IJGGSD
ISSN: 3155-7716
International Journal of Global Goals and Sustainable Development
RESEARCH | INNOVATION | INCLUSION | SUSTAINABLE FUTURES
DOI: https://doi.org/10.65339/ijggsd.V1.I1.95

Assessing the Implementation of Continuous Improvement Instruction-Related Projects in Public Schools Towards Result-Driven School Performance

Rhussel E. Bautista
Master of Arts in Education – Administration and Supervision, Cebu Technological University - Main Campus, Cebu City, Philippines

Email: rhussel.bautista@deped.gov.ph

ABSTRACT

This study assessed the implementation of Continuous Improvement (CI) instruction-related projects in public schools of Bien Unido District, Bohol, during School Year 2025–2026, and examined their relationship with school performance as a basis for developing a sustainability guide. Using a descriptive-correlational research design, data were collected through a structured online questionnaire from 57 respondents comprising 19 school heads and 38 teachers and analyzed using descriptive statistics and Spearman's rank correlation. Reading and numeracy projects were the most frequently implemented initiatives. The Assess, Plan, and Act stages were consistently rated "Always Observed," with overall weighted means of 4.66 for school heads and 4.57 for teachers. Reported dropout and failure rates were very low, while promotion rates were very high. However, no statistically significant relationship was found between CI implementation and school performance among school heads ($\rho = 0.306$, $p = 0.203$) or teachers ($\rho = 0.115$, $p = 0.493$). The findings indicate that consistent implementation was not statistically associated with the selected performance indicators. Schools should operationalize the proposed sustainability guide through improved resource management, workload coordination, capacity building, and systematic monitoring. The study was limited to one district, questionnaire-based implementation assessments, and selected performance indicators. Its contribution lies in providing evidence for strengthening educational and institutional sustainability, supporting SDG 4 (Quality Education) and SDG 17 (Partnerships for the Goals) through evidence-informed school improvement and stakeholder collaboration.

Keywords: *Continuous Improvement, Educational Sustainability, Instructional Projects, Public Schools, School Performance, Sustainability Guide*

1. INTRODUCTION

Continuous Improvement (CI) is an iterative, evidence-informed approach through which schools identify priority concerns, plan appropriate interventions, implement improvement actions, and review the results. Its value lies not merely in completing activities but in using inquiry, collaboration, and feedback to improve educational practice (Yurkofsky, 2022; Bush-Mecenas, 2022). Sustained school improvement also requires coherent leadership, participation, effective use of information, and the capacity to adapt interventions to local conditions (Park et al., 2023; Koh et al., 2023). In the Philippines, the Department of Education (DepEd) has emphasized improved basic education outcomes and results-based monitoring through its Basic Education Development Plan 2030 and Basic Education Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (Department of Education, 2022a, 2022b). This study focuses on public schools in Bien Unido District, Division of Bohol, where CI instruction-related projects have been implemented over several school years. It examines their implementation through the Assess, Plan, and Act stages and considers school performance in terms of dropout, failure, and promotion rates. The purpose is to generate evidence that can inform a sustainability guide for CI instruction-related projects without assuming that project implementation alone determines learner outcomes.

Research Problem

Although schools implement improvement projects to address instructional concerns, the completion of planned activities does not necessarily demonstrate improved school performance. Yurkofsky (2022) showed that school leaders may approach CI as compliance rather than substantive improvement, while Meyers et al. (2023) identified the difficulty of regularly monitoring and adjusting short-cycle school improvement plans. Research also indicates that sustaining change depends on leadership, organizational capacity, collaboration, and the use of evidence across implementation cycles (Koh et al., 2023; Stosich, 2024). In Bien Unido District, CI projects have been implemented for approximately five years, yet it remains necessary to examine how consistently the Assess, Plan, and Act stages are carried out and whether implementation levels are statistically associated with school-performance indicators. Dropout rates reflect learner retention, failure rates indicate difficulties in meeting grade-level requirements, and promotion rates reflect progression to the next grade. These indicators warrant joint examination, while recognizing that socioeconomic circumstances, school context, resources, and teaching practices may also shape educational outcomes (Moore, 2022; Parreño, 2023). The research therefore addresses the need for district-specific evidence on implementation practices, measurable school results, implementation challenges, and the conditions needed to sustain CI instruction-related projects.

Assumptions of the Study

The study proceeds from the analytical assumptions that implementation of CI instruction-related projects can be examined through the Assess, Plan, and Act stages and that school performance can be described through dropout, failure, and promotion rates. These measures offer distinct but complementary perspectives on school processes and outcomes. Research on evidence-informed educational improvement underscores the need to link problem identification, instructional decisions, monitoring, and organizational learning, rather than infer success from the completion of activities alone (Hebbecker et al., 2022; Meyers et al., 2023). The study does not assume that CI implementation causes changes in school performance, because learner outcomes are influenced by multiple contextual factors (Moore, 2022). Consistent with its descriptive-correlational design, the null hypothesis states that there is no significant relationship between the level of CI instruction-related project implementation and school performance. This hypothesis is subject to statistical testing rather than presumed to be true.

Objectives of the Study

This study aims to assess the implementation of CI instruction-related projects in the public schools of Bien Unido District, Division of Bohol, during School Year 2025–2026 as a basis for developing a sustainability guide. Specifically, it seeks to describe the profiles of school heads and teacher-respondents in terms of age and gender, civil status, highest educational attainment, and relevant training or seminars attended; identify the CI instruction-related projects implemented; determine the level of implementation during the Assess, Plan, and Act stages; describe school performance based on dropout, failure, and promotion rates; test the significant relationship between CI implementation and school performance; identify implementation issues and concerns; and formulate a sustainability guide that can be operationalized in the district.

Theoretical or Conceptual Basis

The study draws on four complementary theoretical perspectives retained from the original thesis. Systems Theory regards the school as an interconnected organization in which leadership, teachers, learners, resources, families, and institutional procedures jointly influence improvement efforts. This interpretation is consistent with research showing that coherent, coordinated actions across school systems are important to continuous improvement (Park et al., 2023; Koh et al., 2023). Organizational Learning Theory explains how schools identify problems, examine evidence, share knowledge, and modify practice in response to implementation results. Studies of data-based instructional decisions and continuous improvement emphasize the importance of purposeful evidence use and feedback (Hebbecker et al., 2022; Bush-Mecenas, 2022). Transformational Leadership Theory emphasizes the role of school heads in establishing common goals, mobilizing teachers, and supporting the commitment needed for organizational change. A meta-analysis by Firmansyah et al. (2022) examined the relationship between transformational school leadership and teacher-related outcomes, while UNESCO (2024) stressed school leadership that focuses on learning, collaboration, and professional capacity. School Effectiveness Theory directs attention to measurable educational outcomes and to the contextual conditions that influence differences among schools; Moore (2022) likewise highlighted the importance of context when interpreting school effectiveness. Operationally, the conceptual framework positions the Assess, Plan, and Act stages as the dimensions of CI project implementation and dropout, failure, and promotion rates as the indicators of result-driven school performance. The Assess stage involves identifying school concerns and examining relevant information; the Plan stage involves selecting interventions and mobilizing resources; and the Act stage involves carrying out, monitoring, and refining interventions. The potential relationship between implementation and performance is examined without treating the three stages as proof of causation. Philippine policy support is provided by the Basic Education Development Plan 2030 and the Basic Education Monitoring and Evaluation Framework, which emphasize quality basic education, results-based monitoring, and evidence-informed decisions (Department of Education, 2022a, 2022b).

The study is directly aligned with Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 4—Quality Education, particularly Target 4.1 concerning equitable completion of quality primary and secondary education. Examining dropout, failure, and promotion rates can help schools identify issues affecting retention, learning progression, and completion; the findings can inform interventions, although these indicators alone do not measure every component of Target 4.1 (United Nations Statistics Division, 2025). The inquiry also supports educational and institutional sustainability by emphasizing continuous monitoring, responsive instructional interventions, the professional participation of teachers, and the sustained use of improvement evidence (Koh et al., 2023; UNESCO, 2024). SDG 17—Partnerships for the Goals—has a complementary, rather than

primary, connection because the study concerns the participation of school heads, teachers, parents, and local stakeholders in school improvement. Such collaboration can help strengthen the continuity and shared ownership of CI initiatives (Koh et al., 2023). The study does not make a direct claim of environmental sustainability or establish that CI activities caused progress toward an SDG; its contribution is the provision of local evidence and a proposed sustainability guide for better educational practice.

2. METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The study utilized a descriptive-correlational research design to determine the level of implementation of CI instruction-related projects and its relationship with school performance. The descriptive component examined the respondents' profiles, implemented CI projects, implementation levels, school-performance indicators, and encountered challenges. The correlational component determined whether a significant relationship existed between CI project implementation and school performance. The study followed a systems approach involving the collection of relevant information, statistical analysis, interpretation of findings, and formulation of a sustainability guide.

Research Locale or Study Setting

The study was conducted in public elementary and secondary schools in Bien Unido District, Division of Bohol, Region VII, Philippines. Bien Unido is a fourth-class municipality comprising 15 barangays with mainland, coastal, and island communities. Its geographical characteristics present varying conditions affecting educational accessibility, resource availability, and school operations. The participating schools operate under the Department of Education and implement CI projects as part of school improvement initiatives. The district provided a setting for examining CI implementation across schools with different geographical and operational conditions.

Participants or Data Sources

The study involved 57 respondents from public schools in Bien Unido District, consisting of 19 school heads (33%) and 38 teachers (67%). The teacher-respondents included school CI coordinators and CI team leaders directly involved in implementing CI projects. These respondents provided information regarding their demographic characteristics, implemented projects, implementation practices, school performance, and challenges encountered. Their participation enabled the study to examine CI implementation from both school leadership and teaching personnel perspectives.

Research Instruments or Materials

The study utilized a structured questionnaire adapted from the research of Julius J. Igot and Lorelie P. Mapute (2020), entitled "Continuous Improvement Program (CIP) Implementation in Relation to School Performance." The instrument was modified to address the objectives of the present study and consisted of five parts. The first gathered respondents' demographic information, including age, gender, civil status, highest educational attainment, and relevant training or seminars attended. The second identified implemented CI instruction-related projects. The third measured CI implementation across the Assess, Plan, and Act stages using a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Never Observed) to 5 (Always Observed). The fourth obtained school-performance information concerning dropout, failure, and promotion rates, while the fifth identified issues and concerns encountered during CI implementation.

Data Gathering Procedure

The researcher initially requested permission from the Schools District Supervisor of Bien Unido District through a formal approval letter. Following approval, an online questionnaire link was distributed to the identified school heads and teacher-respondents. Participants were given approximately 20–30 minutes to complete the instrument. After data collection, the responses were checked, organized, and encoded for statistical analysis. The collected data were subsequently forwarded to a statistician for appropriate statistical treatment. With guidance from the research adviser, the results were analyzed, interpreted, and discussed according to the study objectives. The findings were used to formulate a sustainability guide for CI instruction-related projects.

Data Analysis

The collected data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistical techniques. Frequency counts and percentages were employed to describe respondents' demographic characteristics, identify implemented CI projects, summarize school-performance indicators, and determine the issues and concerns encountered during implementation. General averages were used to summarize school performance in terms of dropout, failure, and promotion rates. Weighted means and standard deviations were computed to assess the level of CI implementation across the Assess, Plan, and Act stages. Weighted-mean scores were interpreted using five categories: Always Observed (4.21–5.00), Often Observed (3.41–4.20), Sometimes Observed (2.61–3.40), Rarely Observed (1.81–2.60), and Never Observed (1.00–1.80). School-performance indicators were interpreted using the corresponding percentage ranges established in the study's scoring procedures. The Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient (Spearman's rho) was used to determine the significance of the relationship between CI project implementation and school performance. The statistical findings provided the empirical basis for the study's conclusions, recommendations, and proposed sustainability guide.

Ethical Consideration

Before conducting the study, the researcher obtained administrative permission from the Schools District Supervisor of Bien Unido District. The questionnaire was distributed to the identified respondents following the approval, and sufficient time was provided for them to complete their responses. The collected information was organized and analyzed for the stated research objectives. The original methodology did not explicitly document procedures for obtaining informed consent, ensuring confidentiality and anonymity, protecting research data, or securing ethics committee approval; therefore, these procedures cannot be represented as completed without supporting documentation.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Demographic and Professional Profiles of Respondents

3.1.1 Profile of School Heads

The findings showed that the 19 school heads were predominantly aged 31–40 years (42%), female (68%), and married (100%). Regarding educational attainment, 53% had completed the Certificate of Academic Requirements in Education, while 21% possessed a master's degree. All school heads (100%) had attended In-Service Training, followed by training on Continuous Improvement Program Coaching (58%) and Enhanced School Improvement Planning (47%). These findings indicate that the respondents possessed varying educational qualifications and had participated in professional development activities relevant to school management and improvement. The findings provide a description of the professional backgrounds of school

leaders responsible for implementing CI projects. Williams (2022) emphasized the importance of collaborative leadership, professional learning, and staff support in school improvement. Similarly, Gümüş et al. (2024) examined how school leaders' qualifications, professional preparation, and experience relate to educational outcomes. UNESCO (2024) further highlighted the importance of strengthening instructional leadership and professional capacity. These studies support the relevance of examining leadership preparation and professional development, although the present findings do not establish that respondents' demographic characteristics directly influenced CI implementation.

3.1.2 Profile of Teachers

The 38 teacher-respondents consisted of 19 CI Coordinators (50%) and 19 CI Team Leaders (50%). Most belonged to the 31–40 age group (45%), were female (55%), and were married (84%). Regarding educational attainment, 39% had completed the Certificate of Academic Requirements in Education, 24% held bachelor's degrees, and 21% possessed master's degrees. In terms of professional development, 95% had attended In-Service Training, while 37% participated in CI Program Training Workshops and 34% attended CI Program Coaching. The results indicate broad participation in general professional development but comparatively lower participation in CI-specific training. The findings highlight the importance of providing professional learning opportunities directly related to teachers' responsibilities in school improvement. Rechsteiner et al. (2022) emphasized the contribution of teacher involvement and collaboration to school improvement processes. Popova et al. (2022) identified differences between the design of professional development programs and practices supported by evidence. Asterhan and Lefstein (2024) likewise stressed the importance of critically examining the effectiveness of professional development approaches. These perspectives suggest that strengthening CI-specific training may support teachers in carrying out improvement responsibilities more effectively, although such effects were not directly tested in the present study.

3.2 Continuous Improvement Instruction-Related Projects Implemented

3.2.1 Projects Reported by School Heads

Among school heads, Reading and Numeracy Improvement Projects were the most frequently reported interventions, identified by 16 respondents (84%). These were followed by Remediation and Learning Recovery Projects (37%) and Academic Performance Improvement Projects (32%). Attendance Improvement and Learner Retention Projects accounted for 11%, while Dropout Prevention and Learner Retention Projects were reported by 5%. The findings indicate that the reported improvement initiatives concentrated primarily on foundational academic competencies and learning recovery. The prominence of reading, numeracy, and remediation projects reflects the importance assigned to addressing foundational learning needs. The World Bank (2022) emphasized the continuing challenge of learning poverty and the need to strengthen foundational literacy. In the Philippine context, the Department of Education (2023) identified literacy, numeracy, and learning recovery as priorities under the National Learning Recovery Program. Saculo et al. (2023) likewise examined CI methodology as a mechanism for sustaining school improvement practices. These sources support the educational relevance of the reported projects without establishing their effectiveness in the participating schools.

3.2.2 Projects Reported by Teachers

Among teachers, Reading and Numeracy Improvement Projects were also the most frequently reported, with 23 respondents (61%). Remediation and Learning Recovery Projects followed at 45%, while Academic Performance Improvement Projects accounted for 29%. Dropout Prevention and Learner Retention Projects were reported by 13%, whereas Attendance Improvement and Learner Retention Projects were identified by 5%. These findings indicate that teachers were primarily involved in instructional interventions addressing foundational skills and academic difficulties. The findings demonstrate that the CI projects reported by teachers were directed mainly toward academic improvement and learning recovery. Rechsteiner et al. (2022) emphasized that teachers' participation in school improvement supports collaborative engagement in educational change. The Department of Education (2023) similarly prioritized interventions addressing learning gaps in foundational competencies. Such alignment underscores the relevance of teacher participation in instructional improvement while highlighting the need to assess whether implemented projects achieve their intended learner outcomes.

3.3 Level of Implementation of Continuous Improvement Projects

3.3.1 Assess Stage

The Assess stage was rated "Always Observed" by both school heads and teachers. School heads reported a composite weighted mean of 4.67 (SD = 0.43), while teachers reported 4.65 (SD = 0.53). Among school heads, analyzing school processes and determining root causes received the highest ratings, both with weighted means of 4.74. Among teachers, identifying the root causes of priority improvement areas received the highest mean of 4.68. These results indicate consistently high reported implementation of activities related to identifying school concerns, examining processes, and determining improvement priorities. The findings emphasize the role of systematic assessment in developing responsive school improvement interventions. Yurkofsky (2022) explained that meaningful continuous improvement requires school leaders to move beyond compliance and engage in substantive organizational learning. Stosich (2024) likewise highlighted the importance of examining existing educational conditions and using improvement processes to address identified concerns. The consistently high ratings indicate that respondents perceived assessment practices as regularly implemented, although these perceptions do not independently establish the accuracy of identified problems or the effectiveness of subsequent interventions.

3.3.2 Plan Stage

The Plan stage received a composite weighted mean of 4.72 (SD = 0.39) among school heads and 4.59 (SD = 0.48) among teachers, both interpreted as "Always Observed." Reviewing general objectives and targets obtained the highest ratings for both groups, with weighted means of 4.89 among school heads and 4.84 among teachers. Among teachers, preparing annual implementation plans received the lowest rating of 4.47, although it remained within the "Always Observed" category. The findings indicate consistently high ratings for planning practices, particularly the review of objectives, formulation of solutions, and preparation of school activities. The findings underscore the importance of organized planning and clear improvement priorities. Meyers et al. (2023) emphasized the value of short-cycle school improvement planning, monitoring, and adjustment in supporting organizational change. The Education Endowment Foundation (2024) similarly identified structured implementation processes and

contextual considerations as essential elements of effective educational improvement. These perspectives indicate that systematic planning provides an important foundation for implementation, while the comparatively lower ratings for some planning activities identify areas that may require further attention.

3.3.3 Act Stage

The Act stage was interpreted as "Always Observed," with a composite weighted mean of 4.60 (SD = 0.44) among school heads and 4.48 (SD = 0.49) among teachers. Scheduling school activities obtained the highest ratings for both groups, with weighted means of 4.84 and 4.74, respectively. Among school heads, preparing communication plans received the lowest rating of 4.47, while teachers reported the lowest rating for conducting training plans and interventions (4.32). Although implementation remained consistently high, the Act stage received lower composite ratings than the other stages in both respondent groups. The findings indicate that implementation activities were perceived as regularly carried out, although communication, training, and intervention activities received comparatively lower ratings. Koh et al. (2023) emphasized that sustaining school improvement depends on resource management, continuous professional learning, collaborative leadership, and feedback mechanisms. The Education Endowment Foundation (2024) likewise stressed the importance of embedding improvement approaches into everyday school practices. These findings suggest that continued attention to execution, communication, and monitoring may help strengthen the consistency of CI project implementation.

3.3.4 Overall Level of Implementation

The overall implementation of CI projects was rated "Always Observed" by both respondent groups. School heads reported an overall weighted mean of 4.66 (SD = 0.39), with the Plan stage obtaining the highest rating (4.72), followed by Assess (4.67) and Act (4.60). Teachers reported an overall weighted mean of 4.57 (SD = 0.46), with Assess receiving the highest rating (4.65), followed by Plan (4.59) and Act (4.48). These findings indicate that both groups reported consistently high implementation across the three stages, with the Act stage receiving the lowest comparative ratings. The findings suggest that the participating schools had established practices for assessing concerns, planning interventions, and carrying out improvement activities. Park et al. (2023) emphasized the importance of organizational coherence in sustaining continuous improvement, while Bush-Mecenas (2022) examined how improvement practices become embedded within educational organizations. Nevertheless, high implementation ratings primarily describe respondents' perceptions of process consistency and should not be interpreted as direct evidence of improved learner outcomes.

3.4 School Performance Based on Selected Indicators

3.4.1 Dropout Rate

School heads reported a general average dropout rate of 0.61%, interpreted as "Very Low." Seventeen school heads (89.47%) indicated dropout rates within the 0–1.00% category, while two (10.53%) reported rates between 1.01% and 2.00%. Teachers reported a general average dropout rate of 0.71%, also described as "Very Low." Among teachers, 81.58% reported dropout rates within the lowest category, 15.79% within the low category, and 2.63% within the moderate category. These findings indicate consistently low reported dropout rates across both respondent groups. The results indicate favorable learner-retention indicators within the

participating schools. Parreño (2023) emphasized that school dropout in the Philippines is influenced by multiple circumstances and requires attention to the underlying reasons learners discontinue schooling. Although the reported rates are encouraging, they do not independently establish that CI projects caused improved retention. Continued monitoring of attendance, learner circumstances, and retention-related concerns remains important for identifying students who may require additional assistance.

3.4.2 Failure Rate

School heads reported a general average failure rate of 0.50%, interpreted as "Very Low," with all 19 respondents (100%) indicating failure rates within the 0–1.00% category. Teachers reported a general average failure rate of 0.55%, also interpreted as "Very Low." Among teachers, 36 respondents (94.74%) reported failure rates within the lowest category, while two (5.26%) reported rates within the low category. The findings indicate that the reported failure rates were consistently low across the participating schools. The findings reflect favorable reported outcomes concerning learners' completion of academic requirements. Bibon (2022) examined the relationship between instructional practices and learners' academic achievement in Philippine schools, emphasizing the relevance of teaching practices to educational outcomes. The World Bank (2022) also highlighted the importance of foundational learning, particularly reading proficiency. Although the low failure rates are positive indicators, they do not establish the effectiveness of specific CI interventions or provide a comprehensive assessment of learning quality.

3.4.3 Promotion Rate

The school heads reported a general average promotion rate of 98%, interpreted as "Very High." All 19 respondents (100%) indicated promotion rates between 96% and 100%. Teachers reported a general average promotion rate of 96.84%, also classified as "Very High." Among teachers, 30 respondents (78.95%) reported promotion rates within the very high category, while eight (21.05%) reported rates between 90% and 95%, classified as high. These findings indicate consistently high reported learner progression across both respondent groups. The findings suggest that most learners in the participating schools progressed to the succeeding grade level. UNESCO (2024) emphasized the importance of educational leadership in supporting learning and strengthening school improvement efforts. Similarly, Park et al. (2023) highlighted the relevance of coherent improvement systems in educational organizations. However, promotion rates should be interpreted alongside dropout, failure, and learning-performance indicators because learner progression alone does not establish the quality of learning or the causal contribution of CI projects.

3.5 Relationship Between Continuous Improvement Implementation and School Performance

The Spearman Rank Correlation analysis revealed no statistically significant relationship between the level of CI project implementation and school performance. Among school heads, the correlation coefficient was 0.306 ($n = 19$, $p = 0.203$), indicating a positive but statistically nonsignificant association. Among teachers, the correlation coefficient was 0.115 ($n = 38$, $p = 0.493$), likewise indicating a weak positive and statistically nonsignificant association. Since both p-values exceeded the 0.05 significance level, the null hypothesis was not rejected for either respondent group. These findings indicate that the study did not establish a statistically

significant association between reported CI implementation and the selected school-performance indicators. Yurkofsky (2022) distinguished substantive improvement from procedural compliance, while Stosich (2024) demonstrated the importance of organizational context and the purposes guiding improvement work. Koh et al. (2023) also emphasized that sustaining improvement involves interacting organizational, leadership, and resource-related conditions. Accordingly, the absence of statistically significant relationships should not be interpreted as proof that CI projects are ineffective; rather, the present data do not provide sufficient statistical evidence of an association between implementation ratings and school performance.

3.6 Issues and Concerns Encountered in Continuous Improvement Implementation

3.6.1 Challenges Reported by School Heads

The most frequently reported challenge among school heads was limited financial resources, identified by 15 respondents (78.95%). This was followed by insufficient implementation time due to teachers' other responsibilities, reported by 14 respondents (73.68%). Insufficient learning materials and difficulty sustaining CI projects after initial implementation were each reported by 13 respondents (68.42%). Inadequate training or capacity-building activities were identified by 57.89%, while limited stakeholder involvement was the least frequently reported concern at 26.31%. These findings indicate that financial, material, time-related, and sustainability constraints were the most frequently identified implementation difficulties. The findings highlight the importance of ensuring adequate organizational support for CI initiatives. Koh et al. (2023) emphasized that sustainable school improvement depends on resource management, leadership coordination, professional development, and supportive institutional conditions. The Education Endowment Foundation (2024) similarly identified contextual readiness and implementation capacity as important considerations in sustaining educational change. These perspectives suggest that addressing resource availability and implementation demands may strengthen the conditions necessary for maintaining CI projects.

3.6.2 Challenges Reported by Teachers

Among teachers, limited time for implementing and monitoring CI projects because of other responsibilities emerged as the most frequently reported concern, identified by 32 respondents (84.21%). Insufficient training or capacity-building activities and difficulty sustaining projects after initial implementation were each reported by 27 respondents (71.05%). Limited financial resources and insufficient learning materials were each identified by 18 respondents (47.37%). Difficulties in monitoring and evaluation were reported by 42.11%, while identifying and prioritizing school problems was the least frequently reported concern at 28.95%. These findings indicate that time constraints, specialized training needs, and sustainability difficulties were the principal concerns reported by teachers. The findings emphasize the importance of providing sufficient implementation time, relevant professional development, and continuing organizational support. Popova et al. (2022) highlighted the need to improve the alignment of professional development programs with evidence-informed practices, while Asterhan and Lefstein (2024) emphasized careful evaluation of professional learning approaches. UNESCO (2024) also identified leadership support, collaboration, and professional capacity as important components of educational improvement. Taken together, the findings support the development of a sustainability guide focused on resource planning, manageable implementation responsibilities, targeted training, monitoring, and continued stakeholder participation.

4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study concluded that Continuous Improvement (CI) instruction-related projects were consistently implemented across the Assess, Plan, and Act stages in public schools of Bien Unido District, Bohol, during School Year 2025–2026. Based on responses from 19 school heads and 38 teachers serving as CI coordinators and team leaders, reading and numeracy initiatives emerged as the most commonly implemented projects. Respondents reported very low dropout and failure rates and very high promotion rates, indicating favorable school-performance indicators during the period examined. However, Spearman correlation tests found no statistically significant relationship between the reported level of CI implementation and school performance for either respondent group. Thus, regularly carrying out CI processes was not, in this study, statistically associated with the selected learner outcomes. These findings underscore the distinction between consistent implementation and demonstrable performance results and provide a district-specific basis for strengthening the sustainability, monitoring, and evaluation of instruction-related CI initiatives.

The public schools of Bien Unido District should operationalize the sustainability guide developed from the findings, with school heads, CI coordinators, and team leaders jointly assigning responsibilities and reviewing project progress. Because school heads most frequently identified limited financial resources and teachers most frequently reported insufficient time alongside other duties, schools should prioritize feasible resource allocations, coordinate schedules, and distribute implementation and monitoring tasks. Targeted coaching and capacity-building should address the reported training gaps, while timely provision of learning materials and continued involvement of parents and community stakeholders should support ongoing projects. CI teams should document project activities and outcomes, regularly review dropout, failure, and promotion data, and use the findings to refine, sustain, or adjust interventions rather than treating high implementation ratings as sufficient evidence of success. Reading and numeracy initiatives should remain responsive to identified learner needs, with progress and implementation challenges reviewed through the established Assess, Plan, and Act cycle.

The findings are limited to 57 school heads and teachers involved in CI implementation in public schools of one district during School Year 2025–2026; they should therefore not be generalized automatically to other settings. The descriptive-correlational design identifies statistical associations but cannot establish whether CI projects caused changes in school performance. Implementation levels were assessed through questionnaire responses, while school-performance indicators were reported using the study's prescribed categories. The analysis considered three performance indicators, which do not capture every dimension of educational quality. Future studies may examine other districts and school years, incorporate additional outcome measures, and triangulate survey responses with school records and implementation evidence.

5. REFERENCES

Asterhan, C. S. C., & Lefstein, A. (2024). The search for evidence-based features of effective teacher professional development: A critical analysis of the literature. *Professional Development in Education, 50*(1), 11–23. https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2023.2283437

Bibon, M. B. (2022). Teachers' instructional practices and learners' academic achievement in science. *Contemporary Mathematics and Science Education, 3*(1), Article ep22007. https://doi.org/10.30935/conmaths/11816

Bush-Mecenas, S. (2022). "The business of teaching and learning": Institutionalizing equity in educational organizations through continuous improvement. *American Educational Research Journal, 59*(3), 461–499. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312221074404

Department of Education. (2022a). *Adoption of the Basic Education Development Plan 2030 (DepEd Order No. 024, s. 2022)*. https://www.deped.gov.ph/2022/05/30/may-30-2022-do-024-s-2022-adoption-of-the-basic-education-development-plan-2030/

Department of Education. (2022b). *Adoption of the Basic Education Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (DepEd Order No. 029, s. 2022)*. https://www.deped.gov.ph/2022/06/22/june-20-2022-do-029-s-2022-adoption-of-the-basic-education-monitoring-and-evaluation-framework/

Department of Education. (2023). *Adoption of the National Learning Recovery Program in the Department of Education (DepEd Order No. 013, s. 2023)*. https://www.deped.gov.ph/2023/07/05/july-5-2023-do-013-s-2023-adoption-of-the-national-learning-recovery-program-in-the-department-of-education/

Firmansyah, F., Prasojo, L. D., Jaedun, A., & Retnawati, H. (2022). Transformational leadership effect on teacher performance in Asia: A meta-analysis. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences, 17*(6), 2127–2146. https://doi.org/10.18844/cjes.v17i6.7552

Gümüş, S., Bellibaş, M. Ş., Şen, S., & Hallinger, P. (2024). Finding the missing link: Do principal qualifications make a difference in student achievement? *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 52*(1), 28–51. https://doi.org/10.1177/17411432211051909

Hebbecker, K., Förster, N., Forthmann, B., & Souvignier, E. (2022). Data-based decision-making in schools: Examining the process and effects of teacher support. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 114*(7), 1695–1721. https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000530

Koh, G. A., Askell-Williams, H., & Barr, S. (2023). Sustaining school improvement initiatives: Advice from educational leaders. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 34*(3), 298–330. https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2023.2190130

Meyers, C., Aaron, T., Hitt, D. H., & VanGronigen, B. A. (2023). Promises and pitfalls: Principals using short-cycle school improvement plans to optimize organizational change. *International Journal of Educational Management, 37*(4), 846–862. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-07-2022-0256

Moore, R. (2022). Variation, context, and inequality: Comparing models of school effectiveness in two states in India. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 33*(4), 588–609. https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2022.2089169

Park, V., Kennedy, K. E., Gallagher, H. A., Cottingham, B. W., & Gong, A. (2023). Weaving and stacking: How school districts craft coherence towards continuous improvement. *Journal of Educational Change, 24*(4), 919–942. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-022-09471-5

Parreño, S. J. (2023). School dropouts in the Philippines: Causes, changes and statistics. *Sapienza: International Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies, 4*(1), Article e23002. https://doi.org/10.51798/sijis.v4i1.552

Popova, A., Evans, D. K., Breeding, M. E., & Arancibia, V. (2022). Teacher professional development around the world: The gap between evidence and practice. *The World Bank Research Observer, 37*(1), 107–136. https://doi.org/10.1093/wbro/lkab006

Rechsteiner, B., Compagnoni, M., Wullschleger, A., Schäfer, L. M., Rickenbacher, A., & Maag Merki, K. (2022). Teachers involved in school improvement: Analyzing mediating mechanisms of teachers' boundary-crossing activities between leadership perception and teacher involvement. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 116*, Article 103774. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2022.103774

Saculo, E. A., Buasan, T. T., & Carandang, J. S. (2023). Continuous improvement (CI) methodology: A sustainability mechanism in schools. In *Proceedings of the 13th Annual*

International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Operations Management. IEOM Society International. https://doi.org/10.46254/AN13.20230575

Sharples, J., Eaton, J., & Boughelaf, J. (2024). *A school's guide to implementation* (3rd ed.). Education Endowment Foundation. https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/guidance-reports/implementation

Stosich, E. L. (2024). Working toward transformation: Educational leaders' use of continuous improvement to advance equity. *Frontiers in Education, 9*, Article 1430976. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1430976

UNESCO. (2024). *Global education monitoring report 2024/5: Leadership in education—Lead for learning*. https://www.unesco.org/gem-report/en/publication/leadership

United Nations Statistics Division. (2025). *The Sustainable Development Goals Report 2025: Goal 4—Quality education*. https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/report/2025/Goal-04/

Williams, K. E. (2022). Leadership attributes that support school improvement: A realist approach. *School Leadership & Management, 42*(2), 151–169. https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2021.2016686

World Bank, UNESCO, UNICEF, Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office, United States Agency for International Development, & Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. (2022). *The state of global learning poverty: 2022 update*. World Bank. https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/education/publication/state-of-global-learning-poverty

Yurkofsky, M. M. (2022). From compliance to improvement: How school leaders make sense of institutional and technical demands when implementing a continuous improvement process. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 58*(2), 300–346. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X211053597