



BEYOND TRIFOCAIZATION: REFRAMING PHILIPPINE EDUCATION GOVERNANCE THROUGH COORDINATION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Al Justine L. Lesmis¹, Atty. Glene A. Nalla²

¹Author, ²Co-Author

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra30699>

DOI No: 10.36713/epra30699

ABSTRACT

This position paper examines the implications of trifocalized education governance in the Philippines, particularly the divided authority among the Department of Education, the Commission on Higher Education, and the Technical Education and Skills Development Authority. Although trifocalization was designed to promote specialization, administrative focus, and efficiency across basic, higher, and technical-vocational education, current evidence suggests that fragmented planning, weak inter-agency coordination, unclear accountability, and disconnected learner pathways continue to challenge the constitutional mandate for a complete, adequate, and integrated education system. Using a policy analysis approach supported by legal review, empirical evidence, and education governance literature, this paper argues that trifocalization should be reformed rather than abolished. It maintains that the core issue is not specialization itself, but specialization without strong mechanisms for coordination, shared accountability, unified data systems, and system coherence. The paper further contends that reform is more legally defensible and administratively feasible than abolition, particularly amid learning poverty, low student proficiency, teacher education concerns, and persistent skills mismatch. It recommends strengthening inter-agency coordination, aligning accountability indicators, integrating education data systems, and improving linkages among teacher preparation, basic education, technical-vocational pathways, higher education, and workforce development.

KEYWORDS: Trifocalization, Education Governance, Policy Reform, DepEd, CHED, TESDA, Philippine Education

I. INTRODUCTION: The Policy Problem and Position

The Philippine education system is constitutionally mandated to provide quality education and to establish, maintain, and support a complete, adequate, and integrated system of education relevant to the needs of the people and society. However, the current governance structure of Philippine education remains divided among three major agencies: the Department of Education (DepEd), which governs basic education; the Commission on Higher Education (CHED), which supervises higher education; and the Technical Education and Skills Development Authority (TESDA), which manages technical-vocational education and training. This arrangement, commonly referred to as trifocalization, was introduced to promote specialization, efficiency, and focused governance across different levels and types of education.

In principle, trifocalization appears reasonable. It allows DepEd to focus on basic education, CHED on higher education, and TESDA on technical-vocational education and training. However, in practice, this separation has created persistent concerns in coordination, accountability, and system coherence. Learners experience education as one continuous journey, but it is governed by agencies that often operate through separate plans, standards, data systems, budgets, and accountability mechanisms. This creates a serious policy problem: the learner follows one education pathway, but the State governs it through fragmented institutions.

This paper argues that the trifocalized governance of Philippine education should be reformed rather than abolished. The separation of DepEd, CHED, and TESDA has contributed to disconnected planning, unclear accountability for learning

outcomes, weak alignment between schooling and work, and limited coherence between teacher preparation and basic education needs. The problem is not specialization itself. Rather, the deeper problem is specialization without strong coordination. If the Constitution requires an integrated system of education, then the current governance arrangement must be strengthened so that DepEd, CHED, and TESDA function not as separate bureaucratic silos but as interdependent parts of one coherent national education system.

The position of this paper is therefore clear: the Philippines should preserve the advantages of trifocalization while correcting its weaknesses through stronger inter-agency coordination, shared accountability indicators, unified education data systems, and legally grounded mechanisms for policy coherence. Abolishing trifocalization may create legal, administrative, and political disruption. Maintaining the status quo, however, is no longer defensible in light of learning poverty, low student proficiency, teacher education concerns, curriculum misalignment, and persistent skills mismatch. Reform, not abolition, is the most reasonable, feasible, and constitutionally defensible position.

II. LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK

The strongest legal basis for reforming trifocalized education governance is Article XIV of the 1987 Philippine Constitution. Section 1 provides that the State shall protect and promote the right of all citizens to quality education at all levels and shall take appropriate steps to make such education



accessible to all. Section 2 further provides that the State shall establish, maintain, and support a complete, adequate, and integrated system of education relevant to the needs of the people and society (1987 Philippine Constitution, art. XIV, secs. 1-2). These provisions establish the normative standard by which education governance must be evaluated.

The word integrated is crucial. It implies that education governance must not function as disconnected segments. Basic education, higher education, technical-vocational education, teacher preparation, curriculum development, assessment, local implementation, and workforce development should contribute to a common national educational purpose. Specialized agencies may exist, but their specialization must not defeat integration. If the governance structure leads to fragmentation, the constitutional promise of an integrated system is weakened.

Republic Act No. 7722, or the Higher Education Act of 1994, created CHED and assigned it responsibility for higher education policy, quality assurance, and institutional development. Republic Act No. 7796, or the TESDA Act of 1994, created TESDA to provide relevant, accessible, high-quality, and efficient technical education and skills development responsive to national development goals. Republic Act No. 9155, or the Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001, later established the governance framework for basic education and emphasized authority, responsibility, and accountability in DepEd. Together, these laws institutionalized specialization in Philippine education governance.

However, these statutes must be read in relation to the Constitution, not in isolation from it. The separate mandates of DepEd, CHED, and TESDA do not exempt the State from its duty to provide integrated education. Rather, they create the need for mechanisms that allow specialized agencies to operate coherently. A system composed of specialized agencies can still be integrated if its agencies share outcomes, coordinate policies, use aligned data, and accept joint accountability for the learner's complete educational pathway.

Republic Act No. 11899, or the Second Congressional Commission on Education Act, further supports the need for system-level reform. The law established EDCOM II to review, assess, and evaluate the state of Philippine education, and to recommend innovative and targeted policy reforms. The subsequent extension of EDCOM II through Republic Act No. 12315 in 2026 also indicates that the work of education reform remains ongoing and urgent. The National Education and Workforce Development Plan 2026-2035, prepared under the EDCOM II mandate, explicitly aims to establish an integrated, responsive, and data-driven education system by 2035 (EDCOM II, 2026a).

Republic Act No. 12028, or the Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning Program Act, also illustrates the need for system-wide coherence. Although the ARAL Program is primarily focused on learning recovery among basic education learners, its success depends on teacher preparation, learning resources, assessment systems, local implementation, and policy continuity. These factors extend beyond DepEd alone and require coordination with CHED, local government units, and other education stakeholders.

Republic Act No. 7160, or the Local Government Code of 1991, is likewise relevant because local government units support education through local school boards, local education

planning, and the Special Education Fund. Education governance is therefore not only horizontally divided among DepEd, CHED, and TESDA. It is also vertically connected to local government structures. Any serious reform of trifocalization must address both inter-agency coordination at the national level and coherent implementation at the local level.

Finally, the doctrine of administrative due process in *Ang Tibay v. Court of Industrial Relations* provides a useful governance principle. While not an education case, *Ang Tibay* emphasizes fairness, evidence, reasoned decision-making, and proper administrative procedure in government action. Applied to education governance, reform should not be impulsive or merely political. It must be evidence-based, legally grounded, transparent, and procedurally fair. This strengthens the position that the appropriate response to the weaknesses of trifocalization is not abrupt abolition, but carefully designed institutional reform.

III. EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE: THE GAP BETWEEN LAW AND REALITY

The need to reform trifocalized education governance becomes clearer when viewed against recent empirical evidence and education governance literature. The crisis in Philippine education is not merely a problem of classroom instruction, poverty, or resource limitation. It is also a governance problem. When learning outcomes remain weak across basic education, higher education, and technical-vocational pathways, the issue points to a system that is insufficiently coordinated, poorly aligned, and weakly accountable.

One of the strongest empirical bases for this position is the recent study of Orbeta et al. (2024) on the impact of trifocalization on Philippine education outcomes. The study found that trifocalization had no statistically significant impact on education outcomes at conventional confidence levels. This finding is important because it challenges the assumption that dividing governance among DepEd, CHED, and TESDA automatically produces better educational outcomes. The study further points to the coordination issue as a central concern in the trifocalized system. This supports the central argument of this paper: the problem is not necessarily the existence of three separate agencies, but the absence of strong integrative conditions that compel them to work toward shared outcomes.

The National Education and Workforce Development Plan 2026–2035, introduced by the Second Congressional Commission on Education, also affirms the need for stronger system integration. The NatPlan seeks to transform the Philippine education system into an integrated, responsive, and data-driven system by 2035 (EDCOM II, 2026a). This policy direction is significant because it recognizes that the country's education crisis cannot be addressed through isolated reforms. Similarly, EDCOM II's Turning Point report frames the next decade of education reform around coordinated action across DepEd, CHED, and TESDA (EDCOM II, 2026b). The implication is clear: fragmented policies must be replaced by coherent and sequenced reforms.

The urgency of reform is further supported by learning poverty data. The World Bank (2026) reported that 91% of Filipino 10-year-olds cannot read and understand an age-



appropriate text. This figure reveals a severe crisis in foundational learning. Literacy is the gateway to all other forms of learning. When children fail to acquire reading proficiency at the appropriate age, they are placed at a disadvantage in mathematics, science, social studies, higher education, technical-vocational training, and future employment. Thus, learning poverty should not be interpreted solely as a basic education issue. It is a whole-system concern because its consequences travel across the learner's entire educational and employment pathway.

International assessment results provide additional evidence of the depth of the crisis. In the Program for International Student Assessment 2022, only 16% of Filipino students reached at least Level 2 proficiency in mathematics, far below the OECD average of 69% (OECD, 2023). This suggests that many Filipino learners struggle not only with content knowledge but also with applying that knowledge to practical, real-life situations. Such results raise serious concerns about curriculum coherence, teacher preparation, assessment systems, learning support, and governance accountability.

Teacher education research also supports the need for stronger coordination between DepEd and CHED. Sinsay-Villanueva et al. (2025) found that teacher education and development in the Philippines face serious challenges, including underperforming teacher education institutions, inadequate professional development systems, and unclear career progression pathways. This is directly relevant to trifocalized governance because teacher quality is not produced solely by DepEd. DepEd employs and supervises teachers in basic education, but teacher preparation begins in CHED-regulated higher education institutions. Therefore, any effort to improve learning outcomes must connect basic education reform with teacher education reform.

Similarly, Olvido et al. (2024) examined the quality of graduates of Philippine teacher education institutions through licensure examination performance and the teaching performance of beginning teachers. Their study highlights the importance of teacher education quality, curriculum delivery, and institutional preparation in shaping the competence of beginning teachers. This strengthens the argument that CHED's regulation of teacher education institutions and DepEd's expectations for classroom teaching must be more closely aligned. Without such alignment, teacher preparation may remain disconnected from actual classroom demands.

The problem of weak alignment also extends to technical-vocational education and employment. Bayudan-Dacuycuy et al. (2024) emphasized that skills mismatch remains a persistent concern in the Philippine labor market and that a well-functioning labor market information system is necessary to anticipate and prioritize skills requirements. This is highly relevant to TESDA, DepEd, and CHED, as skills development does not begin at the point of technical training. It is built gradually through foundational literacy, numeracy, higher-order thinking, communication, work ethic, and occupational preparation. A fragmented education system cannot adequately respond to changing labor market needs.

The need for reform is further supported by international education governance literature. Burns and Köster (2016) emphasized that education systems are complex and require coordinated action among a broad range of actors. In such

systems, governance is not simply about issuing policies from the top; it is about aligning actors, knowledge, resources, and time horizons toward common goals. This insight is directly applicable to the Philippines because trifocalization created specialized agencies, but specialization alone cannot guarantee coherence.

Accountability literature also strengthens the case for reform. Fahey (2019) argued that accountability is an essential component of strategic governance in complex education systems, but it must be designed carefully to support improvement rather than mere compliance. This is relevant because the Philippine education system does not only need more accountability reports; it needs accountability mechanisms that connect agency performance to learner outcomes. Similarly, UNESCO (2017) emphasized that accountability in education should be a means to improve inclusive, equitable, and quality education, not simply a mechanism for blaming individuals or institutions.

The public policy implementation literature also supports the view that legal mandates are insufficient without operational coherence. Hill and Hupe (2014) explained that implementation is shaped by governance arrangements, institutional interactions, and the operational realities of translating policy into practice. This perspective is important because Philippine education already has laws that define the mandates of DepEd, CHED, and TESDA. The weakness lies in how these mandates are implemented together. Bardach and Patashnik (2020) likewise emphasized that policy analysis must clearly define the problem, evaluate options, and recommend feasible solutions. Applying this logic, the best policy response is not simply to abolish trifocalization but to redesign its coordination and accountability mechanisms.

Thus, these studies and governance frameworks show that the Philippine education crisis is systemic. Learning poverty begins in the early grades; proficiency remains low in international assessments; teacher preparation remains uneven; and skills mismatch persists in the labor market. These are not isolated problems. They are interconnected outcomes of a system that lacks sufficient coherence. Therefore, reforming trifocalized governance is not merely a matter of administrative restructuring. It is a necessary response to empirical evidence and governance literature showing that fragmented systems weaken the State's capacity to deliver quality, integrated, and relevant education.

IV. THE POSITION AND CORE ARGUMENTS

This paper argues that trifocalized education governance should be reformed, not abolished. Four arguments support this position.

First, trifocalization has weakened system-wide coordination. DepEd, CHED, and TESDA operate under separate mandates, plans, budgets, reporting systems, and accountability structures. While this allows each agency to specialize, it also encourages institutional silos. Basic education reforms may not fully align with teacher education preparation. Higher education policies may not adequately address foundational learning gaps. TESDA programs may not always connect smoothly with senior high school pathways, college credentials, or labor market needs. Without a strong



coordinating mechanism, each agency may perform its assigned mandate while the system as a whole remains incoherent.

Second, trifocalization has fragmented accountability. When learning outcomes are poor, responsibility becomes dispersed. DepEd may be blamed for low literacy and numeracy, but CHED-regulated teacher education institutions contribute to the quality of teachers entering the basic education system. CHED may be blamed for weak graduates, but higher education institutions receive learners whose foundational competencies were developed earlier. TESDA may be blamed for skills mismatch, but technical readiness depends on literacy, numeracy, soft skills, career guidance, and work habits developed before technical training. In this arrangement, every agency is responsible for a part of the system, but no actor is clearly accountable for the learner's complete journey.

Third, trifocalization contributes to weak alignment between education and workforce development. Education should prepare learners for further learning, employment, entrepreneurship, citizenship, and meaningful participation in society. However, when basic, higher, and technical-vocational education are planned separately, learners may experience disconnected pathways. Senior high school tracks, college-readiness standards, teacher education curricula, technical-vocational qualifications, industry needs, and local labor-market priorities must be coordinated. Without alignment, the country risks producing graduates with credentials but without the competencies required for life and work.

Fourth, reform is more practical and legally defensible than abolition. Abolishing trifocalization and merging DepEd, CHED, and TESDA into a single department may solve fragmentation, but it may also create a very large bureaucracy that is difficult to manage. It may disrupt existing mandates, require complex legislation, produce transition costs, and generate political and administrative resistance. The better approach is to preserve the advantages of specialization while correcting the weaknesses of fragmentation. The Philippines does not need to destroy trifocalization. It needs to integrate the trifocalization function.

V. COUNTERARGUMENTS AND REBUTTAL

One counterargument is that trifocalization should be maintained because it allows each agency to specialize. This argument has merit. Education is broad and complex, and it may be unrealistic for a single agency to manage basic, higher, and technical-vocational education with equal depth. However, specialization does not justify fragmentation. The issue is not that DepEd, CHED, and TESDA have different functions. The issue is that these functions are not sufficiently coordinated toward common learner outcomes. A specialized system can still be integrated if it shares targets, uses a unified data set, engages in joint planning, and accepts shared accountability.

A second counterargument is that stronger coordinating mechanisms may only add another layer of bureaucracy. This concern is understandable because education agencies already face heavy administrative demands. However, the answer is not to avoid coordination. The answer is to properly design coordination. A coordinating mechanism should not exist merely to produce meetings, reports, or compliance documents. It should have legal authority, clear responsibilities, measurable indicators, and public accountability. Its purpose should be to

reduce duplication, clarify roles, harmonize policies, and improve implementation.

A third counterargument is that educational problems are more closely linked to poverty, underfunding, classroom shortages, teacher workload, and resource gaps than to governance structure. This is partly true. Poverty and resource constraints deeply affect learning outcomes. However, governance determines how resources are allocated, how reforms are implemented, how priorities are selected, and how evidence is used. Even with increased funding, efforts may still fail if agencies plan separately, measure success differently, and implement reforms without alignment. Governance reform does not deny the importance of resources. It ensures that resources are used coherently and accountably.

A fourth counterargument is that existing laws already define the mandates of DepEd, CHED, and TESDA, making further reform unnecessary. This position misunderstands the issue. The problem is not the absence of mandates. The problem is the weakness of integration across those mandates. The Constitution requires a complete, adequate, and integrated education system. Therefore, separate agency mandates must be implemented in a way that promotes coherence rather than institutional isolation.

VI. EVALUATION OF POLICY OPTIONS

Three policy options are available. The first is to maintain the current trifocalized structure without major reform. This option is administratively convenient because it avoids disruption. However, it does not address weak coordination, fragmented accountability, disconnected learner pathways, or uneven alignment between education and workforce development. Given the persistence of learning poverty, low proficiency, and skills mismatch, maintaining the status quo is the least defensible option.

The second option is to abolish trifocalization and merge DepEd, CHED, and TESDA into a single education department. This option may create the appearance of unity, but it carries serious risks. A single mega-department may become too large and difficult to manage. It may also disrupt ongoing programs, require major legislative restructuring, and create transition problems. Institutional merger does not automatically produce coherence. Without careful design, a merged bureaucracy may reproduce fragmentation within a single larger structure.

The third option is to reform trifocalization through stronger coordination, shared accountability, and system coherence. This is the most balanced and defensible option. It preserves the advantages of specialization while correcting the weaknesses of fragmentation. Under this option, DepEd, CHED, and TESDA remain distinct agencies. Still, they operate within a stronger national education governance framework that requires common outcomes, integrated data, coordinated planning, and joint accountability. This paper supports the third option because it is legally grounded, administratively feasible, and responsive to empirical evidence.

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS

First, Congress should institutionalize a permanent education governance coordinating mechanism with clear authority over cross-agency planning, monitoring, and accountability. This body should include DepEd, CHED, TESDA, relevant local government representatives, industry



partners, and education experts. It should not be merely symbolic or consultative. It must have the authority to harmonize national education priorities, monitor system-wide outcomes, and require coordinated action.

Second, DepEd, CHED, and TESDA should adopt shared accountability indicators. These indicators should include foundational literacy and numeracy, teacher preparation quality, learner transition rates, senior high school readiness, higher education completion, technical-vocational certification, graduate employability, and equity outcomes. A shared accountability framework will prevent agencies from treating learner outcomes as isolated responsibilities.

Third, the government should establish a unified education data system that tracks learner progression across basic education, higher education, technical-vocational training, and employment pathways while observing data privacy and ethical safeguards. Without integrated data, policy decisions remain fragmented and reactive. A unified data system would help identify where learners are falling behind, which interventions are effective, and which sectors require urgent support.

Fourth, CHED and DepEd should strengthen the alignment between teacher education curricula and basic education needs. Teacher education institutions must prepare future teachers in line with actual classroom realities, foundational learning demands, inclusive education requirements, assessment reforms, and digital learning competencies. Teacher quality cannot be solved by DepEd alone, as teacher preparation begins in higher education.

Fifth, TESDA, DepEd, CHED, and industry partners should improve alignment among senior high school tracks, technical-vocational pathways, higher education programs, and labor market needs. Learners should be able to move across pathways without being disadvantaged by disconnected standards, duplicated requirements, or unclear credentialing systems. Education governance must support lifelong learning, employability, entrepreneurship, and social mobility.

Sixth, local government units should be integrated into governance reform through clearer roles in local education planning, stronger participation by local school boards, and a more strategic use of the Special Education Fund. Since education delivery is experienced locally, national reform will remain incomplete without local coordination.

Finally, all governance reforms must be anchored in the constitutional mandate of quality and integrated education. Reform should not be treated as a matter of administrative preference alone. It is a legal, moral, and developmental obligation arising from the State's duty to ensure that every Filipino learner receives education that is coherent, meaningful, and responsive to life, work, citizenship, and national development.

VIII. LIMITATIONS OF THE PAPER

This paper is limited by its reliance on secondary data, legal materials, policy documents, and published literature. It does not present primary empirical findings from interviews, surveys, or institutional case studies. Its purpose is not to measure the direct causal impact of a specific reform model, but to develop a defensible policy position based on available evidence and governance theory.

Future research may strengthen this argument by conducting comparative case studies of inter-agency education coordination, analyzing regional implementation differences, examining learner transition data across DepEd, CHED, and TESDA, and assessing the effectiveness of existing coordination bodies. Further empirical work may also explore how local government units, industry partners, teacher education institutions, and schools experience the effects of trifocalized governance in practice.

IX. CONCLUSION

The problem with Philippine education governance is not simply that DepEd, CHED, and TESDA exist as separate agencies. The deeper problem is that their separation has not been matched by strong coordination, shared accountability, and system coherence. Trifocalization was designed to promote specialization, but specialization becomes counterproductive when it produces disconnected policies, fragmented responsibility, and weak learner pathways.

This paper has argued that trifocalized governance should be reformed rather than abolished. Reform is the most defensible position because it recognizes both the value and the limitations of the current system. It avoids disrupting institutional mergers while confronting the failure of the status quo. It also aligns with the constitutional requirement that the State maintain a complete, adequate, and integrated system of education.

Ultimately, the question is not whether DepEd, CHED, and TESDA should perform different functions. The real question is whether these functions contribute to one coherent national education purpose. If Filipino learners continue to experience learning poverty, weak transitions, uneven teacher quality, and poor alignment between schooling and work, then governance reform becomes urgent. The State cannot fulfill its constitutional duty through fragmented action. It must govern education as one connected system.

The future of Philippine education depends not only on more programs, policies, and agencies, but also on the courage to make these parts work together. Reforming trifocalization is therefore not a rejection of specialization. It is a demand for coherence, responsibility, and justice for learners whose futures depend on a system that finally acts as one.

REFERENCES

1. Bardach, E., & Patashnik, E. M. (2019). *A Practical Guide for Policy Analysis: The Eightfold Path to More Effective Problem Solving*. http://bbr.bibbvb.de:8991/F?func=service&doc_library=BVB01&local_base=BVB01&doc_number=009169330&sequence=000001&line_number=0001&func_code=DB_RECORDS&service_type=MEDIA
2. Bayudan-Dacuycuy, C., Epetia, Ma. C., Vargas, A. R., Ocbina, J. J., & Authority, T. E. and S. D. (2024). *Inputs to the Philippine Labor Market Information System and TESDA's Skills Anticipation and Prioritization of Skills Requirements Framework*. In Econstor (Econstor). <https://doi.org/10.62986/dp2024.06>
3. Burns, T., Köster, F., & Fuster, M. (2016). *Education Governance in Action: Lessons from Case Studies*. In OECD Publishing eBooks. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED569129>



4. Development, O. for E. C. and. (2023). *PISA 2022 results: Country note – Philippines*. OECD Publishing.
5. Fahey, G., & Köster, F. (2019). *Means, ends and meaning in accountability for strategic education governance*. OECD Education Working Papers. <https://doi.org/10.1787/1d516b5c-en>
6. Il, E. (2026). *Turning Point: A decade of necessary reforms*. Second Congressional Commission on Education.
7. Olvido, M. M. J., Dayagbil, F. T., Alda, R., Uytico, B. J., & Rodriguez, K. F. R. (2024). *An exploration of the quality of graduates of Philippine teacher education institutions*. *Frontiers in Education*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1235261>
8. Paqueo, V., Sister, J. M. A., Sarne, S., Lavega, M. L. Y., Orbeta, A., Abrigo, M. R. M., Maddawin, R., & Education, E. 2-T. S. C. on. (2024). *The Impact of Trifocalization on Philippine Education Outcomes and the Coordination Issue*. In Econstor (Econstor). <https://doi.org/10.62986/dp2024.15>
9. Peter, H., & MJ, H. (2014). *Implementing Public Policy: An Introduction to the Study Of Operational Governance (third, revised, edition)*. In *Data Archiving and Networked Services (DANS)*. Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences. <https://pure.eur.nl/en/publications/8815673b-e682-4192-ab17-d4f805d35697>
10. 1987 Philippine Constitution, Article XIV, Sections 1–2, (1987).
11. Higher Education Act of 1994, (1994).
12. *Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning Program Act*, Republic Act No. 12028 (2024).
13. *Ang Tibay v. Court of Industrial Relations*, (1940).
14. *Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001*, (2001).
15. Sinsay-Villanueva, L. M., Garcia, G. D., Lim, V., Tanyag, I. H., Berroya, J., Orbeta, A., & Rivera, J. P. R. (2025). *Quality Education Starting with Teacher Education*. In Econstor (Econstor). <https://doi.org/10.62986/dp2025.04>
16. UNESCO. (2017). *Global Education Monitoring Report 2017/8: Accountability in education: Meeting our commitments*. In UNESCO eBooks. UNESCO. <https://doi.org/10.54676/cgcz9341>