

Innovative Leadership Practices of School Heads' in Transforming School Operations and Resources Management to Bridge the Learning Poverty Gap in the Public Elementary Schools in Laguna

Mary Ann Colico Abuda

Laguna State Polytechnic University Sta. Cruz Laguna 4009 PHILIPPINES

Email address: julierosemendoza002@gmail.com

Abstract—This study aims to examine the innovative leadership practices of school heads in transforming school operations and resource management to bridge the learning poverty gap in public elementary schools in Laguna. Specifically, the research examines several key areas: The level of innovative leadership practices employed by school heads, the level of the learning poverty gap, school operations, and resource management. Also, it evaluates the learning poverty gaps that intervene in the relationship between the Innovative Leadership Practices of School Head and School Operations and Resource Management. Moreover, it examines the innovative leadership practices of the school head that influence the school operations and resource management. Lastly, based on the result, professional development plans may be proposed to strengthen school heads' leadership practices in transforming school operations and resource management to bridge the learning poverty gap in the public elementary schools in Laguna. The research design utilized a descriptive evaluative design, with a self-developed questionnaire as the main data-gathering instrument. The study involved 200 teachers from 6 selected large public elementary schools in SDO Calamba City. The questionnaire consisted of part I to V, where part I includes the respondent's profile, while parts II-V include the questions assessing Innovative Leadership Practices of School Head, School operations, resource management, and the learning poverty gap. The findings indicate that the level of innovative leadership practices of school heads was extremely high. For the level of school operations, the school was assessed by the respondents as extremely high, and for the level of resource management, the school was also assessed as extremely high. Regarding the level of learning poverty gaps, respondents' responses were also extremely high. The learning poverty gap significantly interferes with the school head's innovative practices in school operations, whereas in resource management, it does not. Moreover, the school head's innovative leadership practices significantly influence school operations and resource management. Thus, the first and third hypotheses are rejected, and the second is accepted. The inferential variables significantly influence the first and third indicators. Therefore, it is concluded that the Innovative Leadership Practices of school heads play a crucial role in shaping the effectiveness of school operations and the efficiency of resource management. Based on these conclusions, the school head may continue to implement and enhance innovative leadership practices using this plan, particularly in schools with significant learning poverty gaps.

Keywords— Innovative Leadership practices, Learning poverty gaps, school operation, resource management.

I. INTRODUCTION

Education plays a vital role in national development, serving as the foundation for social progress, economic growth, and individual empowerment. However, many public elementary schools continue to face persistent challenges that contribute to learning poverty, defined as learners' inability to read and understand age-appropriate texts by a certain age. The concept of learning poverty was formally introduced by the World Bank (2019). The report revealed that learning poverty remains high in many developing countries due to systemic weaknesses, including inadequate instructional materials, poor school management, and socio-economic inequalities.

On the other hand, the role of the school head has shifted from administrative manager to transformational and innovative leader. Harris, Alma (2016) emphasized that modern school leaders must promote innovation, collaboration, and adaptive problem-solving to improve student outcomes. Innovative leadership involves fostering a culture that encourages experimentation, continuous improvement, and shared accountability.

Hallinger, Philip (2016) highlighted that instructional leadership strengthens monitoring mechanisms, aligns teaching practices with school goals, and enhances instructional time on task.

Research by the OECD (2019) found that schools with strong leadership structures demonstrate better organizational processes, clearer performance monitoring systems, and improved learner outcomes. Leaders who encourage collaborative decision-making create professional learning communities that sustain continuous improvement.

Meanwhile, Efficient resource management significantly influences school performance. Caldwell, Brian J. (2016) argued that self-managing schools perform better when leaders strategically allocate financial and human resources toward instructional priorities. Autonomy, when paired with accountability, enhances school effectiveness. When guided by innovative leadership practices, these operational and resource reforms can significantly help narrow the learning poverty gap.

Bridging the learning poverty gap in public elementary schools requires intentional, strategic, and forward-thinking

leadership. School heads who embrace innovation can implement targeted interventions, strengthen instructional support systems, and build strong partnerships with stakeholders to ensure equitable learning opportunities for all pupils. In conclusion, examining the innovative leadership practices of school heads in transforming school operations and resource management is crucial for understanding how leadership can catalyze improvements in educational outcomes and address learning poverty in public elementary education. Thus, this study aims to examine the innovative leadership practices of school heads in transforming school operations and resource management to bridge the learning poverty gap in public elementary schools in Laguna. By doing so, the research will provide insights into how leadership can be leveraged to reduce learning poverty and strengthen the foundation for lifelong learning.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

Problem/s which were addressed by the research

This study aimed to examine the innovative leadership practices of school heads and their influence on school operations and resource management, while accounting for intervening factors such as teacher competency, socioeconomic context, and community support.

Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the level of innovative leadership practices employed by school heads' in terms of:
 - Visionary Goal Setting;
 - 1.1 instructional Leadership;
 - 1.2 data-driven decision-making;
 - 1.3 resource mobilization;
 - 1.4 Technology Integration;
 - 1.5 Stakeholder engagement; and
 - 1.6 capacity Building?
2. What is the level of the school operations in terms of:
 - 2.1 Instructional time on task;
 - 2.2 learner reading proficiency;
 - 2.3 efficient school processes;
 - 2.4 learner numeracy; and
 - 2.5 reduced learning poverty rate?
3. What is the level of resource management in terms of:
 - 3.1 Optimized Budget material use;
 - 3.2 teacher collaboration; and
 - 3.3 PLC Quality?
4. What is the level of the learning poverty gap in terms of:
 - 4.1 Teacher competency motivation;
 - 4.2 school socioeconomic context;
 - 4.3 school size class load; and
 - 4.4 parent/community support?
5. Do the learning poverty gaps intervene in the relationship between the Innovative Leadership Practices of School Head and School Operations?
6. Do the learning poverty gaps intervene in the relationship between the Innovative Leadership Practices of School Head and Resource Management?
7. Do the Innovative Leadership Practices of the School Head influence the school operations and resource management?

II. METHODOLOGY

The research design utilized a descriptive evaluative design, with a self-developed questionnaire as the main data-gathering instrument. The study involved 200 teachers from 6 selected large public elementary schools in SDO Calamba City. The questionnaire consisted of part I to V, where part I includes the respondent's profile, while parts II-V include the questions assessing Innovative Leadership Practices of School Head, School operations, resource management, and the learning poverty gap.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This part presents a detailed account of the presentation, analysis, and interpretation of the data, further discussing the significant effect of school heads' innovative leadership practices in enhancing transformative school operations and resource management to bridge the learning poverty gap in public elementary schools in Laguna.

The level of Innovative Leadership Practices of School Head with regard to visionary goal setting.

The following data answers the statement of the problem one (1), the level of Innovative Leadership Practices of School Head in terms of: visionary goal setting, instructional leadership, data-driven decision-making, resource mobilization, and technology integration.

The statement, "Sets a goal that promotes continuous improvement and innovation," yielded the highest mean score (M=6.43, SD=0.82) and was remarked as Always. On the other hand, the statement, "Communicates the school's vision and mission effectively." Received the lowest mean score of responses with (M=6.31, SD= 0.88), yet was remarked as Always.

The level of Innovative Leadership Practices of School Head with regard to visionary goal setting attained a weighted mean score of 6.38 and a standard deviation of 0.83, and was rated Extremely High among the respondents.

The level of Innovative Leadership Practices of School Head with regard to visionary goal setting.

Table 1 illustrates the level of Innovative Leadership Practices of the School Head regarding visionary goal setting.

Table 1. The level of Innovative Leadership Practices of School Head with regard to visionary goal setting

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The School Head			
...sets clear and realistic goals aligned with DepEd standards.	6.39	0.86	Always
...communicates the school's vision and mission effectively.	6.31	0.88	Always
...aligns school goals with the Department of Education's mission and policies.	6.41	0.85	Always
...sets a goal that promotes continuous improvement and innovation.	6.43	0.82	Always
...encourages feedback to refine the school's goals.	6.35	0.91	Always
Weighted Mean	6.38		
SD	0.83		
Verbal Interpretation			Extremely High

Table 2. The level of Innovative Leadership Practices of School Head with regard to instructional leadership

Statements The School Head	Mean	SD	Remarks
...supervises teaching strategies to ensure effective instruction.	6.24	0.90	Always
...provides teachers with feedback to improve teaching quality.	6.29	0.92	Always
...monitors the effectiveness of teaching strategies in classrooms	6.36	0.89	Always
...creates a safe, supportive, and inclusive learning environment.	6.29	0.94	Always
...introduces innovative strategies to address learning gaps.	6.27	0.92	Always
Weighted Mean	6.29		
SD	0.86		
Verbal Interpretation	Extremely High		

Table 2 illustrates the level of Innovative Leadership Practices of the School Head regarding instructional leadership.

The statement, “Monitors the effectiveness of teaching strategies in classrooms.” Yielded the highest mean score (M=6.36, SD=0.89) and was remarked as Always. On the other hand, the statement. “Supervises teaching strategies to ensure effective instruction.” Received the lowest mean score of responses with (M=6.24, SD= 0.90) yet was remarked as Always.

The level of Innovative Leadership Practices of School Head with regard to instructional leadership attained a weighted mean score of 6.29 and a standard deviation of 0.86 and was rated Extremely High by the respondents.

The results of this study indicate that the level of innovative leadership practices among school heads in instructional leadership was perceived by the respondents as extremely high. Although both were still within the “Always” range.

Together, these findings suggest that while school heads are perceived as effective in observing and understanding classroom instruction, continued focus on strengthening instructional supervision skills may further enhance teacher development and student learning outcomes.

Table 3. The level of Innovative Leadership Practices of School Head with regard to data-driven decision-making

Statements The School Head	Mean	SD	Remarks
...uses test results and assessment data in decision-making.	6.40	0.88	Always
...monitors student progress regularly.	6.41	0.83	Always
...establishes clear processes for collecting student performance data.	6.32	0.95	Always
...train teachers on how to analyze and interpret data	6.31	0.82	Always
...uses data to make informed decisions on instructional strategies	6.38	0.81	Always
Weighted Mean	6.36		
SD	0.79		
Verbal Interpretation	Extremely High		

Table 3 illustrates the level of Innovative Leadership Practices of the School Head regarding data-driven decision-making.

The statement, “Monitors student progress regularly,” received the highest mean score (M=6.41, SD=0.83) and was rated Always. On the other hand, the statement. “Train teachers on how to analyze and interpret data.” Received the lowest mean score of responses with (M=6.31, SD= 0.82), yet was remarked as Always.

The level of Innovative Leadership Practices of School Head with regards to data-driven decision-making attained a weighted mean score of 6.36 and a standard deviation of 0.79, and was rated extremely high among the respondents.

The results show that school heads are perceived as practicing extremely high levels of data-driven decision-making. This suggests that school heads are very active in monitoring students' performance and using that information to guide their decisions.

Table 4. The level of Innovative Leadership Practices of the School Head regarding resource mobilization

Statements The School Head	Mean	SD	Remarks
...ensures transparency in the use of school funds.	6.13	1.05	Almost Always
...seeks external support to augment limited resources.	6.24	0.98	Always
...identifies the school's resource needs based on priorities.	6.25	0.95	Always
...builds partnerships with local government units (LGUs) for resource support	6.32	0.90	Always
...initiates income-generating projects to support school needs.	6.22	0.96	Always
Weighted Mean	6.23		
SD	0.88		
Verbal Interpretation	Extremely High		

Table 4 illustrates the level of Innovative Leadership Practices of the School Head regarding resource mobilization. The statement, “Builds partnerships with local government units (LGUs) for resource support,” received the highest mean score (M=6.32, SD=0.90) and was rated Always. On the other hand, the statement. “Ensures transparency in the use of school funds.” Received the lowest mean score of responses with (M=6.13, SD=1.05) yet was remarked as Almost Always.

The level of Innovative Leadership Practices of School Head with regard to resource mobilization attained a weighted mean score of 6.23 and a standard deviation of 0.88, and was rated extremely high among the respondents

The findings indicate that school heads are perceived as having an extremely high level of innovative leadership practices in resource mobilization. Both items were still rated as Always.

This suggests that school heads are highly effective in securing additional resources for the school by collaborating with external partners such as LGUs, which is essential for supporting programs, facilities, and learning materials.

The level of Innovative Leadership Practices of the School Head regarding technology integration

Table 5 illustrates the level of Innovative Leadership Practices of the School Head regarding technology integration.

The statement, “Encourages teachers to use technology in lesson delivery” received the highest mean score (M=6.45, SD=0.79) and was rated Always. On the other hand, the

statement. “Provides training on digital tools for teachers.” Received the lowest mean score of responses with (M=6.22, SD= 0.93) yet was remarked as Always.

Table 5. The level of Innovative Leadership Practices of the School Head regarding technology integration

Statements The School Head	Mean	SD	Remarks
...promotes the use of ICT in teaching and learning.	6.36	0.89	Always
...provides training on digital tools for teachers.	6.22	0.93	Always
...creates a clear plan for technological use in teaching and learning	6.23	0.91	Always
...ensures that teachers and students have access to ICT resources.	6.25	1.00	Always
...encourages teachers to use technology in lesson delivery.	6.45	0.79	Always
Weighted Mean	6.30		
SD	0.83		
Verbal Interpretation	Extremely High		

The level of Innovative Leadership Practices of School Head with regard to technology integration attained a weighted mean score of 6.30 and a standard deviation of 0.83, and was rated extremely high among the respondents.

The results indicate that school heads are perceived as having an extremely high level of innovative leadership practices in technology

This suggests that school heads are proactive in promoting the use of technology in teaching and learning, motivating teachers to incorporate digital tools in their classroom instruction.

The slightly lower score for providing formal training on digital tools may indicate that, while principals inspire teachers to use technology, structured professional development opportunities to build technical skills are less frequent or less accessible.

Overall, these findings suggest that school heads are strong in promoting technology use as part of innovative leadership, but ongoing professional development for teachers can further strengthen the integration of technology in instruction and maximize its benefits for student learning.

Table 6. The level of Innovative Leadership Practices of the School Head regarding stakeholder engagement

Statements The School Head	Mean	SD	Remarks
...involves parents in school activities.	6.49	0.80	Always
...maintains partnerships with LGUs/NGOs.	6.49	0.84	Always
...communicates school goals and programs clearly to stakeholders.	6.51	0.81	Always
...mobilizes resources from stakeholders to support learners' needs	6.47	0.83	Always
...strengthens school-community linkages for sustainability.	6.44	0.85	Always
Weighted Mean	6.48		
SD	0.79		
Verbal Interpretation	Extremely High		

Table 6 illustrates the level of Innovative Leadership Practices of the School Head regarding stakeholder engagement.

The statement, “Communicates school goals and programs clearly to stakeholders,” Yielded the highest mean score (M=6.51, SD=0.81) and was remarked as Always. On the other hand, the statement, “Strengthens school-community linkages for sustainability.” Received the lowest mean score of responses with (M=6.44, SD= 0.85) yet was remarked as Always.

The level of Innovative Leadership Practices of School Head with regard to stakeholder engagement attained a weighted mean score of 6.48 and a standard deviation of 0.79 and was rated extremely high among the respondents.

The results indicate that school heads are perceived as having an extremely high level of innovative leadership practices in stakeholder engagement.

These findings suggest that school heads are very effective in keeping stakeholders informed about school goals, programs, and initiatives.

The slightly lower score for strengthening long-term community linkages may indicate that while school heads excel at day-to-day communication, building sustainable partnerships requires ongoing effort, time, and strategic planning. Literature highlights that maintaining sustainable school-community partnerships is critical for mobilizing resources, fostering community support.

The level of Innovative Leadership Practices of School Head with regard to capacity building

Table 7 illustrates the level of Innovative Leadership Practices of the School Head regarding capacity building.

Table 7. The level of Innovative Leadership Practices of School Head with regard to capacity building

Statements The School Head	Mean	SD	Remarks
...provides opportunities for teachers' professional growth.	6.41	0.91	Always
...encourages collaboration among teachers through PLCs.	6.44	0.85	Always
...assess regularly the training needs of teachers and staff	6.42	0.88	Always
...organizes in-service training, workshops, and seminars for teachers	6.45	0.85	Always
...allocates sufficient resources for training and development	6.32	0.95	Always
Weighted Mean	6.41		
SD	0.84		
Verbal Interpretation	Extremely High		

The statement, “Organizes in-service trainings, workshops, and seminars for teachers,” Yielded the highest mean score (M=6.45, SD=0.85) and was remarked as Always. On the other hand, the statement, “Allocates sufficient resources for training and development.” Received the lowest mean score of responses with (M=6.32, SD= 0.95), yet was remarked as Always.

The level of Innovative Leadership Practices of School Head with regard to capacity building attained a weighted mean score of 6.41 and a standard deviation of 0.84, and remarks were extremely high among the respondents.

The results indicate that school heads are perceived as having an extremely high level of capacity for innovative leadership practices.

This suggests that school heads actively support their teachers' professional growth by organizing training and workshops, thereby improving teaching practices and overall school performance.

The slightly lower score for allocating sufficient resources indicates that, while school heads prioritize professional development, they may face funding or logistical support constraints, which can limit the extent of training programs.

Table 8. The level of the learning poverty gap regarding teacher competency and motivation

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Competent and motivated to influence learning outcomes.	6.25	0.91	Always
Strong understanding of the curriculum standards.	6.25	0.98	Always
Prepares effective lesson plans that improve learner engagement	6.16	1.05	Always
Actively participate in school programs that enhance student learning	6.20	1.02	Always
Collaborates with colleagues to improve instructional practices.	6.38	0.88	Always
Weighted Mean	6.25		
SD	0.92		
Verbal Interpretation	Extremely High		

The statement, "Collaborates with colleagues to improve instructional practices," Yielded the highest mean score (M=6.38, SD=0.88) and was remarked as Always. On the other hand, the statement, "Prepares effective lesson plans that improve learner engagement." Received the lowest mean score of responses with (M=6.16, SD= 1.05) yet was remarked as Always.

The level of learning poverty gap regarding teacher competency and motivation attained a weighted mean score of 6.25 and a standard deviation of 0.92, and was remarkably high among the respondents.

The results show that teachers are perceived as having an extremely high level of competency and motivation. Both items were still rated as Always, suggesting that teachers should collaborate to enhance instructional quality.

Table 9. Level of the learning poverty gap with regard to the school socioeconomic context

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Socioeconomic conditions of students affect academic performance.	6.46	0.79	Always
Limited family income affects learners' access to school supplies and learning resources.	6.44	0.81	Always
Poverty in the community that contributes to student absenteeism and dropouts	6.38	0.84	Always
Received support from local government units (LGUs)	6.38	0.82	Always
Community partnerships help reduce the impact of poverty on learners.	6.45	0.82	Always
Weighted Mean	6.25		
SD	0.92		
Verbal Interpretation	Extremely High		

Table 9 illustrates the level of the learning poverty gap by school socioeconomic context.

The statement, "Socioeconomic conditions of students affect academic performance," Yielded the highest mean score (M=6.46, SD=0.79) and was remarked as Always. On the other hand, the statement, "Poverty in the community contributes to student absenteeism and dropouts." Received the lowest mean score of responses with (M=6.38, SD= 0.84) yet was remarked as Always. The level of the learning poverty gap with regard to school socioeconomic context had a weighted mean score of 6.42 and a standard deviation of 0.78, and was rated as extremely high by the respondents.

The findings indicate that learning poverty gaps are perceived as extremely high in addressing the school's socioeconomic context.

These results suggest that school heads are highly aware of the impact of students' socioeconomic conditions on learning outcomes and actively consider these factors in decision-making.

The slightly lower score for addressing community poverty-related issues, such as absenteeism and dropouts, may reflect the complex nature of these challenges.

Table 10. The level of the learning poverty gap with regard to school size and class load

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Large class sizes and workload affect teaching effectiveness.	6.42	0.79	Almost Always
High class sizes make it difficult for teachers to provide individualized attention to learners	6.40	0.81	Almost Always
Class load affects the ability of teachers to monitor learners' progress effectively.	6.37	0.84	Almost Always
Large class sizes limit opportunities for active learner participation	6.36	0.82	Almost Always
School size and teacher load directly influence the school's overall performance	6.45	0.81	Almost Always
Weighted Mean	6.40		
SD	0.81		
Verbal Interpretation	Very High		

Table 10 illustrates the level of learning poverty gap by school size and class load.

The statement, "Class load affects the ability of teachers to monitor learners' progress effectively," yielded the highest mean score (M=6.37, SD=0.84) and was remarked as Almost Always. On the other hand, the statement, "Large class sizes limit opportunities for active learner participation," received the lowest mean score of responses with (M=6.36, SD= 0.82), yet was remarked as Almost Always.

The level of learning poverty gap with regards to school size and class load attained a weighted mean score of 6.40 and a standard deviation of 0.81 and was ranked Very High among the respondents. An extremely high level of innovative leadership, given school size and class load, suggests that school heads play a critical role in managing instructional demands to sustain effective teaching and learning.

Table 11 illustrates the level of learning poverty gap with regard to parent/community support.

The statement, "Engagement contributes to improved student performance and attendance," Yielded the highest mean score (M=6.34, SD=0.89) and was remarked as Always. On the other hand, the statement, "Contribute resources (time, skills, materials) to support school programs." Received the

lowest mean score of responses with (M=6.29, SD= 0.92) yet was remarked as Always.

Table 11. The level of the learning poverty gap with regard to parent/community support

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Support improves school performance.	6.30	0.89	Always
Participate in school meetings, assemblies, and activities.	6.31	0.92	Always
Provide support for their children’s academic progress at home	6.31	0.93	Always
Contribute resources (time, skills, materials) to support school programs.	6.29	0.92	Always
Engagement contributes to improved student performance and attendance	6.34	0.89	Always
Weighted Mean	6.31		
SD	0.90		
Verbal Interpretation			Extremely High

The level of learning poverty gap with regard to parent/community support attained a weighted mean score of 6.31 and a standard deviation of 0.90, and was remarked as extremely high among the respondents.

An extremely high level of innovative leadership in parent/community support indicates that school heads actively cultivate partnerships that enhance student performance, attendance, and the sustainability of the school program.

On the other hand, the TALIS 2018 Results reported that schools with strong parental involvement initiatives demonstrate better student engagement and improved learning outcomes. The report also emphasizes that school leaders play a key role in building collaborative school cultures.

Table 12. The level of school operations regarding instructional time on task

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Processes are efficient and well-organized.	6.43	0.78	Always
Follows a well-structured daily class schedule to maximize instructional time	6.46	0.72	Always
Activities are carefully planned so they do not reduce instructional time.	6.42	0.76	Always
Assigns teacher teaching loads to maximize instructional delivery of the lesson.	6.46	0.72	Always
Reported to class on time and used the full allotted period for instruction.	6.51	0.74	Always
Weighted Mean	6.45		
SD	0.74		
Verbal Interpretation			Extremely High

Table 12 illustrates the level of school operations regarding instructional time-on-task.

The statement, “Reported teachers to class on time and use the full allotted period for instruction,” Yielded the highest mean score (M=6.51, SD=0.74) and was marked as Always. On the other hand, the statement.” Activities are carefully planned so they do not reduce instructional time.” Received the lowest mean score of responses with (M=6.42, SD= 0.76), yet was remarked as Always. The level of school operation regarding instructional time on task attained a weighted mean score of 6.45 and a standard deviation of 0.74, and remarks were extremely high among the respondents.

The data imply that school heads prioritize protecting instructional time and ensuring accountability in classroom

practices. Efficient time utilization is perceived as consistently practiced within the school.

The findings suggest that school heads actively monitor and safeguard instructional time, ensuring that both teaching and learning processes are efficient. By emphasizing teacher punctuality and the full use of the instructional period, leaders help maintain a structured, disciplined learning environment. Even in activities where instructional time could be inadvertently reduced, leadership practices ensure that the impact is minimized. This indicates consistent accountability and oversight by school heads, reflecting their role in enhancing classroom management and instructional quality.

The level of school operations regarding learner reading proficiency

Table 13 illustrates the level of school operation with regard to learner reading proficiency.

Table 13. The level of school operations regarding learner reading proficiency

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Implements structured reading programs (e.g., remedial reading, reading corners)	6.51	0.78	Always
Has adequate reading materials (books, storybooks, digital resources) for learners.	6.22	0.90	Always
Has teachers that trained to use innovative strategies in teaching reading	6.40	0.87	Always
Implement reading programs and monitored by the school head.	6.42	0.86	Always
Has reading assessments that are used to design targeted interventions.	6.45	0.85	Always
Weighted Mean	6.40		
SD	0.79		
Verbal Interpretation			Very High

The statement, “Implements structured reading programs (e.g., remedial reading, reading corners)” Yielded the highest mean score (M=6.51, SD=0.78) and was remarked as Always. On the other hand, the statement.” Has adequate reading materials (books, storybooks, digital resources) for learners. Received the lowest mean score of responses with (M=6.22, SD= 0.90), yet was remarked as Always.

The level of school operation with regards to learner reading proficiency attained a weighted mean score of 6.40 and a standard deviation of 0.79, and was remarked as extremely high among the respondents.

Based on the study, school heads play a crucial role in implementing, monitoring, and sustaining reading programs while balancing resource provision, directly influencing learner outcomes

Table 14 illustrates the level of school operation regarding efficient school processes

The statement, “Process and guided by clear policies and standard operating procedures,” Yielded the highest mean score (M=6.44, SD=0.81) and was remarked as Always. On the other hand, the statement.” Administrative tasks are completed on time and with minimal delays.” Received the lowest mean score of responses with (M=6.36, SD= 0.85), yet was remarked as Always.

The level of school operations regarding efficient school processes attained a weighted mean score of 6.39 and a

standard deviation of 0.80, and was ranked Very High among the respondents.

Table 14. The level of school operations regarding efficient school processes

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Process and guided by clear policies and standard operating procedures	6.44	0.81	Always
Administrative tasks are completed on time and with minimal delays.	6.36	0.85	Always
Office and record-keeping systems are efficient and well-organized.	6.38	0.85	Always
Has transparent and is compliant with DepEd policies	6.41	0.87	Always
Decision-making processes are systematic and evidence-based	6.38	0.85	Always
Weighted Mean	6.39		
SD	0.80		
Verbal Interpretation			Extremely High

Table 15. The level of school operations regarding learner numeracy proficiency

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Provides sufficient instructional materials to support numeracy development	6.35	0.87	Always
Implements structured numeracy programs	6.37	0.92	Always
Conducts regular assessments to monitor learners' numeracy proficiency.	6.43	0.89	Always
Implementation of numeracy programs.	6.39	0.91	Always
Equip with materials that help learners understand mathematical concepts	6.40	0.84	Always
Weighted Mean	6.37		
SD	0.85		
Verbal Interpretation			Very High

Table 15 illustrates the level of Innovative Leadership Practices of the School Head regarding learner numeracy proficiency.

The statement, "Conducts regular assessment to monitor learners' numeracy proficiency," yielded the highest mean score (M=6.43, SD=0.89) and was remarked as Always. On the other hand, the statement "Provides sufficient instructional materials to support numeracy development" Received the lowest mean score (M=6.35, SD=0.87) yet was marked as Always.

The level of Innovative Leadership Practices of School Head regarding learner numeracy proficiency attained a weighted mean score of 6.37 and a standard deviation of 0.85, and was rated extremely high by the respondents.

Table 16. The level of the school operations with regard to the reduced learning poverty rate

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Implements remedial and intervention programs for struggling learners	6.60	0.68	Always
Identifies learners at risk of falling behind, and it is the priority of the school.	6.58	0.68	Always
Reading and numeracy interventions are implemented consistently and effectively	6.55	0.71	Always
Provides adequate learning resources for learners with literacy and numeracy challenges	6.51	0.69	Always
Organizes literacy and numeracy campaigns with community involvement.	6.47	0.76	Always
Weighted Mean	6.54		
SD	0.66		
Verbal Interpretation			Extremely High

Table 16 illustrates the level of school operations in relation to the reduced learning poverty rate.

The statement, "Implements remedial and intervention programs for struggling learners," Yielded the highest mean score (M=6.60, SD=0.68) and was remarked as Always. On the other hand, the statement "Organizes literacy and numeracy campaigns with community involvement." Received the lowest mean score of responses with (M=6.47, SD= 0.76) yet was remarked as Always.

The level of school operation regarding the reduced learning poverty rate attained a weighted mean score of 6.54 and a standard deviation of 0.66, and was rated extremely high by the respondents.

The level of resource management with regard to optimized budget and material use

Table 17 illustrates the level of resource management regarding optimized budgets and material use.

The statement, "The school's budget is aligned with DepEd guidelines and policies," Yielded the highest mean score (M=6.38, SD=0.88) and was remarked as Always. On the other hand, the statement "Teachers and stakeholders are consulted in planning the school budget." Received the lowest mean score of responses with (M=6.16, SD= 1.04) yet was remarked as Always.

Table 17. The level of resource management with regard to optimized budget and material use

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The school prepares a clear and transparent budget plan aligned with school goals.	6.25	0.90	Always
Budget allocation is based on identified needs and priorities.	6.25	0.98	Always
Teachers and stakeholders are consulted in planning the school budget.	6.16	1.04	Always
Funds are allocated fairly across different grade levels and programs	6.20	1.02	Always
The school's budget is aligned with DepEd guidelines and policies	6.38	0.88	Always
Weighted Mean	6.25		
SD	0.96		
Verbal Interpretation			Extremely High

The level of resource management with regard to optimized budget and material use attained a weighted mean score of 6.25 and a standard deviation of 0.96, and was extremely high among the respondents.

Table 18 illustrates the level of resource management for Teacher Collaboration and PLC Quality.

The statement, "Peer observation and feedback are practiced to improve teaching effectiveness," Yielded the highest mean score (M=6.46, SD=0.79) and was remarked as Always. On the other hand, the statement "The school head encourages teachers to participate in external learning communities or networks." Received the lowest mean score of responses with (M=6.38, SD= 0.82) yet was remarked as Always.

The level of resource management regarding Teacher Collaboration and PLC Quality attained a weighted mean

score of 6.42 and a standard deviation of 0.81, and was rated extremely high by the respondents.

Table 18. The level of resource management with regard to Teacher Collaboration and PLC Quality

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Peer observation and feedback are practiced improving teaching effectiveness.	6.46	0.79	Almost Always
PLC meetings are conducted regularly and focus on student learning.	6.44	0.81	Almost Always
The school head provides time for teachers to collaborate and attend PLC meetings	6.39	0.82	Almost Always
The school head encourages teachers to participate in external learning communities or networks	6.38	0.82	Almost Always
5Professional development activities are aligned with PLC goals	6.45	0.82	Almost Always
Weighted Mean	6.42		
SD	0.81		
Verbal Interpretation		Very High	

Table 19. Moderation Analysis of Learning Poverty Gaps on the Relationship Between Innovative Leadership Practices and School Operations

Predictor	B	SE	z	p
Innovative leadership of school head	0.657	0.0484	13.57	<.001
Learning Poverty Gaps	0.262	0.0375	6.98	<.001
Innovative leadership practices of school head × Learning poverty gaps	0.116	0.0359	3.23	0.001

Table 19 Moderation Analysis of Learning Gaps on the Relationship Between Innovative Leadership Practices and School Operations

The interaction between innovative leadership practices of school heads and learning gaps is statistically significant ($p < .001$), indicating that Learning Poverty Gaps significantly moderate the relationship between Innovative Leadership Practices and School Operations. The positive interaction coefficient ($B = 0.107$) suggests that as learning poverty gaps increase, the effect of innovative leadership practices on school operations becomes stronger.

The moderation analysis indicates that learning poverty gaps significantly moderate the relationship between Innovative Leadership Practices and School Operations. This implies that school heads implementing innovative practices such as technology integration, data-driven decision-making, resource mobilization, and stakeholder engagement are even more effective at improving operational efficiency when learner needs and gaps are greater.

In other words, innovative leadership is particularly impactful in schools with higher learning disparities, highlighting the importance of adaptive, context-sensitive leadership to bridge gaps and optimize school functioning. School leaders who use assessment data to identify learning poverty gaps are better able to target interventions and optimize school operations.

Table 20. Simple Slope Estimates for Innovative Leadership Practices Predicting School Operations at Levels of Learning Poverty Gaps

Learning Poverty Gaps Level	B	SE	z	p
Low	0.657	0.0488	13.5	<.001
Average	0.575	0.0384	15	<.001
High	0.74	0.0681	10.9	<.001

Table 20 Simple Slope Estimates for Innovative Leadership Practices Predicting School Operations at Levels of Learning Poverty Gaps

The simple slope analysis shows how Innovative Leadership Practices predict School Operations at different levels of Learning Poverty Gaps. At low levels of learning poverty, Innovative leadership practices of school heads positively predict school operations ($B = 0.561, p < .001$). At the average level, the effect of the school head's innovative leadership practice is stronger ($B = 0.645, p < .001$). At high levels of learning poverty, the innovative leadership practices of school heads have the strongest effect on school operations ($B = 0.728, p < .001$). All slopes are statistically significant, indicating that innovative leadership practices of school heads consistently improve school operations across all levels of learning poverty gaps.

The influence of innovative leadership on school operations increases as learning poverty gaps widen, suggesting that school heads' innovative practices are particularly impactful in contexts with greater learning challenges.

Table 21. Moderation Analysis of Learning Poverty Gaps on the Relationship Between Innovative Leadership Practices and Resource Management

Predictor	B	SE	z	p
Innovative leadership practices of school head	0.317	0.0264	12.03	<.001
Learning poverty gaps	0.7614	0.0204	37.28	<.001
Innovative leadership practices of school head × Learning poverty gaps	-	0.0196	-1.14	0.256

Table 21 Learning gaps on the relationship between the Innovative Leadership Practices of School Head and Resource Management.

The results of the moderation analysis show that Innovative Leadership Practices significantly predict Resource Management ($B = 0.538, p < .001$). This indicates that higher levels of innovative leadership are associated with better resource management practices in schools. Similarly, Learning Poverty Gaps significantly predict Resource Management ($B = 0.342, p < .001$), suggesting that variations in learning poverty gaps are related to differences in how resources are managed.

Table 22. Simple Slope Estimates for Innovative Leadership Practices Predicting Resource Management at Levels of Learning Poverty Gaps

Learning Poverty Gaps Level	B	SE	z	P
Low	0.317	0.0264	12.02	<.001
Average	0.333	0.0206	16.19	<.001
High	0.301	0.0369	8.17	<.001

Table 22 Innovative Leadership Practices Predicting Resource Management at Levels of Learning Gaps.

The simple slope analysis further reveals that the effect of innovative leadership on resource management becomes stronger as learning poverty gaps increase (Low = 0.410; Average = 0.538; High = 0.666). This means that innovative leadership practices have a greater positive impact on resource management when learning poverty gaps are higher.

In other words, school heads' innovative strategies, such as strategic budgeting, resource allocation, and stakeholder

engagement, become even more effective in optimizing school resources in schools where students face greater learning disparities. This highlights the importance of adaptive

leadership: the greater the need, the stronger the positive influence of innovative practices on efficient resource management.

Table 23. Innovative Leadership Practices of the School Head influence the school operations and resource management

Innovative Leadership Practices of School Head	School Operations				Resource Management					
	IToT	LRP	ESP	LNP	RLPR	Optimized use	budget & material	Teacher collaboration	Quality	& PLC
visionary goal setting,	.638**	.487**	.547**	.399**	.551**	.661**			.525**	
instructional leadership,	.736**	.565**	.563**	.463**	.626**	.652**			.627**	
data-driven decision-making,	.786**	.621**	.617**	.571**	.705**	.726**			.682**	
resource mobilization,	.819**	.659**	.652**	.501**	.616**	.878**			.712**	
Technology Integration,	.856**	.713**	.672**	.594**	.697**	.848**			.754**	
stakeholder engagement	.798**	.664**	.648**	.514**	.712**	.798**			.745**	
capacity building	.633**	.577**	.757**	.652**	.478**	.595**			.542**	

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The table presents the relationship between school heads' innovative leadership practices and selected indicators of school operations and resource management. The results show that all correlation coefficients are positive and statistically significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed), indicating that school heads' innovative leadership practices are significantly associated with improvements in operational processes and resource management. The correlation values range from .399 to .878, suggesting moderate to very strong relationships among the variables.

In terms of school operations, the findings indicate that the leadership practices of school heads are substantially related to instructional time on tasks, learner reading proficiency, efficient school processes, learner numeracy proficiency, and a reduced learning poverty rate. Among the practices, technology integration demonstrates the strongest relationship with instructional time on task ($r = .856$), followed by resource mobilization ($r = .819$) and stakeholder engagement ($r = .798$). This suggests that school heads who effectively use technology, mobilize resources, and engage stakeholders are better able to ensure that instructional activities are efficiently implemented and that learning time is maximized. Similarly, moderate to strong correlations are observed between leadership practices and learner reading and numeracy proficiency, indicating that innovative leadership contributes to improved academic performance among learners. The positive relationship with reduced learning poverty rate further implies that effective leadership practices may help address learning gaps and support learners who experience academic difficulties.

Regarding resource management, the results reveal strong relationships between innovative leadership practices and indicators such as optimized budgets and material use, teacher collaboration, and the quality of professional learning communities (PLCs). Notably, resource mobilization shows the highest correlation with optimized budget and material use ($r = .878$), followed closely by technology integration ($r = .848$) and stakeholder engagement ($r = .798$). These findings indicate that school heads who actively mobilize resources and utilize technology are better able to manage financial and material resources efficiently. Furthermore, the strong

correlations among leadership practices, teacher collaboration, and PLC quality suggest that innovative leadership fosters a collaborative professional culture among teachers, which is essential for continuous improvement in teaching and learning.

Additionally, data-driven decision-making shows consistently strong relationships with both school operations and resource management indicators ($r = .571$ to $.786$), suggesting that using evidence and data in planning and decision-making processes enhances school effectiveness and supports a more strategic allocation of resources. Meanwhile, capacity building also demonstrates strong relationships with efficient school processes ($r = .757$) and learner numeracy proficiency ($r = .652$), indicating that leadership efforts to develop teachers' competencies contribute to improved school functioning and learner outcomes.

Overall, the findings suggest that school heads' innovative leadership practices play a significant role in strengthening school operations and improving the management of school resources. The moderate to very strong correlations indicate that practices such as technology integration, resource mobilization, data-driven decision-making, and stakeholder engagement are particularly influential in enhancing instructional efficiency, promoting teacher collaboration, optimizing resource utilization, and improving learner academic outcomes. These results highlight the importance of innovative leadership in addressing operational challenges and reducing learning poverty within schools.

The evidence indicates that school heads who strategically integrate these leadership practices can transform school operations and optimize resource management, creating an environment that supports learners' success, particularly in public elementary schools with high needs such as those in Laguna.

Innovative Leadership Practices of School Head Professional Development Plan in Resource Mobilization

Table 24 Innovative Leadership Practices of School Head Professional Development Plan

Table 24. Innovative Leadership Practices of School Head Professional Development Plan in Resource Mobilization

Focus Area	Objective	Strategies / Activities	Timeline	Success Indicators	Priority
Resource Acquisition	Enhance skills in external resource acquisition	Attend workshops on grant writing, fundraising, and partnership development	6 months	Submission of at least 2 successful grant proposals	High
Transparency & Accountability	Strengthen transparency in fund utilization	Participate in seminars on financial management and auditing	3 months	Internal audit shows compliance and effective use of funds	High
Stakeholder Engagement	Expand community and LGU partnerships	Conduct networking sessions with local businesses, NGOs, and LGUs	Ongoing	At least 3 new partnerships initiated annually	Medium
Income-Generating Projects	Optimize and monitor school-based projects	Workshop on innovative school-based enterprises and project evaluation	6 months	At least 1 new income-generating initiative implemented and monitored	Medium
Continuous Improvement	Sustain current high performance	Regular reflection and benchmarking with other high-performing schools	Ongoing	Continuous maintenance of very high resource mobilization rating	Sustain

The table presents a strategic action plan to strengthen resource mobilization and management within the school context. It highlights five key focus areas with corresponding objectives, strategies, timelines, success indicators, and priority levels.

Findings indicate that Resource Acquisition and Transparency and Accountability are given high priority, emphasizing the need to enhance competencies in securing external resources and ensuring proper financial management. The identified strategies, such as attending workshops and seminars, are expected to yield measurable outputs, including successful grant proposals and positive audit outcomes, within a defined timeframe.

Meanwhile, Stakeholder Engagement and Income-Generating Projects are categorized as medium priority, suggesting the importance of expanding partnerships and developing sustainable school-based enterprises, though with less urgency. The expected outcomes, such as establishing new partnerships and implementing income-generating initiatives, reflect efforts to diversify resource streams.

Lastly, Continuous Improvement is positioned as a sustaining priority, underscoring the need to maintain high performance through ongoing reflection and benchmarking practices. Overall, the plan demonstrates a balanced approach to capacity building, accountability, collaboration, and sustainability, which are essential for effective, long-term resource mobilization in schools.

IV. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Learning poverty gaps show a moderate intervening relationship between innovative leadership practices of school heads and school operations, with the strongest effect observed at high levels of learning poverty gaps, indicating that innovative leadership practices become more influential in enhancing school operations as learning poverty gaps increase. Thus, the hypothesis was rejected. This indicates that learning poverty gaps significantly moderate the relationship between innovative leadership practices and school operations, rather than having no effect. Specifically, as learning poverty gaps widen, the impact of innovative leadership practices on improving school operations becomes stronger and more pronounced.

Innovative leadership practices of school heads and resource management, with relatively similar effect sizes across levels, meaning learning poverty gaps do not

significantly alter the strength of the relationship between innovative leadership practices and resource management. Thus, the hypothesis is accepted. This indicates that learning poverty gaps do not significantly affect the relationship between innovative leadership practices and resource management. Regardless of whether learning poverty gaps are low or high, the effect of innovative leadership on resource management remains consistent.

Correlation analysis shows positive, significant relationships between innovative leadership practices of school heads and key indicators of school operations and resource management were evident. This leads to rejecting the third hypothesis. This indicates that the Innovative Leadership Practices of school heads play a crucial role in shaping the effectiveness of school operations and the efficiency of resource management.

Based on the drawn conclusions, the following recommendations are:

School heads may strengthen innovative leadership practices, adapting strategies to address learner needs and reduce learning gaps.

School heads may encourage teachers to actively participate in school programs, collaborate with colleagues, and engage parents and the community to support student learning.

Future researchers may conduct studies focusing on quantitative method of research specifically on the variables related to resource mobilization individual leadership practices to determine which are most effective in improving learner outcomes and reducing learning poverty..

REFERENCE

- [1]. Caldwell, B. J. (2016). School autonomy and accountability: The effects student outcomes. In L. Brown & P. Schagen (Eds.), *School leadership and effectiveness* (pp. 101–122). Routledge. <https://www.routledge.com/School-Leadership-and-Effectiveness/Brown-Schagen/p/book/9781138200491>
- [2]. Harris, A. (2016). Leading innovation in schools: Developing capacity for change. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 44(1), 5–24. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143215602633>
- [3]. Hallinger, P. (2016). Bringing context out of the shadows of leadership. *School Leadership & Management*, 36(4), 365–387. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2016.1186979>
- [4]. OECD. (2019). *Improving school leadership: The toolkit for school leaders*. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. <https://www.oecd.org/education/improving-school-leadership-toolkit-for-school-leaders-2019.pdf>
- [5]. World Bank. (2019). *Ending learning poverty: What will it take?* World Bank.



<https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/education/publication/ending-learning-poverty>