

An Audit of Decision-Making Practices and Enhancement Strategies for Campus Administrators at Western Philippines University

Jergen Jel C. Labaria, PhD

Associate Professor V College of Education Western Philippines University, Palawan, Philippines

Jergen.labaria@wpu.edu.ph

HOW TO CITE:

Jergen Jel C. Labaria (2026).
An Audit of Decision-Making
Practices and Enhancement
Strategies for Campus
Administrators at Western
Philippines University.
International Journal of Special
Education, 41(8s), 31-44

ABSTRACT:

Decision-making is a central leadership function that shapes organizational effectiveness and institutional climate in higher education. In multi-campus universities, geographically dispersed governance structures intensify the need for participatory, transparent, and evidence-based decision-making processes. This study examined the decision-making practices of campus administrators, their perceived influence on organizational climate, and the relationship between decision-making practices and organizational climate

A quantitative descriptive–correlational design was employed using purposive sampling of faculty members and campus administrators ($N = 40$) across seven campuses. Data were collected through a validated survey instrument (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.91$) measuring engagement in decision-making processes, leadership effectiveness, and perceived organizational climate. Statistical analyses included weighted means and Pearson's correlation coefficient.

Findings revealed high levels of engagement in decision-making processes ($M = 4.20$) and leadership effectiveness ($M = 4.20$), alongside a very high perceived influence on organizational climate ($M = 4.23$). A strong and statistically significant relationship was found between decision-making practices and organizational climate ($r = 0.72, p < 0.001$). Results indicate that participatory and transparent decision-making practices are associated with enhanced trust, collaboration, and institutional commitment.

This study contributes to the literature by providing empirical evidence from a multi-campus public university context in the Philippines, highlighting how distributed and participatory leadership practices operate across geographically dispersed units. Implications emphasize the institutionalization of inclusive decision-making frameworks and the strengthening of leadership competencies to sustain positive organizational climates in higher education systems.

COPYRIGHT STATEMENT:

Copyright: © 2026 Authors.
Open access publication under the
terms and conditions
of the Creative Commons Attribution

(CC BY)
license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Keywords: decision-making, organizational climate, participatory leadership, distributed leadership, higher education governance

Introduction

Decision-making plays a vital role in higher education institutions because it influences how universities function, respond to challenges, and achieve their goals. In academic environments where administrators regularly deal with policy implementation, resource allocation, faculty concerns, and institutional accountability, sound decision-making becomes essential to effective governance. Studies have shown that leadership decisions grounded in timely action, stakeholder participation, and evidence-based processes contribute to stronger institutional performance, improved collaboration, and a healthier organizational climate (Carroll et al., 2025; Tabiolo, 2018). On the other hand, poorly communicated or inconsistent decisions may create uncertainty, reduce faculty engagement, and weaken trust within the institution.

In recent years, leadership in higher education has increasingly emphasized participatory and distributed approaches to governance. Rather than concentrating authority solely on top administrators, these leadership perspectives encourage shared responsibility and active stakeholder involvement in institutional processes (Ghosh & Kabra, 2025; Huang et al., 2024). Faculty and staff participation in decision-making not only improves transparency and accountability but also strengthens professional commitment and organizational cohesion (Zeeman et al., 2024). Collaborative governance structures further enable institutions to adapt more effectively to changing academic and administrative demands.

Decision-making practices are also closely connected to organizational climate, which reflects how employees perceive leadership behavior, communication, workplace relationships, and institutional support. Leadership decisions that are viewed as fair,

inclusive, and transparent often foster trust, cooperation, and positive working relationships among stakeholders (Zhong & Wang, 2025). In contrast, centralized or poorly communicated decisions may contribute to workplace tension and disengagement (Li et al., 2025). Because higher education institutions depend heavily on collaboration in instruction, research, and extension activities, maintaining a positive organizational climate remains an important institutional concern.

In the Philippines, public higher education institutions operate within governance systems shaped by national regulations, accreditation standards, and increasing demands for accountability and quality assurance. These challenges become more complex in multi-campus universities, where administrators must ensure coordination and consistency across geographically dispersed campuses while remaining responsive to local needs. Western Philippines University (WPU), which consists of several external campuses across Palawan, provides an appropriate context for examining how decision-making practices operate within a decentralized institutional structure. In such settings, administrators are expected to engage in various stages of decision-making, including identifying institutional concerns, consulting stakeholders, evaluating alternatives, implementing policies, and monitoring outcomes.

Although leadership and governance have been widely examined in higher education research, studies focusing specifically on decision-making practices in multi-campus public universities remain limited, particularly in the Philippine context. Moreover, few studies have examined decision-making practices across specific stages of the decision-making process using empirical data from Philippine public higher education

institutions. Addressing these gaps, this study examines the decision-making practices of campus administrators and their relationship with organizational climate in a multi-campus public university. Guided by participatory and distributed leadership perspectives, the study assumes that effective and inclusive decision-making practices contribute to a more positive organizational climate characterized by trust, collaboration, and institutional commitment.

Objectives

This study aimed to examine the decision-making practices of campus administrators and their relationship with organizational climate. Specifically, it sought to:

1. Determine the extent of engagement in decision-making processes;
2. Assess the effectiveness of administrators' decision-making responsibilities;
3. Examine the perceived influence of decision-making practices on organizational climate; and
4. Determine the relationship between decision-making practices and organizational climate.

Methodology

Research Design

This study employed a quantitative descriptive–correlational research design to examine decision-making practices and their relationship with organizational climate in a multi-campus university setting. Descriptive research was used to determine the extent of stakeholder engagement in decision-making processes and the effectiveness of administrators' decision-making responsibilities, while the correlational component examined the association between decision-making practices and organizational climate. This design is appropriate for studies that aim to describe existing conditions and determine relationships among variables without manipulating the research environment (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). The approach also aligns with previous leadership and organizational climate studies in higher education that utilized quantitative methods to examine governance and institutional effectiveness (Hallinger & Wang, 2020; Zhong & Wang, 2025).

Research Respondents and Sampling

The study involved 40 respondents composed of campus administrators and faculty members from the seven campuses of Western Philippines University (WPU), namely Puerto Princesa, Quezon, Rio Tuba, El Nido, Culion, Busuanga, and Canique. Data collection was conducted during the School Year 2024–2025.

A purposive sampling technique was employed to select respondents with direct experience and involvement in institutional decision-making processes. Campus administrators were required to have served in their positions for at least one academic year, while faculty members were required to have worked under campus administrators for a minimum of one year. These inclusion criteria ensured that the participants possessed adequate institutional knowledge and relevant experience to provide informed and reliable responses regarding administrative decision-making practices and organizational climate.

Limitations of the Study

Several limitations should be considered in interpreting the findings of this study. First, the relatively small sample size ($N = 40$) limits the generalizability of the findings to other higher education institutions. Although the study provides valuable insights into decision-making practices within a multi-campus university, broader samples across multiple institutions may yield more comprehensive results.

Second, the study was confined to a single public university in the Philippines; therefore, institutional practices and organizational dynamics may differ in other higher education settings. Third, the study relied on self-reported data, which may be influenced by social desirability bias and respondents' subjective perceptions.

Fourth, the descriptive–correlational design limits the ability to establish causal relationships between decision-making practices and organizational climate. The findings only indicate associations between variables and should not be interpreted as evidence of direct causation (Fraenkel et al., 2019). Finally, other variables that may influence organizational climate, such as leadership style, organizational culture, institutional resources, and employee motivation, were not included in the analysis. Future studies may incorporate these variables using broader analytical frameworks and mixed-method approaches.

Research Instrument

Data were gathered using a structured survey questionnaire designed to measure three major dimensions: engagement in the decision-making process, effectiveness of administrators' decision-making practices, and perceived influence on organizational climate. The instrument consisted of closed-ended items measured using a five-point Likert scale to facilitate quantitative analysis of responses.

The questionnaire was adapted from established instruments in educational leadership and organizational climate research and was

contextualized to reflect the governance structure and operational conditions of the university (Tabiolo, 2018). Content validity was established through expert review by specialists in educational leadership and research methodology. A pilot test was subsequently conducted to assess the clarity, consistency, and reliability of the instrument. The pilot testing yielded a high reliability coefficient (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.91$), indicating excellent internal consistency based on accepted reliability standards (Taber, 2018). Necessary revisions were incorporated to improve item clarity and contextual relevance prior to full-scale data collection.

Data Gathering Procedure

Prior to data collection, formal approval was secured from the university administration. Ethical protocols, including informed consent, voluntary participation, confidentiality, and anonymity, were strictly observed throughout the conduct of the study.

The validated questionnaires were distributed to qualified respondents who met the inclusion criteria. Participants were provided sufficient time to complete the instrument to ensure thoughtful and accurate responses. Upon retrieval, completed questionnaires were checked for completeness, coded, and organized for statistical analysis. To protect respondent identity, no personally identifiable information was included in the data processing procedures.

Data Analysis

The collected data were encoded, tabulated, and analyzed using appropriate statistical tools. Weighted mean was utilized to determine the extent of engagement in decision-making processes, the effectiveness of administrators' decision-making responsibilities, and the perceived influence of decision-making practices on organizational climate. Pearson product–moment correlation coefficient (r) was employed to examine the relationship between decision-making practices and organizational climate.

These statistical techniques are widely used in educational and organizational research to

examine patterns, perceptions, and variable relationships (Field, 2018). The use of descriptive and inferential statistics enabled objective interpretation of the findings and provided empirical support for the study's conclusions.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical principles were strictly observed throughout the research process. Participants were informed about the objectives and significance of the study and were assured that participation was entirely voluntary. They were also informed of their right to withdraw from the study at any stage without penalty.

Confidentiality and anonymity were maintained through the coding of responses and the exclusion of identifying information from the dataset. All collected data were handled securely and were used solely for academic and research purposes in accordance with established ethical standards in social science research.

Results and Discussion

Extent of Engagement of Faculty Members and Campus Administrators in the Decision-Making Process.

Table 1. Extent of Engagement of Faculty Members and Campus Administrators in the Decision-Making Process (N = 40)

Decision-Making Process Steps	Mean	Interpretation
1. Identifying and defining problems before making decisions	4.32	Very High Extent
2. Gathering relevant information and data	4.25	Very High Extent
3. Consulting stakeholders (faculty and staff)	4.10	High Extent
4. Generating alternative solutions	4.18	High Extent
5. Evaluating possible alternatives before final decisions	4.22	Very High Extent
6. Selecting the most appropriate course of action	4.30	Very High Extent
7. Implementing decisions effectively	4.15	High Extent
8. Monitoring and evaluating decision outcomes	4.05	High Extent
Overall Mean	4.20	High Extent

The findings revealed a high level of engagement in the decision-making process among faculty members and campus administrators ($M = 4.20$), indicating that participatory governance practices are evident across campuses. This suggests that administrators actively involve stakeholders in institutional processes, which may contribute to greater transparency, collaboration, and trust within the university. Similar findings were reported by Zeeman et al. (2024), who emphasized that stakeholder participation strengthens institutional trust and professional commitment in educational organizations.

Higher mean ratings in problem identification ($M = 4.32$) and information gathering ($M = 4.25$) indicate that decision-making practices within the institution are largely guided by systematic and evidence-based processes. These findings support previous studies highlighting the importance of data-informed leadership in improving institutional effectiveness and accountability (Carroll et al., 2025). Moore et al. (2024) likewise noted that careful information gathering enhances transparency and supports more informed administrative decisions. This implies that campus leaders recognize the value

of rational and well-informed governance practices in addressing institutional concerns.

The findings also showed strong engagement in stakeholder consultation ($M = 4.10$) and the generation of alternative solutions ($M = 4.18$), reflecting the presence of collaborative and inclusive governance mechanisms. Faculty participation in institutional decision-making may strengthen organizational cohesion and encourage shared responsibility among stakeholders. This observation is consistent with the work of Ghosh and Kabra (2025), who emphasized that participatory leadership promotes collaboration and organizational commitment. Similarly, Pann et al. (2025) found that distributed leadership and shared decision-making contribute to stronger professional relationships and improved cooperation within educational institutions. Men et al. (2020) further explained that stakeholder consultation enhances communication and minimizes resistance to organizational change.

High ratings in evaluating alternatives ($M = 4.22$) and selecting appropriate courses of action ($M = 4.30$) further suggest that administrators practice careful and reflective decision-making. These findings align with participatory leadership perspectives that emphasize fairness, inclusivity, and critical evaluation in institutional governance (Huang et al., 2024). Tahan et al. (2025) noted that evaluative decision-making processes contribute to higher-quality decisions and stronger organizational trust, while Zhou et al. (2024) emphasized that transparent evaluation procedures improve leadership credibility. The results therefore indicate that leadership

decisions within the institution are generally guided by strategic considerations and transparent processes.

Despite these positive findings, comparatively lower ratings in implementation ($M = 4.15$) and monitoring and evaluation ($M = 4.05$) suggest that post-decision processes may require further improvement. While administrators appear effective in formulating decisions, sustaining implementation and monitoring mechanisms remains a challenge. This finding supports the observation of Zhong and Wang (2025) that continuous monitoring and evaluation are essential for organizational learning and adaptive governance. Bapanova et al. (2025) likewise emphasized that successful implementation depends on collaborative leadership, stakeholder engagement, and clearly defined responsibilities. These findings suggest that strengthening post-decision evaluation mechanisms may further improve policy implementation and institutional effectiveness.

Overall, the high level of engagement in decision-making practices indicates a favorable environment for collaborative governance and positive organizational climate. When faculty members and administrators participate actively in institutional processes, professional relationships, trust, and mutual respect are strengthened. Albir et al. (2020) similarly found that participatory decision-making reduces workplace conflict and improves organizational relationships. The findings therefore suggest that inclusive decision-making practices contribute positively to institutional harmony, staff motivation, and organizational cohesion.

Effectiveness of Campus Administrators in Performing Decision-Making Responsibilities

Table 2. Effectiveness of Campus Administrators in Performing Decision-Making Responsibilities ($N = 40$)

Decision-Making Responsibilities	Mean	Interpretation
1. Provides clear direction when making decisions	4.28	Very Effective
2. Makes timely and well-informed decisions	4.22	Very Effective
3. Encourages faculty participation in decision-making	4.10	Effective

4. Communicates decisions transparently to stakeholders	4.18	Effective
5. Resolves conflicts fairly and objectively	4.15	Effective
6. Ensures decisions align with university vision and goals	4.30	Very Effective
7. Takes responsibility for outcomes of decisions	4.26	Very Effective
8. Adjusts decisions based on feedback and evaluation	4.08	Effective
Overall Mean	4.20	Effective

The findings revealed that campus administrators were generally effective in performing their decision-making responsibilities ($M = 4.20$), indicating a strong level of leadership competence in managing institutional processes and governance functions. This finding supports existing literature emphasizing that effective leadership practices contribute significantly to institutional performance, organizational stability, and stakeholder confidence (Malik et al., 2025). The results also reflect the presence of strategic leadership practices that promote institutional coherence and effective governance across campuses. Hallinger and Wang (2020) similarly emphasized that effective decision-making remains a central component of educational leadership performance in higher education institutions.

High ratings in providing clear direction ($M = 4.28$) and making timely, well-informed decisions ($M = 4.22$) suggest that campus administrators demonstrate strong strategic leadership capabilities. These findings align with studies highlighting the importance of timely, informed, and well-communicated decisions in complex institutional environments (Huang et al., 2024). Bush and Glover (2020) further explained that leadership decisions characterized by clarity and timeliness strengthen organizational trust and improve institutional performance. The findings therefore suggest that administrators are capable of responding effectively to academic and operational concerns, contributing to institutional stability and a more positive organizational climate.

The results also showed that administrators were effective in encouraging faculty participation ($M = 4.10$) and communicating decisions transparently ($M = 4.18$), reflecting the application of participatory and inclusive leadership practices. These leadership behaviors promote trust, collaboration, and stronger organizational relationships among stakeholders (Zeeman et al., 2024). Similarly, Leithwood and Sun (2020) found that shared decision-making enhances professional collaboration and collective commitment within educational institutions. The findings indicate that campus administrators recognize the importance of involving faculty members in institutional governance and maintaining open communication in decision-making processes.

Administrators also demonstrated effectiveness in conflict resolution ($M = 4.15$) and accountability for decision outcomes ($M = 4.26$), which are important indicators of ethical and responsible leadership. These practices contribute to workplace stability, institutional credibility, and stronger professional relationships (Zhong & Wang, 2025). Rahim (2023) emphasized that fair and objective conflict management is essential in maintaining a positive organizational climate and reducing workplace tensions. The findings therefore suggest that administrators exercise fairness, accountability, and professionalism in carrying out leadership responsibilities.

The highest mean rating was observed in aligning decisions with the institutional vision and goals ($M = 4.30$), indicating that campus administrators

strongly consider long-term institutional directions in their decision-making practices. This finding reinforces the importance of strategic leadership in achieving organizational effectiveness and sustainability (Li et al., 2025). Fullan (2021) similarly noted that vision-driven leadership plays a critical role in sustaining educational improvement and institutional reform. Moreover, the rating for adjusting decisions based on feedback and evaluation ($M =$

4.08) suggests that administrators also practice adaptive and reflective leadership. Day and Sammons (2020) explained that flexibility and continuous evaluation strengthen institutional resilience and responsiveness to organizational needs. Overall, the findings indicate that campus administrators integrate strategic planning with stakeholder responsiveness in managing institutional decision-making processes.

Perceived Influence of Administrators' Decision-Making Practices on Campus Organizational Climate

Table 3. Perceived Influence of Administrators' Decision-Making Practices on Campus Organizational Climate

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1. Administrators' decisions promote transparency in campus operations.	4.32	Very High Impact
2. Decision-making processes encourage trust between administrators and faculty.	4.25	Very High Impact
3. Administrators involve faculty and staff in important campus decisions.	4.10	High Impact
4. Decisions made by administrators improve teamwork and collaboration.	4.18	High Impact
5. Administrative decisions contribute to a positive work environment.	4.30	Very High Impact
6. Decision-making practices reduce workplace conflicts.	4.05	High Impact
7. Administrators' decisions enhance motivation among faculty and staff.	4.22	Very High Impact
8. Decisions are communicated clearly and timely to stakeholders.	4.28	Very High Impact
9. Administrators' decision-making strengthens institutional commitment.	4.26	Very High Impact
10. Overall, decision-making practices improve the campus organizational climate.	4.35	Very High Impact
Overall	4.23	Very High Impact

The findings revealed that decision-making practices had a very high perceived influence on organizational climate ($M = 4.23$), emphasizing the important role of leadership in shaping workplace relationships, institutional culture, and stakeholder perceptions. This finding supports organizational climate theory, which explains that leadership behaviors and administrative practices significantly influence employees' experiences

within the workplace (Zhong & Wang, 2025). The results suggest that the way administrators make and communicate decisions contributes substantially to the overall campus environment.

High ratings in transparency ($M = 4.32$) and trust-building ($M = 4.25$) indicate that decision-making processes within the institution are generally perceived as open, fair, and credible. These

findings support previous studies linking transparent leadership practices to stronger institutional trust, improved communication, and enhanced collaboration among stakeholders (Li et al., 2025). Similarly, Meriç and Öz (2025) found that transparent decision-making practices significantly strengthen trust in school leadership. The results therefore imply that openness and accountability in administrative decisions help foster confidence among faculty and staff members.

The involvement of faculty members in decision-making ($M = 4.10$) and the observed improvements in teamwork and collaboration ($M = 4.18$) further reflect the presence of a participatory organizational culture within the university. These findings align with studies showing that inclusive governance practices encourage cooperation, strengthen professional relationships, and improve organizational performance (Ghosh & Kabra, 2025). Active

stakeholder participation in institutional processes may therefore contribute to a stronger sense of shared responsibility and organizational cohesion across campuses.

The findings also showed that decision-making practices contribute positively to the work environment ($M = 4.30$), employee motivation ($M = 4.22$), and institutional commitment ($M = 4.26$). These results reinforce previous research indicating that participatory leadership practices enhance employee engagement, professional satisfaction, and commitment to organizational goals (Zeeman et al., 2024). Nguyen et al. (2024) similarly found that participative leadership positively influences teacher motivation, engagement, and institutional commitment. The findings suggest that inclusive and transparent decision-making practices not only improve administrative processes but also strengthen morale and professional dedication among university personnel.

Relationship Between Decision-Making Practices and Organizational Climate of the School.

Table 4. Relationship Between Decision-Making Practices and Organizational Climate

Variables	r-value	p-value	Interpretation
Decision-Making Practices and Organizational Climate	0.72	< 0.001	Strong Positive Relationship (Significant)

The results revealed a strong and statistically significant relationship between decision-making practices and organizational climate ($r = 0.72$, $p < 0.001$), indicating that higher levels of engagement and effectiveness in decision-making are associated with more positive organizational climate outcomes. This finding suggests that the quality of administrative decision-making plays an important role in shaping workplace relationships, institutional trust, and stakeholder perceptions within the university.

The strong relationship observed in this study highlights the importance of participatory, transparent, and well-structured decision-making processes in fostering a positive institutional

environment. In a multi-campus university setting, where coordination and collaboration are necessary across geographically dispersed campuses, effective decision-making practices may strengthen trust, shared responsibility, and organizational cohesion. These findings are consistent with previous studies emphasizing that leadership behaviors significantly influence organizational climate and workplace conditions in educational institutions (Zhong & Wang, 2025; Li et al., 2025).

The findings also support participatory leadership theory, which emphasizes shared governance and stakeholder involvement as important mechanisms for improving

organizational outcomes (Ghosh & Kabra, 2025). Administrators who involve faculty and staff in institutional processes are more likely to promote transparency, accountability, and collaboration within the organization. Similarly, Roper (2025) highlighted that collaborative decision-making contributes to a healthier workplace culture and stronger institutional relationships. Garcia and Ching (2024) likewise found that transparent leadership practices significantly strengthen trust in school administrators. These observations suggest that inclusive governance practices contribute positively to faculty confidence and institutional stability.

The results further align with studies showing that effective institutional management practices influence organizational commitment, faculty performance, and workplace engagement in higher education settings (Tabiolo, 2018). Zeeman et al. (2024) emphasized that open communication and inclusive participation strengthen professional commitment and organizational alignment. In the same way, participative leadership has been associated with improved job satisfaction and reduced professional burnout among educators (Mekheimer, 2025). Collaborative leadership structures also enhance cooperation and collective responsibility within educational organizations (Mooney, 2022; Netshakhuma, 2025). These findings indicate that decision-making practices extend beyond administrative functions and contribute directly to institutional relationships and organizational effectiveness.

Effective decision-making practices may also help reduce workplace conflict by promoting fairness, consistency, and accountability in institutional processes. Participatory governance frameworks encourage open communication and minimize resistance to administrative directives (Weishaupt, 2025). Leadership decisions grounded in shared institutional goals likewise strengthen support for organizational initiatives and reforms (Kearney et al., 2024). This suggests that transparent and inclusive decision-making practices contribute to a more stable and cooperative working environment.

Across higher education settings, effective decision-making has consistently been associated with participative leadership, evidence-based governance, and collaborative institutional cultures. Administrators who adopt inclusive and data-informed leadership approaches are more likely to strengthen organizational effectiveness and stakeholder trust (Aquino, 2025; Baolong & Agapay, 2024). Leadership models that emphasize communication, adaptability, and professional growth further enhance administrative effectiveness and institutional responsiveness (Azucena et al., 2023).

The findings also reinforce previous evidence that organizational climate and decision-making practices are closely interconnected in educational institutions. Positive organizational climates characterized by collaboration, mutual respect, and supportive leadership may encourage more effective and participatory decision-making processes (Mabalay, 2019; Mandaguio, 2025). In turn, effective decision-making practices contribute to overall school effectiveness and institutional performance (Oroye-Okpoudhu & Efayena, 2026). The relationship between these variables therefore appears mutually reinforcing within higher education environments.

While the findings demonstrated a strong association between decision-making practices and organizational climate, the results should be interpreted within the limitations of the study. The correlational design does not establish causal relationships, and other institutional or contextual factors may also influence organizational climate. Future studies may consider larger samples, multiple institutions, and mixed-method approaches to provide deeper understanding of how leadership practices shape organizational outcomes in higher education settings.

Overall, the findings suggest that strengthening participatory, transparent, and evidence-based decision-making processes may help promote a more positive, collaborative, and sustainable organizational climate in multi-campus higher education institutions.

Conclusions

The study revealed that faculty members and campus administrators demonstrated high levels of engagement in decision-making processes, reflecting the presence of participatory and collaborative governance practices within the university. Campus administrators were likewise perceived as effective in performing decision-making responsibilities, particularly in providing clear direction, promoting accountability, aligning decisions with institutional goals, and encouraging stakeholder participation.

The findings further showed that decision-making practices had a strong influence on organizational climate, particularly in fostering transparency, trust, collaboration, motivation, and institutional commitment among faculty and staff. Most importantly, a strong and statistically significant relationship was found between decision-making practices and organizational climate, indicating that effective and participatory leadership practices contribute to a more positive institutional environment.

The study highlights the importance of participatory, transparent, and evidence-based decision-making in strengthening organizational cohesion and institutional effectiveness within a multi-campus university setting. However, the relatively lower ratings in implementation and monitoring suggest the need to further strengthen post-decision evaluation and feedback mechanisms to support continuous institutional improvement.

Recommendations

The university may strengthen participatory governance by institutionalizing faculty

consultative councils and cross-campus committees to ensure consistent stakeholder engagement across campuses. Leadership development programs should also be enhanced to improve administrators' competencies in evidence-based decision-making, strategic planning, and adaptive governance.

The findings further suggest the need to strengthen monitoring and evaluation systems through regular performance reviews and stakeholder feedback mechanisms to improve post-decision processes. Communication systems may likewise be improved through the timely dissemination of decisions and the establishment of formal channels for consultation and feedback to promote transparency and organizational trust.

In addition, institutional policies may integrate participatory and data-driven decision-making frameworks to support effective governance and long-term sustainability. Future studies may include multiple institutions, larger samples, and additional variables such as leadership styles and organizational culture to provide broader insights into decision-making practices and organizational climate in higher education institutions.

Declaration of Conflicting Interest

The author declares no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

REFERENCES

- Akullo, G., Aracil, E., Mwaura, S., & McMillan, C. (2025). Beyond teaching: The extended role of informal entrepreneurship education and training in challenging contexts. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 31(8), 2049–2071. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEBR-09-2023-0917>
- Albir, P. H., Galán-Mañas, A., Kuznik, A., Olalla-Soler, C., Rodríguez-Inés, P., & Romero, L. (2020). Translation competence acquisition: Design and results of the PACTE group's experimental research. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 14(2), 95–233. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1750399X.2020.1732601>

-
- Aquino, J. M. D. R. (2025). Best practices of high-performing higher education institutions in the Philippines toward the development of a harmonized quality-assured instructional leadership framework. *Frontiers in Education*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1663289>
- Azucena, J. A., Geroso, M. J. S., & Maguate, G. S. (2023). Contingent educational management response: The construction and validation of a leadership scale in the era of change. *International Journal of Latest Research in Humanities and Social Sciences*, 6(7), 315–327.
- Bapanova, G. K., Orekhova, N. V., Kadirsizova, S. B., Kasbayeva, G. S., & Sholpankulova, G. K. (2025). Research skills as student learning achievement. *International Journal of Educational Reform*, 34(3), 543–558. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10567879231155874>
- Baolong, G., & Agapay, Y. S. G. (2024). Innovative strategies for enhancing administrative management capability in universities: A case study approach. *International Journal of Science and Engineering Applications*, 13(8), 73–77.
- Bush, T., & Glover, D. (2020). Educational leadership and management: Theory, policy, and practice in higher education. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 23(1), 1–19.
- Carroll, M. B., Garrison, K., Wakeling, S., Oddone, K., & Reynolds, S. (2025). Documenting a profession: An exploration of the published history of school libraries and teacher librarians in Australia. *History of Education Review*, 54(1–2), 17–37. <https://doi.org/10.1108/HER-05-2024-0022>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Day, C., & Sammons, P. (2020). *Successful school leadership*. Education Development Trust.
- Field, A. (2018). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Fullan, M. (2021). *The right drivers for whole system success* (2nd ed.). Centre for Strategic Education.
- Garcia, J. M., & Ching, D. A. (2024). The effect of ethical leadership at work on school head transparency and trust in governance in public elementary schools. *TWIST*, 19(3), 427–435.
- Ghosh, V., & Kabra, G. (2025). “I exist because I adapt”: Evolving technology HR themes and roles with STARA competencies for performance. *Sustainable Futures*, 10, 100926. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sfr.2025.100926>
- Hallinger, P., & Wang, W.-C. (2020). Science mapping the knowledge base on educational leadership and management from emerging regions of Asia, Africa, and Latin America (1965–2018). *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 48(2), 209–230. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143218822772>
- Huang, J., Yamada, H., & Zhou, Z. (2024). An analysis of the governance of the Japanese teacher license renewal system. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 128, 102468. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2024.102468>
- Kearney, G. P., Gormley, G. J., Johnston, J. L., Hart, N. D., & Corman, M. K. (2024). “We lie about what we do”: Unstandardizing standardized ways of knowing in health professions education. *SSM - Qualitative Research in Health*, 5, 100368. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssmqr.2023.100368>
- Li, Y., Sadiq, G., Qambar, G., & Zheng, P. (2025). The impact of students' use of ChatGPT on research skills: The mediating effects of motivation and engagement. *Education and Information Technologies*, 30(4), 4185–4216. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-12981-9>
- Leithwood, K., & Sun, J. (2020). How school leadership influences student learning: A test of the four paths model. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 56(4), 570–599. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X19878772>
- Mabalay, N. S. (2019). The interaction between school organizational climate and decision-making practices of administrators. *International Journal of Management and Commerce Innovations*, 7(1), 1–10.
- Malik, A., Khan, M. L., Hussain, K., Qadir, J., & Tarhini, A. (2025). AI in higher education: Academicians' perspectives on teaching, research, and ethics. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 33(3), 2390–2406. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2024.2409407>
- Mandaguio, L. D. (2025). Decision-making processes in school management: The role of community involvement and school climate. *EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 12(10).
-

-
- Men, L. R., Neill, M. S., & Yue, C. A. (2020). Examining the effects of symmetrical internal communication and employee engagement on organizational change outcomes. *Public Relations Journal*, 13(4).
- Meriç, E., & Öz, H. (2025). School transparency as a predictor of organizational trust. *BMC Psychology*, 13, Article 1383. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-025-03776-9>
- Mekheimer, M. (2025). Challenges in the preparation of EFL students in faculties of education in Egypt. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 11, 101517. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2025.101517>
- Mooney, P. H. (2022). Local governance of a field in transition: The food policy council movement. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 89, 98–109. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2021.11.013>
- Moore, W., Palerino, A., & Pawloski, K. (2024). Integrating innovation and competency-based education in the development of a direct-entry master of science in nursing program. *Journal of Professional Nursing*, 53, 65–70. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.profnurs.2024.05.004>
- Nguyen, D., See, B. H., Brown, C., & Kokotsaki, D. (2024). Leadership for teacher retention: Exploring the evidence base on supporting teacher autonomy, development, and voice. *Oxford Review of Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2024.2432635>
- Netshakhuma, N. S. (2025). The changing face of the archive profession in South Africa. *Collection and Curation*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CC-12-2024-0059>
- Oroye-Okpoudhu, R. Z., & Efayena, T. (2026). Principals' transformational leadership, decision-making practices, and organizational climate as predictors of school effectiveness. *International Journal of Academic Management Science Research*, 10(3), 27–34.
- Pann, K. J., Buchner, V.-K., Eßl-Maurer, R., Bacher, T., Glarcher, M., & Ewers, A. (2025). International competencies of nurses with advanced practice in anesthesia nursing: An integrative review. *International Journal of Nursing Studies Advances*, 8, 100319. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnsa.2025.100319>
- Rahim, M. A. (2023). *Managing conflict in organizations* (5th ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003285861>
- Roper, L. (2025). Accreditation and practices for ensuring quality education. In *Encyclopedia of libraries, librarianship, and information science* (pp. 402–411). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-323-95689-5.00121-8>
- Taber, K. S. (2018). The use of Cronbach's alpha when developing and reporting research instruments in science education. *Research in Science Education*, 48(6), 1273–1296. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-016-9602-2>
- Tabiolo, C. D. L. (2018). University management system: Organizational commitment and performance influences. *International Review of Social Sciences*, 6(8), 439–445.
- Tahan, H. M., Warren, J. I., Godfrey, N., & Stephenson Zipp, J. (2025). New graduate nurse competencies—Part II: Perceptions of faculty and practice leaders. *Nursing Outlook*, 73(4), 102475. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.outlook.2025.102475>
- Weishaupt, T. (2025). Workforce development in low-carbon energy transitions: The case of horizontal governance in Schleswig-Holstein. *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*, 57, 101040. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eist.2025.101040>
- Zeeman, J. M., Vyas, D., & Ragucci, K. R. (2024). Best practices for interprofessional education. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 88(12), 101321. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajpe.2024.101321>
- Zhong, J., & Wang, D. (2025). Upward responsibility and accountability in teachers' workload. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 156, 104938. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2025.104938>
- Zhou, N., Yang, L., Pan, J., & Lv, K. (2024). Competency-based nursing teaching in blended learning environments. *Nurse Education in Practice*, 79, 104027. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nepr.2024.104027>
-

Author Biography

Dr. Jergen Jel C. Labaria is an Associate Professor V at Western Philippines University, Palawan, Philippines, under the College of Education, where she has served for 18 years and currently handles general education, professional, and graduate courses. She also serves as a campus administrator for the university's external campuses. She specializes in teaching, research, and academic leadership, with active involvement in curriculum development and teacher education. She has participated in various local and international trainings and speaking engagements in the field of education. Dr. Labaria has authored and co-authored research publications in international peer-reviewed and Scopus-indexed journals and has published academic books. Her research interests include educational leadership, decision-making practices, organizational climate, and participatory governance. She is a recipient of several awards and is an active member of local and international professional organizations.