used in this study. According to this theory, human behavior can be taught. According to the law of effect, behavioral responses (R) that resulted in a desirable outcome were more likely to develop into existing habits and recur in response to the same stimulus (S).

Stimulus-response (S-R) theories underpin conditioning principles. They are based on the premise that human acts are teachable. Edward L. Thorndike, an early contributor to the field, suggested the law of effect, which stated that behavioral responses (R) closely associated with a favorable result were more likely to become defined patterns and recur in response to the same stimulus (S). The most straightforward S-R scheme is the unmediated S-R scheme. When a single organism (O) affects another stimulus, such as thinking about a response, the response is mediated.

Individuals and organizations often make use of the S-O-R theory of behavior to describe social interaction. Conditioning is a type of learning in which a stimulus becomes more effective at eliciting a response, or the response occurs more frequently in a well-defined and predictable manner. The type of reinforcement used will dictate the outcome. When two stimuli are presented in a timely and sufficient intensity relationship, one will eventually elicit the same response as the other. As a result of this process, a stimulus substitution process can be described. This technique is referred to as classical conditioning.

Supervision is the responsibility of ensuring that the curriculum is appropriately implemented and supporting others. Inspection and supervision are separate but complementary tools for achieving educational objectives. Although inspection focuses on fact-finding, supervision focuses on developing a productive superior-subordinate relationship with a specific emphasis on specialization to maximize the use of available human and material resources to achieve the organization's goals.

Instructional supervision occupies a unique role within the educational system. It is described as enhancing teachers' professional development, curriculum development, and teaching techniques through democratic interactions between teachers and supervisors. Instructional supervision in the modern age is focused on enhancing the teaching-learning environment for both teachers and students. It assists in identifying teachers' strengths and weaknesses and carrying out follow-up exercises to address recognized areas of teachers' vulnerability and recognize the teacher.

Meanwhile, school supervision is a social process that entails the identification, maintenance, simulation, control, and unification of formal or informal organized human and physical energies within an interpreted framework. The school admin is responsible for pupils, compliance with applicable laws and regulations, and implementing the school system's policies. School supervision is a specialized role that includes various complex and demanding responsibilities, including student management, school personnel management, instructional program management, school facilities management, and legal records management. (Encyclopedia Britannica last update: 5-4-2015 <https://www.britannica.com/topic/conditioning#ref154466>).

## 3. The Research Problem

This study aimed to determine the influence of school heads' administrative supervision on the programs accredited by the Private Higher Education Institutions (PHEIs) in Region XII.

Specifically, this study attempted to answer the following question:

1. What is the extent of administrative supervision of school heads in terms of:
  - a. Planning;

- b. Organizing;
  - c. Leading; and
  - d. monitoring?
2. What is the level of institutional performance of PHEIs in programs accredited?
  3. Does administrative supervision influence the level of accredited programs of PHEIs?

#### **4. Research Hypothesis**

**Ho:**The extent of administrative supervision of the school heads do not influence the level of accredited programs of Private Higher Education Institutions (PHEIs)

#### **Related Literature and Studies**

##### **On Administrative Supervision**

Supervisors are also required to provide the enabling environment, equipment, and services necessary for successful teaching and learning in a school setting. In practice, Lennox (2013) noted that managers/administrators/supervisors perform a variety of critical functions in organizations and are widely recognized for their significant influence on the overall environment of the workplace. Tess (2003) asserted that administrators/supervisors must empower employees to use their ingenuity and initiative as needed in contributing to the achievement of institutional goals.

On the other hand, Roe (1961) argues that administration is a mechanism that guides individuals' efforts toward a common objective

through leadership, collaboration, and control.

As defined by Girling (1991), the administration is a set of functions that include preparing, coordinating, delegating, assessing, supervising, guiding, and regulating. Additionally, Mussazi (2002) asserts that as an educator, the school head is accountable for ensuring that existing processes and systems assist the school in accomplishing its objectives and goals. As an administrator, he is also responsible for maintaining the school and ensuring its smooth operation. He is responsible for monitoring and controlling the work of the entire school system.

Additionally, Mussazi (2002) asserts that administration is a necessary component of any organization. It is critical for the continued and increased effectiveness and competitiveness of complex institutions such as schools, universities, and other institutions.

Sergiovanni (2002) believes that a significant portion of the performance of administrative acts is contingent upon the interpretations made by principals as they transform theoretical understanding into realistic decisions and behaviors. Sergiovanni views supervisors' and administrators' behavior, school objectives, scarce available resources, and the importance of collaborating with others such as teachers, parents, and students as essential administration elements. When administrators/supervisors successfully align their activities with their objectives, they are deemed adequate.

While the administration is a necessary component of all institutions and organizations, there has never been a more significant challenge to school administration staff in this country than there is now. Supervisors must also collaborate with school boards and teacher unions. Additionally, they must maintain these systems. External organizations such as unions and legislators seek to control the content or structure of educational administration and achieve resource redistribution.

On the other hand, Ojo (1999) emphasized that school administration entails managing, administering the curriculum and teaching, pastoral care, discipline, resource allocation, costing and planning, staff appraisal, and relationship building with the community. Many of these responsibilities can be summarized as follows: planning, organizing, leading, supervising, and reviewing the educational system. These are the school administrator's responsibilities, and he or she must ensure that they are all geared toward productive and successful teaching-learning in the classroom to achieve high-quality outputs (Ojo, 1999).

By definition, Uyanga (2007) asserts that a school's supervisor is a planner, operator, controller, coordinator, organizer, advisor, and problem solver. The supervisor is the individual who is ultimately responsible for the school's success or failure. The supervisor defines and establishes the school's priorities and objectives, which must, of course, be consistent with national objectives, analyzes assignments and assigns roles to staff members based on their specialization and expertise.

Numerous reports have been conducted on administrators' administrative responsibilities. According to Uyanga (2007), the school administrator is the school's chief executive and the school's superintendent, instructional leader, and personnel manager for both students and workers. The school head of school is both the finance and facilities manager. He must establish positive relationships with the immediate community and maintain communication with the higher agency such as the Commission on Higher Education. The school system is divided into many types of administrative task areas. There are student and staff employees, teaching and curriculum creation, school finance and business management, school project management, and other general activities.

In general, the school head serves as a standard-setter, fostering an aspiration and expectation among teachers and students to do good work. He is the one who supports teachers in their efforts to improve processes, resources, and assessment and thus acts as a quality control measure. School administrators may assist teachers in honing their techniques and developing their capacity for data analysis and interpretation. the school head must possess specific administrative skills for him/her to fulfill his/her duties effectively

### **Planning as Administrative Supervision**

McDonnell (2011) describes planning as a process where the school determines what it wants to be in the future and how to get there. They provide guidance and aim for the school, its subunits, and contributing staff. As Gardiner (2011) said, this aim and the strategies necessary to achieve it will serve as its planning structure. He added that school counselors, social workers, school psychologists, library media experts, department heads, and teachers must align individual goals with those of the building's school principal.

According to Oosterlynck (2011), planning is critical because it provides staff with a sense of mission and direction, defines the types of tasks they will undertake, and describes how their activities contribute to their overall objectives. Without this knowledge, employees will have no way of knowing how to use their time and energies efficiently and effectively. They will then react randomly to their job duties, wasting valuable human resources.

Goodstein (2011) emphasized the importance of planning as a prerequisite for all other leadership functions. According to McDonnell (2011), it serves as the foundation for measuring and assessing actual results. The plans created in the first phase serve as standards or metrics against which actual output is measured in the monitoring stage. Ornstein (2008) suggests that without well-defined and mutually agreed-upon programs, there is no benefit or basis for assessing the success of educational outcomes.

Boschee (2009) continued by stating that comparing expected and tangible outcomes enables the school head to make appropriate changes to the school's plan of action. Criticisms of conventional planning models have culminated in the emergence of the strategic planning strategy since the 1970s. New perspectives on the existence of educational institutions have emerged. Schools have been compared to decentralized economies and structured anarchies. The difficulties schools face has shifted significantly as new demands have been raised on them.

Strategic planning, as a subset of the policy process, according to Boschee (2009), could be an ideal technology for shaping the future of education. Marzano and Waters (2010) stated that given the contextual constraints of educational policy, the task for strategic planners is to understand the internal and external boundaries and use this understanding to devise strategies that can result in changes in student achievement and school structure.

### **Organizing as Administrative Supervision**

According to Argyris (2011), once school leaders have formulated feasible strategies and methods for implementing them, they must design an organization capable of effectively implementing the plans. He continued by stating that organizing entails three critical components: designing the organization's structure, obtaining and developing human capital, and creating common trends and networks.

Jones (2010) asserts that designing an organization's structure entails developing a school's organizational map. The leader sets policies and procedures governing authority relationships, reporting structures, the chain of command, departmentalization, and various administrative and subordinate responsibilities. The school's head of school then takes measures to recruit qualified staff. When appropriate, the school head creates a curriculum to train new staff in performing their assigned tasks. Finally, the school head establishes systematic communication and knowledge networks, including the types of information transmitted, the direction in which communication flows, and the removal of obstacles to successful communication.

According to Grant (2011), organizing at the highest levels of an institution typically entails developing the school's overall structure. According to Burton (2007), organizing is typically more specific at the building level

and can include the following activities: developing methods to help people understand what portion of the job is their responsibility; coordinating individual efforts across work schedules to avoid unnecessary delays in task completion and designing an efficient system for performing day-to-day work.

### **Leading as Administrative Supervision**

Northhouse (2010) states that once strategies are developed, and events are planned, the next step is to lead staff members toward the institution's goals. While planning identifies what to do and scheduling identifies how to do it, leading identifies why the staff member may choose to do it. Northhouse added that the leading role has recently been referred to as encouraging, collaborating, or actuating. Whatever the word, leading involves guiding and influencing others.

Hord and Sommers (2008) describe the position of the school head as "having things done by collaboration with all school stakeholders in a professional learning environment." They must also have some control over the actions of others. To effectively influence others, the principal must have a working knowledge of leadership, inspiration, communication, and group dynamics. According to English (2008), leadership entails communicating objectives to employees and instilling in them a willingness to perform at a high level. Since schools primarily comprise communities, leading entails inspiring whole departments or teams and individuals toward target attainment.

### **Monitoring as Administrative Supervision**

When school administrators compare expected and actual outcomes and take corrective action when appropriate, they carry out the monitoring role.

According to Blankstein et al. (2010), each principal is responsible for monitoring. It may simply include walking around the house, speaking with students, visiting classes, and speaking with faculty, or it may include developing sophisticated information systems to monitor performance quality, but it must be done if the school head is to be successful.

The success in which school heads perform these tasks defines the school's effectiveness. According to Blankstein (2010), a school is established to carry out a specific set of tasks and accomplish several specified goals, the most critical of which is student learning. DuFour et al. (2010) added that it is the school head's responsibility to collaborate with all school stakeholders in a competitive learning environment. It entails planning, organizing, directing, and monitoring.

In conclusion, administrative supervision entails organizing activities and establishing a framework for achieving educational objectives. Additionally, it entails cooperation, facilitation, and school heads with their subordinates to maintain a harmonious partnership and health.

## **5. Methods**

The researcher utilized the ex-post facto research method or causal-comparative method since the researchers investigated accessible documents on the accredited programs of the Private Higher Education Institutions (PHEIs) in Region XII from Academic Year 2014 to 2016. In addition, the descriptive-correlation method was utilized in determining the influence of administrative supervision of the school heads to the level of programs accredited. The descriptive survey method was used to determine the extent of administrative supervision demonstrated by the school heads and the number of approved programs. Key informant interviews were also used to obtain from the school heads to justify the respondents' answers.

Thirty (30) presidents, thirty (30) vice presidents for academic affairs, fifty (50) college deans, one hundred (100) program heads, one hundred (100) school coordinators, and one hundred (100) chairpersons took part in the survey. These respondents came from 30 PHEIs. A total of 410 school heads took part in this research.

The data gathered were analyzed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software V.21X64. Frequency count and percentage, mean, and regression analysis were the statistical methods used.

The survey questionnaire was formulated after reviewing the related literature and consulting with experts. The instrument was found valid and reliable. Using item-total correlation, items that did not meet the required correlation coefficients were either discarded or improved while other items that met the required standards were retained. Further, a reliability test was performed to determine the instrument's reliability after the instrument's items were finalized. A reliability index of .97 was determined from this test, indicating that the instrument was very reliable.

## 6. Results And Discussions

**Table 1** Extent of School Heads' Administrative Supervision

Variables	Mean	Description
Planning	3.24	Manifested
Organizing	3.21	Manifested
Leading	3.19	Manifested
Monitoring	3.19	Manifested
Grand Mean	3.20	Manifested

Legend:

3.50 – 4.00 Highly Manifested

2.50 – 3.49 Manifested

1.50 – 2.49 Least Manifested

1.00 – 1.49 Not Manifested

The school heads manifested their administrative supervision in terms of planning. The school heads showed signs of organizing supervision as well. Further, the monitoring supervision was viewed manifested, including the leading administrative supervision.

The result suggests that school heads used their administrative skills and supervisory expertise to sustain and improve their institution's efficiency. This means that they are using the above sub-variables to fulfill the objectives of PHEIs.

This supports Lennox's (2013) assertion that managers/administrators/supervisors perform a variety of critical functions in organizations and are widely acknowledged as having a significant effect on the overall climate of the workplace.

**Table 2** Level of Programs Accreditation of PHEIs

Accreditation	Level	f%
Level 1 Accredited	10	13.7
Level 2 Accredited	33	45.2
Level 3 Accredited	8	10.9
Level 4 Accredited	4	5.5
No Accreditation	18	24.17

There were 30 PHEIs participated in this study. Some PHEIs were categorized as autonomous and deregulated; others were regulated by the Commission on Higher Education (CHED). In this study, these PHEIs were lumped together since only their accredited programs were needed.

A total of 55 programs were accredited from the 30 PHEIs. Eighteen or 24.17% of these programs were not accredited. The reason was their accrediting agencies. Of the 55 programs, 10 or 13.7 percent were level 1 accredited. This means that PHEIs after the application for accreditation, on-site visitation were conducted on these institutions seeking accreditation. These institutions received positive feedback, which is why they were issued the level 1 qualification. The findings were passed to the Federation of Accrediting Agencies in the Philippines (FAAP) and then endorsed to CHED. This level is good for two years. The following programs are Computer Science, BS Information Technology, MAED, MPA, MBA, BS Computer Engineering, Accountancy, BSHRM, BS on Office Administration, BS in Nursing, BSBA, and BSSED and BEED.

Meanwhile, 33 or 45.2 percent of PHEIs programs were level 2 accredited. This means that before they were granted level 2, they had undergone on-site visitation and evaluation resulted in their level 2 accreditation. This

level can be renewed every three years. These accredited programs were BS Industrial Engineering, BS Civil Engineering, BS in Accountancy, BS Computer Science, BS Information Technology, BS Electrical Engineering, BS Electronics Engineering, Ph.D. in Educational Management, MBA, MPA, MAED, BEED, BSED, AB, BSBA.

Further, eight or 10.9 percent of the programs of PHEIs were level 3 accredited, which implies that PHEIs performed well in licensure exams, conducted research projects, with close links to other schools and organizations, a well-run library, community extension services, journals, and a strong faculty development program. These accredited programs by the autonomous, deregulated, and even some regulated PHEIs were BS Nursing, BSBA, BS in Accounting Technology, AB History, English, Philosophy, Political Science, BEED, BSED, BS Biology, BS Psychology, Bachelor in Public Administration, AB Communications, BS in Accounting.

Lastly, four or (5.6%) of the programs had level 4 accreditation. These programs were Arts and Sciences, Education, Business Administration, and Nursing offered by autonomous PHEIs. The data suggests that these institutions had projects with substantial academic publications and intentionally recognized teaching and learning techniques, had global interconnections and contributed to regional and national, social, and educational advantages. The data further explains that the autonomous and deregulated states have more accredited programs than the regulated schools.

The findings above support the study conducted by Conchada and Tiongco (2014) that the quality of educational institutions of several higher education institutions have deteriorated over time because they have few accredited programs.

**Table 3**

Regression Analysis Between the School Heads' Administrative Supervision and the Level of Programs Accreditation of PHEIs					
Administrative Supervision	B	Std. Error	t	Sig.	Interpretation
Monitoring	-	.504	-3.500	.001	Significant
Leading	-.968	.454	-2.133	.037	Significant
Planning			.264	.793	Not Significant
Organizing			.382	.704	Not Significant

R=.553

Adjusted R=.286

F=28.6

Sig F: p=.001

The relationship between the two variables was investigated using multiple linear regression analyses, accredited programs, and potential predictors such as the extent of school heads' supervision in planning, organizing, leading, and monitoring their administrative supervision. The descriptive figures and findings are summarized in table 7.

Monitoring and leading, when taken in combination, significantly influenced the private HEIs level of accredited programs. Table 7 shows the results.

The multiple regression model with all four predictors produced adjusted  $R^2 = .553$ ,  $F = 28.6$ ,  $p < .001$ . The multiple regressions suggest a moderate correlation between the extent of administrative supervision and the level of accredited programs, as its correlation coefficient of .553 indicates. Together, they account for 28.6 percent of the total variance of the accredited program level while the remaining 71.4%, respectively, are accounted for other factors different from what were considered in this study.

Table7 shows that the independent variables monitoring and leading manifested in the school heads' administrative supervision in the private HEIs have significant negative weights (opposite in sign from its correlation with the criterion-level of the accredited program). This indicates that after accounting for planning

and organizing manifestation, school heads who manifest more monitoring and leading supervision tend to improve the lower levels of accredited programs (a suppressor effect). Planning and organizing did not contribute to the level of accredited programs.

The beta coefficient for monitoring (-1.765) and leading (-.968) are significant at a 0.001 probability level.

The obtained F-ratio of 28.6, which was found significant at .001 alpha, indicates that the school heads' monitoring and leading administrative supervision formed a very significant set of predictors for the level of accredited PHEIs programs.

## **7. Conclusions and Recommendations**

This study concluded that the school heads demonstrate a strong manifestation of their administrative skills supervision to help improve teaching and learning.

On the other hand, PHEIs' programs are mostly level 1 and level 2 accredited with a limited period of 2 to 3 years to sustain, improve, and downgrade accreditation levels. Many of these programs are primary education, engineering, accountancy and business, nursing, and graduate degree programs. Few accredited programs were in level 3 and level 4. Most of these accredited programs are nursing, education, arts and sciences, accounting and financial management, and graduate degree in education. Furthermore, these accredited programs are offered chiefly by autonomous and deregulated HEIs, and very few being offered by regulated HEIs. A quarter of the 30 HEIs has no accredited programs or membership in any accrediting bodies.

Although PHEIs had obtained lower levels of their accredited programs, the monitoring and leading as administrative supervision are good predictors of improving the level of accreditation of programs.

Since the school heads of PHEIs show manifestation in administrative supervision, it implies the effectiveness in their efforts to provide quality education; this implies sustaining and improving supervision programs. It also implies that supervision might be a gateway towards accrediting more programs. However, most HEIs do not have accredited programs in program accreditation, which implies the need to work for their accreditation to meet standards set for providing quality education.

It is recommended that HEIs should continue to improve its supervision program through sustain faculty development and training, acquiring adequate resources and materials for instruction, improving facilities, attuning teaching methodologies and strategies on the rapid pace of development of information technology, and providing needed administrative support, and strengthen the collaboration among HEIs stakeholders.

Most regulated PHEIs do not have accredited programs; if not, only a few programs are accredited. These PHEIs should work for accrediting their programs through the following priority areas: constructing more facilities, buildings, continuing training of faculty and staff, requiring faculty to get graduate degrees in line with their field of specialization, improve teaching methodologies and strategies, acquire more instructional resources, such as books, teaching materials, etcetera, the conduct of research and community outreach programs.

## **References**

- Argyris, C. (2011). *Organizational Traps: Leadership Culture, Organizational Design*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press
- Blankenstein, A. (2010). *Data Enhanced Leadership*. Thousand Oaks,
- Boschee, F. (2009). *Performance-Based Education: Developing Programs Through Strategic Planning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Burton, R. (2007). *Organizational Design: A Step-by-Step Approach*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press
- English, F. (2008). *The Art of Educational Leadership. Balancing Performance and Accountability*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SageCA: Corwin Press
- Gardiner, P. (2011). *Project Management: A Strategic Planning Approach*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan
- Goodstein, L. (2011). *Strategic Planning: A Leadership Imperative*. Alexandria, VA: American Society for Training and Development
- Grant, R. (2011). *Contemporary Strategy Analysis*. New York, NY: Wiley Publishing
- Hord, S. & Sommers, W. (2008). *Leading Professional Learning Communities*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press
- Jones, G. (2010). *Organizational Theory, Design and Change*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall
- Lennox, H. (2013). *Intellectual Capital in a Recession. Evidence from the UK. SMEs. Journal of*



Intellectual Capital

Marzano, R. & Waters, T. (2010). *District Leadership the Works: Striking the Right Balance*, Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree

McDonnell, R. (2011). *Essentials of Program Planning and Education*. Sudbury, MA: Jones and Barlett

Musaazi, J. (2002). *The Theory and Practice of Educational Administration*. London and Basingstoke. Macmillan Publishers

Northouse, P. (2010). *Leadership: Theory and Practice (5th Ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Ojo, K. (1999). *Administration and Management of Secondary Education. Effective Management of Secondary Schools: The Principal's Challenge*. Ibadan: Adeose Publication

Oosterlynck, S. (2011). *Bridging the Gap between Planning and Implementation: Turning Transformative Visions into Strategic Projects*. London, UK: Taylor and Francis

Ornstein, A. (2008). *Educational Administration: Concepts and Practices (5th Ed.)*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Cengage

Paqueo, V. B., J. R. G. Albert, and A. C. Orbeta. 2012. "A Critical Look at the Education Sector: Achievements, Challenges, and Reform Ideas. Chapter 3 of PIDS 2011 Economic Policy

Monitor: Education for Development. Makati City: Philippine Institute for Development

Prididilok, K (2009) *Administration and supervision of an introductory study*, 1st edition, Bangkok: Aksara Pipat Company Limited, 2009

Roe, W. (1961). *School Business Management*. McGraw Hill Book Co. New York

Sergiovanni, T. & Starratt, P. (2002). *Supervision: A Redefinition (7th Ed.)*. New York:

Tess, S. (2003). *Personnel Administration towards Optimum Productivity*. Ibadan: Newmark Industrial Printer.

Uyanga, R. (2008). *The Principal and Education Reform Agenda in Nigeria*. Publication of MCT Program (ANCOPSS)

Visco, Dionisio A. (2015). *Determinants of Performance in The Licensure Examination for Teachers (LET) of Abra State Institute of Sciences And Technology*. *International Journal of Research in Management & Business Studies (IJRMBS 2015)*. Vol. 2 Issue 1 Jan. - Mar. 2015. <http://ijrmbs.com/vol2issue1/dionisio.pdf>.