School-based Management Practices Among Public Schools in Region I: Basis for Technical Assistance Plan

Ritchie G. Macalanda[1]

[1]Education Program Supervisor, Department of Education Region 1, City of San Fernando, Philippines

Corresponding Email: *ritchie.macalanda@deped.gov.ph

Abstract

This study focused on school-based management practices among public school in Region I, this school year 2021-2022. The respondents in this study are the school heads in both public elementary and secondary schools. Results showed that most of the school heads are at middle adulthood age, female, married, full-pledged principal, mostly Principal IV, had been serving for long years as principal, mostly doctorate degree holders, have adequate relevant trainings, financially stable and has outstanding performance. Most of the schools are in the rural area and medium in size. Schools have average MOOE allocation. In terms of performance indicators, the schools should look into the dropout rate and completion rate. The implementation of the SBM in terms of leadership and governance, curriculum and instruction, accountability and continuous improvement is recorded to be at maturing level (Level 2). On the other hand, management of resources is at level 3 advanced. There is a significant relationship between the SBM level of practice along leadership and governance, curriculum and learning, accountability and continuous improvement, and management of resources and the profile variables of the school principals. Indicators on SBM in the four areas showed insignificant relationship.

Keywords: School-based Management, Region 1, Philippines, Public Schools, Field Technical Assistance

INTRODUCTION

School-based management (SBM) is concluded as a strategy widely used by policymakers to decentralize the decision-making power in schools. Globally, it is adapted as a catalyst for reform and improvement in school operation. This is associated to various names such as local management of schools, site-based management, self- managing schools, school-site autonomy, school-based budgeting, shared-decision making, restructuring, decentralized management, and project-based school management. Similarly, all are anchored to decentralization of authority and empowerment of schools in decision-making.

According to Caldwell (2019), SBM in a system of public education is the systematic and consistent decentralization of the school level of authority and responsibility to make decisions on significant matters related to school operations within a centrally determined framework of goals, policies, curriculum, standards, and accountabilities. The essence of SBM is school level autonomy and participatory decision-making. This is supported by David (2018) when he claimed that SBM replaces bureaucratic regulations with professional responsibility and delegation of authority from district to school as its strong support. Furthermore, the rationale of SBM rests on two established propositions. First, the school is

GMPI International Conference on Teacher Education and Graduate Studies for the SDGs 2024
GMPI Conference Series, Vol.4, No.1, 2025, pp. 15-41
e-ISSN 2829-0747. DOI. 10.52889/gmpics.v4.597

the primary decision-making unit and its corollary decisions rest down to the lowest level; and second, changes require ownership that comes from the opportunity of participation.

With the enactment of Republic Act 9155 otherwise known as "Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001", decentralization has been observed from the central office to individual school. It is established through the policy of the State to protect and promote the right of all citizens to quality basic education and to make such education accessible to all by providing all Filipino children a free and compulsory education in the elementary level and free education in the high school level. Such education shall also include alternative learning systems for out-of-school youth and adult learners. It shall be the goal of basic education to provide them with the skills, knowledge, and values they need to become caring, self- reliant, productive, and patriotic citizens. The authority, responsibility, and accountability (AURA) are given in the schools.

Additionally, decentralization has been practiced in improving the learning outcomes and the school in general via partnership and linkages among stakeholders. Hence, decentralization is the promotion of school-based management, transfer of authority, and decision-making powers from the central, regional, and division office to the school level. It means that the decision-making process starts from the higher authorities to public school heads, teachers, students, local government units, and the community to achieve accessible, quality, relevant, and liberating education.

Likewise, DepEd Order No. 83, s. 2012 serves as the primary legal basis in implementing SBM among public institutions in the basic education. It strengthens the SBM practice and re-emphasizes the centrality of the learners and the involvement of community. This is a response to achieve the vision, mission, goals, and objectives of the Department of Education (DepEd) specifically in partnership and linkages to give the best education even among the depressed and underserved areas. It recognizes the role of the Local Government Units (LGUs) and other stakeholders as partners in the delivery of basic education.

This is also strengthened through the issuance of Regional Memorandum No. 77, s. 2022 on policy guidelines on the enhanced School-Based Management assessment process, validation, and tool with contextualized means of verification (MOVs). The tool aims to a.) ensure improvement of SBM level of practice in schools; b.) harmonize and unify understanding of all concerned regarding the conduct of effective and efficient SBM assessment and validation in the new normal; c.) facilitate the provision of technical assistance to improve the level of SBM Practice for better performance of schools in the region; d.) identify outstanding accomplishments and best practices of the SBM implementers

in achieving the ACCESS principles and its mandate in improving learning outcomes; e.) determine the schools with Level III SBM practices for the promotion of shared governance, continuous improvement and sustain good performance; and f.) recognize and reward best practices of SBM implementers that support and strengthen the School-Based Management

Based on the issued policy guidelines, the following are the salient points that prompted the Regional Office to enhance the Policy on Regional Order No. 02, s. 2019 on Re: Policy Guidelines of School-Based Management (SBM) Assessment Tool with Contextualized Means of Verification (MOVs). These are: (1) inclusion of SBM Norms and Criteria for the Identification of the 60% learning outcomes as reflected in terms of KPIs and the final scoring matrix. (2) focus on SBM practices of schools rather than merely compliance to MOVs (3) alignment of SBM Assessment in the New Normal Situation. Similarly, as reflected in the data obtained by the DepEdRO1-FTAD on the 2019 SBM consolidated report, among the 14 Schools Division Offices (SDOs), there were only 9.43 % potential SBM Level III schools validated by the SDOs while 43.02 % were categorized as Level I /Developing and 47.31 % as Level II/ Maturing.

Meanwhile, the Field Technical Assistance Division (FTAD) of DepEd Region 1 is mandated to lead the validation of SBM practices in the 14 divisions. Hence, it leads and integrates the provision of Technical Assistance to SDOs, facilitating the delivery of quality basic education, and creating an enabling environment for schools and learning centers in areas of Technical Assistance, Knowledge Management, and Team Management. This is possible through the help of other functional divisions via Regional Field Technical Assistance Team (RFTAT) and Division Field Technical Assistance Team (DFTAT). SBM coordinators in every division serve as frontliners in the implementation of SBM in the division level.

Hence, proper monitoring and evaluation of SBM practices of schools will lead to higher commitment of school heads, teachers, parents, learners, community leaders, and other stakeholders to work for the common good. Public schools in the elementary and secondary are encouraged to actively engage in the activities that would lead to shared-governance and community involvement. Later, this will have positive effects to the learners as the heart of the educational system.

It is in this context that the study is conceptualized. The researcher would like to conduct this study on school-based management practices of public schools in Region I as basis for technical assistance plan.

School-Based Management as an approach or strategy being utilized to improve the quality of education around the globe as response to the decentralization trend since the 1970's. It has been adopted by other countries before it was introduced in the Philippines.

The passage of Republic Act 9155 in 2001 provides the DepEd a mandate to reorganize governance in basic education. The duties and functions of every unit in the agency are clearly stipulated with the end goal of a decentralized organizational structure. Decentralization was then articulated by its declared policy that "The state shall encourage local initiatives for improving the quality of education. The state shall ensure that the values, needs, and aspirations of a school community are reflected in the program of education for the children, out of school youth and adult learners.

This is in support to the mission statement of DECS (former name of DepEd) as stated in its Medium-Term Development Plan for basic education in 1999-2004) to decentralize educational management so that the school will become the focus for enhancing initiative, innovation, and effectiveness. The efforts of educational quality improvement shall originate from the school and redound to its own benefits and that of the community." The decentralization process which initiated decision-making to the school level is now known as School-Based Management.

The issuance of Department Order No. 45, Series of 2015 followed by then Secretary Bro, Armin A. Luistro which emphasizes on SBM as a DepEd thrust that decentralizes the decision-making from the central office and field offices to individual schools to enable them to better respond to their specific education needs. Prior to this, DepEd Order No. 55, s. 2011 which was issued to provide the guidelines in granting SBM to schools which first and foremost have to be used to improve learning outcomes by way of support activities leading to the formulation of a three-year School Improvement Plan (SIP) that has been agreed upon by school authorities, the community, and the DepEd Division Office and is to be implemented and translated into Annual Implementation Plan (AIP).

Aside from the above reviewed literatures, foreign and local studies are reviewed to gain underlying concepts and knowledge in connection with the objectives of this study. According to Isa, et. al. (2020), in their study entitled School-Based Management (SBM) Practices in Malaysia: A Systematic Literature Review, four specific questions were answered including the level of SBM implementation in their schools and problems faced in relation to SBM. Their findings revealed that Malaysia is at the moderate level of SBM implementation based on autonomy of principals, teachers, parents, and community. Issues experienced along its implementation are due to the inadequate understanding of SBM implementation as well as

minimal parental and community involvement. The researchers therefore proposed the need for a standard instrument to evaluate SBM and emphasized the support of higher officers focused on the empowerment of school leaders and teachers, the PTA involvement, leadership and empowerment of teachers that will increase their motivation and guidance in areas of pedagogy, professional development, accountability, and integrity.

Also, Carr-Hill, et.al (2018) had a study entitled "The Effectiveness of School-Based Decision Making in Improving Educational Outcomes: A Systematic Review. They found out that devolving decision-making on the school level has a positive effect on reducing dropouts and teacher attendance improvement. However, evidence suggests that school-based decision-making appears to be less effective if parents and community members have low levels of education and low status. The researchers arrived at reforms and interventions that will improve decision –making in schools involving parents and the community.

Likewise, the work of Sharma (2017) on the impact of school management trainings and head of school's attitude on students' learning outcomes tried to assess the effectiveness of School Management Trainings (SMT) programs on students' learning outcomes in terms of students' results and engagement with classroom and school activities. The findings revealed that school management trainings equip school heads with desired school management skills which enable them to manage schools effectively. Thus, its findings point out the overall improvement in students' learning outcomes.

Moreover, Mehdinezhad and Sarsahrzahi (2016) conducted study on leadership behavior and its relationship with principals' management experience which aimed at studying the leadership behaviors reported by principals and observed by teachers and its relationship with management experience of principals. Results of the study showed that teachers describe leadership behaviors of their principals relatively well. However, principals themselves evaluated their leadership behaviors as very well. Comparing therefore the results revealed that a leader's effectiveness is largely determined by the followers. Empowering school leaders is imperatively beneficial to the followers and the entire organization shall benefit from the examples of effective leadership and management of their leaders.

Kadi and Beytekin's (2017) work entitled, "The study on Metaphorical Perceptions of Teachers, Principals, and Staff on School Management" examined the metaphorical perceptions of teachers, principals, and staff on school management. Their study underscored those metaphors are excellent tools in expressing subconscious thoughts and perceptions about their organizations as well as in understanding the estimations of school management by its members. From their findings, it was concluded that the most produced metaphor is

GMPI International Conference on Teacher Education and Graduate Studies for the SDGs 2024
GMPI Conference Series, Vol.4, No.1, 2025, pp. 15-41
e-ISSN 2829-0747. DOI. 10.52889/gmpics.v4.597

family which means that majority of the respondents believe that an ideal school management must be like a family.

Furthermore, Lubrica, et al.'s (2017) study titled, "Hallmarks of School-Based Management: Their Impact to Quality Improvement Among Public Secondary Schools" was anchored on a premise that School-Based Management training improves the capability of school heads in their governance along: instructional supervision; leadership and administration; fiscal management; human resource development; monitoring and evaluation; and planning and development. Results showed that school principals differ in the extent of their application of knowledge and skills while implementing SBM approaches. This was conducted locally to find out that efforts failed in improving the areas of curriculum and instruction in the public secondary schools. And this implied the need to establish a substantial realization of their vision, missions, and goals embarking on quality improvement programs as mandated by their schools so that SBM be implemented successfully in all its domains enumerated above.

Another study reviewed which strengthens the conduct of the present work was written by Cabardo (2016) which evaluated the levels of participation of the school stakeholders to the different school-initiated activities and the implementation of School-Based Management in selected schools in the Division of Davao del Sur in SY 2014-2015. His study entitled, "Levels of Participation of the Stakeholders to the Different School-Initiated Activities and the Implementation of School-Based Management" focused on the 13 school heads, 56 teachers, and 50 stakeholders as respondents to the researcher-structured questionnaire through a descriptive-correlational survey method. The major finding revealed that the level of participation of stakeholders to school activities could significantly affect the level of SBM implementation. Stakeholders can be internal and external, and both are important aspects of the SBM. And since stakeholders' participation is one of the six dimensions of the SBM implementation, it must be effective in order to contribute to the overall school SBM performance.

Cabardo found out that stakeholders' participation in the areas is moderate and still needs to be levelled-up. He recommended that necessary moves be done to improve the level of participation of stakeholders to the different school-initiated activities; seminars and conferences should be conducted within the school level to disseminate information and the importance of SBM to stakeholders. This would give them better understanding on what SBM really is and may develop linkages for better collaboration among parents and learners as members of the larger group of stakeholders.

Another study entitled Impact of School-based Management Level of Practices Among Secondary School Implementing Units on the K To 12 Program Implementation in Leyte Division, Philippines was conducted by Tapayan, et.al. (2016) to assess the impact of SBM level of practices of the respondents from areas covered by the study. They utilized descriptive survey method involving 144 school heads as respondents. Their work revealed a moderate level of SBM practices in the six dimensions and found a significant relationship between the levels of SBM practices with their K to 12 implementations. With these findings, they recommended that school heads need to undergo more intensive trainings for them to be more responsive to the K to 12 programs.

The paper of Gutierrez (2014) which focused on determining the extent of implementation of School-Based Management practices of Public Elementary Schools in the Third Congressional District of Division I of Pangasinan was thoroughly studied. He measured the extent of SBM practices of his respondents in the six areas of the SBM implementation. He also determined the difference between the perceptions of the elementary school heads and teachers in the SBM implementation. Along this, he sought to find out the problems encountered by his respondents in the SBM implementation and arrived at an action plan to enhance their SBM practices. He found out that: the principals lacked the implementation on the SBM practices on school leadership, internal stakeholders and school improvement process, school-based resources, and school performance accountability; the perceptions of elementary school teachers and school heads in the SBM implementation are significantly different; teachers had high expectations on their school heads; the problems encountered were moderately serious and the seriousness of the problems was caused by the failures of the school heads in the implementation of the SBM practices along school leadership, internal and external stakeholders, school improvement process, school-based resources, and school performance accountability; and that the perceptions of teachers and elementary school heads on the problems encountered were significantly different.

Furthermore, Gutierrez' work is related to this study regarding its objective of finding out the extent of implementation of SBM along the six dimensions. The six dimensions make up the whole SBM practices. But there are the two main objectives of the SBM – Empower the school heads to lead their teachers and students through reforms which lead to higher learning outcomes, and bring resources, including funds, down to the control of schools to spur change in line with decentralization, school heads hold the biggest responsibility to function the roles in the SBM to achieve its ultimate goals. That makes up the goal of this

study that its subjects were the school principals with the highest and biggest role in the SBM implementation.

In the study of Torrevillas (2020), the stakeholders expressed that the implementation in their respective schools are very evident in all the dimensions of the school-Based Management in Leadership and Governance, Curriculum and Learning, Accountability and Continuous Improvement, and Resources Management. Thus, this study is primarily aimed to evaluate the implementation of the School Based Management (SBM) as correlates to the academic performance of selected public high schools. Results show that there is significant differences on the dimension of SBM particularly on the aspect of Leadership and Governance and the stakeholders such as the principal and community and the department heads and community. Likewise, there is significant differences between the stakeholder's principal and department head, principal and faculty, principal and alumni, principal and community, principal and parent, and community and parent and the SBM dimension on Curriculum and Learning.

Pepito and Acibar (2020) conducted a study on SBM among public elementary school heads. Using the descriptive method of research, the study revealed that all the districts were on the level of SBM. On the other hand, all the 44 elementary school heads obtained Very Satisfactory ratings based on their Performance Appraisal system, taking into account their occupational competence, professional and personal characteristics, punctuality and attendance. All these were rated Very Satisfactory, except for punctuality and attendance which were rated Outstanding. Based on the results of the study, the school heads as school leaders had to exert more efforts on the stakeholders' participation, school improvement process, and school performance accountability. They have to increase their occupational and professional competencies. To improve their management skills and performance, a technical Assistance Plan was developed.

Viggayan (2018) conducted a study on SBM among secondary school heads. The results showed that there is no significant difference in the assessment of school heads on the extent of practice of SBM in terms of school leadership, internal stakeholders' participation, external stakeholders' participation, school improvement process, school-based resources and school performance accountability when grouped according to position. There is no significant difference in the assessment of school heads on the extent of practice of SBM when they are grouped according to educational attainment. There is no significant difference on the extent of practice of the school heads in terms of school leadership internal stakeholders' participation, external stakeholders' participation, school improvement process,

GMPI International Conference on Teacher Education and Graduate Studies for the SDGs 2024
GMPI Conference Series, Vol.4, No.1, 2025, pp. 15-41
e-ISSN 2829-0747. DOI. 10.52889/gmpics.v4.597

and school-based resources of school-based management when grouped according to administrative experience. However, there is a significant difference on the extent of practice of the school heads on school performance accountability

Pepugal (2022) aimed to determine and evaluate the levels of perception on school-based management implementation in San Luis National High School, San Luis District-I, Division of Agusan del Sur, Philippines. Based on the findings, a moderate descriptive rating for each di-mension of school-based management (SBM) implementation is indicated by an overall mean rating of 3.37 and a standard deviation of 0.637. Wherein, all scored higher than the minimum standard: leadership and governance, 3.66 ± 0.729; curriculum and learning, 3.39 ± 0.542; accountability and continuous improvement, 2.98 ± 0.691; and management of resources, 3.43 ± 0.607. Based on how the data was processed, the Pearson correlation is equivalent to 0.541 with a r2 of 0.365. The positive correlation coefficient of determination (r), which is comparable to the significance threshold of $p< .05$. The perception of school-based management (SBM) implementation among teachers in this regard was determined to be moderate.

Barrera, Bilbao, and Opadia, (2022) focused on assessing the implementation level of School-Based Management (SBM) and formulating a structural equation model in the public secondary schools of the Zamboanga del Norte Division. The findings disclosed that the SBM implementation level, along with Leadership and Governance, Curriculum and Learning, Accountability and Continuous Improvement, and Resource Management, are fully implemented in the public secondary schools of Zamboanga del Norte Division. In addition, it was found out that an insignificant difference existed in the level of SBM implementation among the four secondary schools, and no significant correlation between the school's level of SBM implementation and the schools' performance.

Bustamante (2022) conducted a study to determine the school – Based Management (SBM) practices as the basis for analysis on the effectiveness of school performance. Based on the gathered data, the school – based management practices is effective. The research further reveals that there is a significant relationship between the school – Based Management and effectiveness of school performance.

Finally, Abucay's (2013) work entitled, "The Responsiveness of the School-Based Management Program Towards School Management" assessed the responsiveness the SBM toward school management. It focused on the profile of the teacher-respondents; the objectives of the program and to what extent these were realized; the six (6) dimensions catered to by the program and their effect to the attainment of the objectives; the features of

the program; the strategies for change; the program implements; and finally, the problems encountered in the implementation of the program and the extent to which these are felt.

Given the said literatures and studies, this study on school-based management practices of public schools in Region I as basis for technical assistance will be conducted. This study determined the personal and professional profile of the school principals in Region I, the level of school-based management practices, the significant relationship between the profile and the level of school-based management practices, the challenges encountered, in order to develop a technical assistance plan.

METHOD

The subjects of the study are the public elementary and secondary school heads in Region I. Stratified sampling was used in the 14 Schools Division Superintendents. The researcher adopted the enhanced school-based management (SBM) assessment process, validation, and tool with contextualized means of verification which was issued by the office of the regional director as per Regional Memorandum No. 077, s. 2022. This questionnaire served as the main instrument in gathering the information on the school-based management practices. This tool has undergone validation from the experts in the regional and division level through the Regional Field Technical Assistance Team (RFTAT) and the Division Field Technical Assistance Team (DFTAT). In addition, pilot-testing has been conducted among five potential SBM level III schools. The first part of the questionnaire provides information on the profile of school heads both personal and professional. After that, the profile of schools was identified. The second part of the questionnaire gives an information on the level of school-based management practices in terms of the principles a) leadership and governance, b) curriculum and instruction, c) accountability and continuous improvement, and d) management of resources. Moreover, the third part of the questionnaire focused on the challenges encountered by the respondents in the implementation of School-Based Management.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Profile of the School Principals in Region I

Age. Table 1 reveals the profile of the respondents in terms of age. As shown in the table, there were close to majority of 232 or 49.9 percent among the respondents who belongs to the age 51 to 60 years old. There are 159 or 34.2 percent of the school heads who are 41-50 years old. Meanwhile, 33 out of 411 or 7.2 percent were on the retirement age.

This implies that close to majority belongs to the middle adulthood age which means that they are experienced and professionally competent school heads. They are expected to

GMPI International Conference on Teacher Education and Graduate Studies for the SDGs 2024
GMPI Conference Series, Vol.4, No.1, 2025, pp. 15-41
e-ISSN 2829-0747. DOI. 10.52889/gmpics.v4.597

have adequate length of service to contribute to educating learners. Along with that, it also implies that close to majority of the respondents belongs to the ageing teachers' population.

Sex. The table shows that more than majority of the respondents are females having 268 or 57.6 percent while males constituted 42.4 percent of the respondents. Computed data implies that more than majority among the respondents in the study were female teachers and dominates the schools in the region.

Civil Status. Marital status has been believed to affect the performance of teachers in educating learners and in carrying out their responsibilities. Table 1 presents the result in terms of the respondents' marital status. It can be seen from table 1 that majority of the respondents are married having 375 or 80.6 percent while 63 or 13.5 percent among the respondents are single. The result implies that in terms of civil status, majority of the respondents are married. Being married is usually associated with more responsibilities that may affect teachers' performance in constructive or destructive ways.

Position. Table 2 reveals the data gathered in terms of the respondents' profile position. The table shows that there are 117 or 25.2 percent among the respondents who are appointed as Principal IV. There 92 or 19.8 percent of them who are either Principal I or Principal II. 54 or 11.6 percent are head teachers while 43 or 9.2 percent are OIC/TIC. The result implies that only 97 are not yet full-fledged school heads.

Number of Years as Principal. Data gathered in terms of the respondents' length of service in the Department of Education is presented in the Table 2. The table shows that in terms of the length of service as principal that the respondents have incurred in their career in the Department of Education, 106 or 22.8 percent has been serving as principal for 15 years and above; 147 or 31.6 percent among them has been in service for 6 – 10 years. Also, there were 142 or 30.5 percent among the respondents who are in service for 1 – 5 years. The result implies that the respondents have a qualifying profile in terms of length of service to manage schools. It then strengthens their professional eligibility and qualification to handle administrative positions. Thus, being involved in School Based Management will be a piece of cake for them being experienced in the field of teaching.

Highest Educational Attainment. It can be noted from the table that in terms of the highest educational attainment of the respondents, 177 or 38.1 percent out of 565 are holders of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) or Doctor of Education (EdD). In comparison, it can be gleaned from the table that 134 or 28.8 percent of the respondents' highest educational attainment has earned units in the doctorate degree. The data shows that most of the

respondents were able to attain their post graduate degrees of Doctorate Level. Hence, their qualification to hold an administrative position in the Department of Education is justifiable.

Relevant Trainings. The table depicts the data in terms of the number of training workshops in SBM that the respondents of the study have undertaken. It can be observed that majority among the respondents were able to attended division trainings as attested by 327 or 70.3 percent of them. In comparison, there are only 7 or 1.5 percent among the respondents who attended international trainings. The result implies that although majority of the respondents were able to attend enough training workshops that do not guarantee their competence in implementing SBM in their respective school of assignments.

Likewise, the work of Sharma (2017) stressed that school management trainings equip school heads with desired school management skills which enable them to manage schools effectively. Thus, its findings point out the overall improvement in students' learning outcomes. Lubrica, et al.'s (2017) further emphasized that school-Based Management training improves the capability of school heads in their governance along: instructional supervision; leadership and administration; fiscal management; human resource development; monitoring and evaluation; and planning and development.

Membership to Professional organizations. Almost half of the school heads are members of division professional organizations. At close is national organizations as attested by 219 or 47.1 percent of them. This can be attributed to the fact that many of them are members of National Association of Public Secondary Schools Inc.

Monthly Gross Income. The result of the investigation shows that school heads are financially stable. This can be attributed to the fact that 3321 or 69.0 percent of them have a monthly income of 50,000 pesos and above. There are 54 or 14 percent who earned 40,000 pesos and below while 53 or 11.4 percent who earned 45,000-50,000 monthly.

Performance. All of the school heads registered an outstanding performance in their Office Performance Commitment and Review Form (OPCRF). A closer analysis of their performance, posted an average of 4.63. With this, it can be viewed that school heads are highly responsible in doing their tasks along administration and supervision.

Profile of the Public Schools in Region I

Location. The table shows that most of the public high schools are located in the rural This is attested by the 399 or 85.8 percent of the school heads. Meanwhile, only 66 or 14.2 percent are situated in the urban areas.

School category. Schools who participated in this study are mostly medium in size as attested by the 218 or 46.9 percent of the school heads. 106 of the schools are categorized as large while 77 are considered small schools.

School classification. Three-fourths of the school heads come from national high schools. There are 352 of them. The remaining 113 or 24.3 percent are stationed in the integrated schools.

This study includes the performance indicators as part of the school profile. This is taken as to promotion rate, completion rate, Mean Percentile Score, dropout rate. These indicators are included because they are included as one of the criteria in rating the SBM practice of schools. They are included along learning outcomes which comprise 60% of the scores. It can be said that based on the result of the investigation, the region has been able to be successful in terms of promotion rate as attested by the recorded promotion rate of 98.96. In terms of completion rate, there is a challenge to exert more efforts in raising the completion rate in the schools.

In the lens of dropout rate, the registered value of 0.48 is considerable. It is near the 0% target. However, the schools should consider this in providing strategies and interventions to lower the dropout rate. Along mean percentile score, the recorded value of 78.3 is described to be fairly satisfactory. Although, it surpassed the 75% passing rate, schools should devise and implement programs, projects, and activities to leverage the academic performance of the learners. Lastly, in the lens of financial profile, the schools recorded an average MOOE of 325,270.00. This would translate to an annual MOOE of almost 4 million.

In connection, the study of Carr-Hill, et.al (2018) found out that devolving decision-making on the school level has a positive effect on reducing dropouts. Mejia and Filus (2018) proposed that SBM would lead to changes in school culture that would have positive effects on the attitudes and behaviors of teachers, students, and parents; improvements in culture and attitudes would in turn lead to improved school quality and, ultimately, improved student achievement.

Level of School-Based Management Practices
Table 1. Leadership and Governance

Indicator	Mean	Interpretation
1. In place is a developmental plan (e.g. SIP) developed collaboratively by the stakeholders of the school and the community.	2.6	Advanced
2. The development plan (SIP) is regularly reviewed by the school community to keep it responsive and relevant to emerging needs, challenges, and opportunities.	2.44	Maturing

Indicator	Mean	Interpretation
3. The school is organized by a clear structure and work arrangements that promote shared leadership and governance and define the roles and responsibilities of the stakeholders.	2.48	Maturing
4. A leadership network facilitates communication between and among school and community leaders for informed decision-making and solving of school-community-wide learning problems.	2.47	Maturing
5. A long-term program is in operation that addresses the training and development needs of school and community leaders.	2.39	Maturing
Average Weighted Mean	**2.48**	**Maturing**

It can be seen from the table that in terms of the SBM level of implementation of the respondents along leadership and governance, the following results came out. Developmental plan is developed collaboratively by the stakeholders of the school and the community as attested by the mean of 2.60 which is described as advanced.

"The school is organized by a clear structure and work arrangements that promote shared leadership and governance and define the roles and responsibilities of the stakeholders" has weighted mean of 2.48; The indicator "A leadership network facilitates communication between and among school and community leaders for informed decision-making and solving of school-community-wide learning problems" has a weighted mean of 2.47. The remaining indicators are revealed to be maturing which led the interpretation into moderate implementation on their level of SBM implementation. Still on the same table, it can be noted that the average weighted mean is 2.48. The total result under school leadership revealed that the indicators are moderately practiced. Thus, result implies that the SBM Level of Implementation along leadership and governance among the respondents is moderately implemented. Such finding would mean that the level of implementation of the respondents along leadership and governance is not highly implemented based on the data gathered. With that, certain measures to improve the level of implementation must be applied.

The results corroborate with the findings of Barrera, Bilbao, and Opadia, (2022), Pepugal (2022), and Pepito and Acibar (2020), whose result found that school have Maturing level of practice along school leadership. This showed that schools have exponentially gained the necessary indicators portrayed in the schools by respective school heads.

In the study of Cabardo (2016), results showed that schools have exceeded the minimum standard in SBM level of practices. In his study Cabardo (2016) major finding revealed that the level of participation of stakeholders to school activities could significantly

affect the level of SBM implementation. Cabardo found out that stakeholders' participation in the areas is moderate and still needs to be levelled-up.

Tapayan, et.al. (2016), in his work work revealed a moderate level of SBM practices in the six dimensions. Isa, et. al. (2020) in her study found that school have moderate level of SBM implementation based on autonomy of principals, teachers, parents, and community. However, Gutierrez (2014) found that the principals lacked the implementation on the SBM practices on school leadership, internal stakeholders and school improvement process, school-based resources, and school performance accountability.

Table 2. Curriculum and Instruction

Indicator	Mean	Interpretation
1. The curriculum provides for the development needs of all types of the learners in the community.	2.46	Maturing
2. The implemented curriculum is localized to make it more meaningful to the learners and applicable to life in the community.	2.24	Maturing
3. A representative group of school and community stakeholders develop methods and materials for developing creative thinking problem-solving.	2.36	Maturing
4. The learning systems are regularly and collaboratively monitored by the community using appropriate tools to ensure the holistic growth and development of the learners and the community.	2.69	Advanced
5. Appropriate assessment tools for teaching and learning are continuously reviewed and improved and assessment results are contextualized to the learner and local situations and the attainment of the relevant life skills.	2.52	Advanced
6. Learning managers and facilitators (teachers, administrators, and community members) nurture values and environments that are protective to all children and demonstrate behaviors consistent to the organizations' vision, mission and goals.	2.63	Advanced
7. Methods and resources are learner-and-community-friendly, enjoyable, safe, inclusive, accessible, and aimed at developing self-directed learners. Learners are equipped with essential knowledge, skills and values to assume responsibility and accountability for their own learning.	2.39	Maturing
Average Weighted Mean	**2.47**	**Maturing**

Curriculum and instruction level of practice is found to record an average weighted mean of 2.47. This translates to maturing level of SBM practice. Among the indicators, the highest mean registered is 2.69 and is described to be advanced. This refers to the indicators that the learning systems are regularly and collaboratively monitored by the community using appropriate tools to ensure the holistic growth and development of the learners and the

community. The schools are also found to be advanced along the indicators: learning managers and facilitators (teachers, administrators, and community members) nurture values and environments that are protective to all children and demonstrate behaviors consistent to the organizations' vision, mission and goals, and appropriate assessment tools for teaching and learning are continuously reviewed and improved and assessment results are contextualized to the learner and local situations and the attainment of the relevant life skills. However, the lowest mean is posted at 2.24 and this is traced to the indicator stating that the implemented curriculum is localized to make it more meaningful to the learners and applicable to life in the community.

This result is supported by in the study of and Pepugal (2022) and Torrevillas (2020) which revealed that SBM implementation is very highly implemented along curriculum and learning.

Table 3. Accountability and Continuous Improvement

Indicator	Mean	Interpretation
1. Roles and responsibilities of accountable person/s and collective body/ies are clearly defined and agreed upon by community stakeholders.	2.58	Advanced
2. Achievement of goals is recognized based on a collaboratively developed performance accountability system; gaps are addressed through appropriate action.	2.52	Advanced
3. The accountability system is owned by the community and is continuously enhanced to ensure that management structures and mechanisms are responsive to the emerging learning needs and demands of the community.	2.66	Advanced
4. Accountability assessment criteria and tools, feedback mechanisms, and information collection and validation techniques and processes are inclusive and collaboratively developed and agreed upon.	2.28	Maturing
5. Appropriate assessment tools for teaching and learning are continuously reviewed and improved and assessment results are contextualized to the learner and local situations and the attainment of the relevant life skills.	2.29	Maturing
Average Weighted Mean	**2.47**	**Maturing**

Same with the two previous dimensions of SBM, accountability and continuous improvements posted same level of SBM practice. The average weighted mean is computed at 2.47 and translate to maturing SBM level of practice. Schools are found to be at the highest level of SBM practice in terms of the indicators stating that the accountability system is

owned by the community and is continuously enhanced to ensure that management structures and mechanisms are responsive to the emerging learning needs and demands of the community; roles and responsibilities of accountable person/s and collective body/ies are clearly defined and agreed upon by community stakeholders; and achievement of goals is recognized based on a collaboratively developed performance accountability system; gaps are addressed through appropriate action. A closer look at the results would suggest to give stress on the last two indicators which states that Accountability assessment criteria and tools, feedback mechanisms, and information collection and validation techniques and processes are inclusive and collaboratively developed and agreed upon; and appropriate assessment tools for teaching and learning are continuously reviewed and improved and assessment results are contextualized to the learner and local situations and the attainment of the relevant life skills. The findings is parallel to the result of the study of Pepugal (2022) and Pepito and Acibar (2020) whose results showed that schools have maturing level of SBM practices in terms of accountability. In the study of Torrevillas (2020), the stakeholders viewed that resource management is very evident.

Table 4. Management of Resources

Indicator	Mean	Interpretation
1. Regular resource inventory is collaboratively undertaken by learning managers, learning facilitators and community stakeholders as basis for resource allocation and mobilization.	2.64	Advanced
2. A regular dialogue for planning and resource programming, that is accessible and inclusive, continuously engage stakeholders and support implementation of community education plans.	2.50	Advanced
3. In place is a community-developed resource management system that drives appropriate behaviors of the stakeholders to ensure judicious, appropriate, and effective use of resources.	2.69	Advanced
4. Regular monitoring, evaluation, and reporting processes of resource management are collaboratively developed and implemented by the learning managers, facilitators and community stakeholders.	2.38	Maturing
5. There is a system that manages the network and linkages, which strengthens and sustains partnerships for improving resource management.	2.44	Maturing
Average Weighted Mean	**2.53**	**Advanced**

The total weighted mean in terms of the SBM level of implementation along management of resources is 2.53 which in total was interpreted as advanced. The findings

signify that management of resources has been implemented by the respondents in their respective schools but not in full implementation.

The school heads excel in having in place community-developed resource management system that drives appropriate behaviors of the stakeholders to ensure judicious, appropriate, and effective use of resources; regular resource inventory is collaboratively undertaken by learning managers, learning facilitators and community stakeholders as basis for resource allocation and mobilization; and a regular dialogue for planning and resource programming, is accessible and inclusive, continuously engage stakeholders and support implementation of community education plans.

The last two indicators can be interpreted as moderate or maturing level of implementation. Schools are moderate along collaboratively developing and implementing regular monitoring, evaluation, and reporting processes of resource management by the learning managers, facilitators and community stakeholders; and having a system that manages the network and linkages, and strengthens and sustains partnerships for improving resource management.

The result is affirmed by Bustamante (2022), Barrera, Bilbao, and Opadia, (2022, and Cabardo (2016) who study results showed that schools have exceeded the minimum standard in SBM level of practices along management pf resources. In the study of Torrevillas (2020), the stakeholders expressed that the implementation in their respective schools are very evident in terms of resources Management.

Table 5. Significant Relationship on the Level of School-Based Practices and the Profile of the School Heads

Profile	Leadership and Governance	Curriculum and Instruction	Accountability and Continuous Improvement	Management of Resources
Sex	0.09	0.026	0.116	0.007
Age	0.616	0.257	0.023*	0.342
Civil Status	0.254	0.102	0.167	0.342
Position	0.126	0.032*	0.00	0.26
Years in service as Principal	0.523	0.57	0.189	0.14
Highest Educational Attainment	0.05	0.012*	0.00	0.076
Relevant Training	0.209	0.173	0.00	0.03*
Membership	0.00	0.173	0.00	0.00
Monthly Gross Income	0.095	0.003*	0.00	142
Performance	0.385	0.05*	0.00	107

Table 5 recapitulates the results of the relationship between the profile variables of School Heads with respect to their SBM level of implementation. The results of the analysis of variance show that the leadership and governance, curriculum and instruction, accountability and continuous improvement, and management of resources varied significantly according to age, civil status, position, highest educational attainment, length of service, membership in professional organizations, and number of relevant trainings.

There is a significant relationship between the SBM level of practice along (1) leadership and governance, (2) curriculum and learning, (3) accountability and continuous improvement, and management of resources and the profile variables of the school principals. Significant and highly significant relationship are found among the SBM indicators in particular in terms of Membership of the school principals to professional organizations. 'Accountability and Continuous Improvement' is the area where most indicators showed significant relationship (0.05; 0.01 alpha level) with the profile variables of the school principals.

In the study of Palisoc (2022), the results showed that educational attainment is related to school leadership; and age, position and training affects accountability. Batool, et.al. (2016) and Sawati, et. al. (2013) points out the insignificant relationship between age and management performance of principals. Whereas, school heads are affected with age, according to Julian, et. al. (2019) who say otherwise. However, Eboka (2016) and Walson and Yellowe (2018) have a common finding on gender's influence to principals as school managers. Aside from these, Viggayan (2017), in his study found that there is no significant difference in the assessment of school heads on the extent of practice of SBM in terms of school leadership and school-based resources when grouped according to position. There is no significant difference on the extent of practice of the school heads in terms of school leadership school improvement process, and school-based resources of school-based management when grouped according to administrative experience. However, there is a significant difference on the extent of practice of the school heads on school performance accountability.

Table 6. Significant Relationship on the Level of School-Based Practices and the Profile of the Schools

Profile	Leadership and Governance	Curriculum and Instruction	Accountability and Continuous Improvement	Management of Resources
Location	0.131	0.200	0.105	0.129
Category	0.015*	.032*	0.003*	0.043*
Classification	0.329	0.540	0.612	0.498
Promotion rate	0.569	0.330	0.365	0.650
Completion rate	0.509	0.347	0.346	0.659
MPS	0.464	0.308	0.652	0.718
Dropout rate	0.772	0.430	0.557	0.389
MOOE	0.686	0.446	0.276	0.107

This study aims further to measure the degree of relationship between the SBM level of practice and school profiles. Most indicators showed significant ($p<0.005$) to highly significant ($p<0.001$) relationship with the profile variables of public schools in Region I, Philippines. Promotion rate, Completion Rate, and Mean Percentage Scores do not show significant relationship with any of the indicators in the four areas of SBM. Very few indicators showed significant relationship with Dropped Our Rate and Average MOOE. Indicators on SBM in the four areas showed insignificant relationship in terms of school location, category, and classification, except for school category.

The result is supported by Torrevillas (2020) whose study found that there is no significant relationship between the school's level of student's performance and SBM level of practices. Furthermore, Barrera, Bilbao, and Opadia, (2022), found in their study that is no significant correlation between the school's level of SBM implementation and the schools' performance. However, Bustamante (2022) found the opposite view. His study shows that SBM affects the school performance.

Table 7. Problems Encountered

Problems	Frequency	Percentage
1. Inadequate funding	460	98.9
2. Lack of school equipment and facilities	459	98.7
3. Lack of School Leadership Trainings	324	69.7
4. Confusion about new/additional roles and responsibilities	235	50.5
5. Sudden change in the system due to pandemic	223	48.0
6. Lack of motivation and support coming from DepEd authorities	218	46.9
7. Lack of knowledge by stakeholders of what SBM is and how it works	205	44.1

This study further identifies the problems encountered by the school heads along with the implementation of the SBM. As a result, seven problems surfaces. Topping the problems encountered is the lack of fund as attested by the 98.9 percent of the school heads. Coming close is the lack of school equipment and facilities as verified by 459 school heads. Lack of school leadership training is also one of the problems identified by the school heads. Other problems include confusion about new/additional roles and responsibilities, sudden change in the system due to pandemic, lack of motivation and support coming from Deped authorities, and lack of knowledge by stakeholders of what SBM is and how it works.

These results are parallel to the study of Alvarado and Adriatico in 2019 whose research revealed the problems of school heads in SBM which included inadequate funding and physical facilities; process management implementation; curriculum management; and management and leadership roles.

Moreover, Isa, et. al. (2020) stressed that issues experienced along its implementation are due to the inadequate understanding of SBM implementation as well as minimal parental and community involvement. Gutierrez (2014), on the other hand found the problems encountered were moderately serious and the seriousness of the problems was caused by the failures of the school heads in the implementation of the SBM practices along school leadership, internal and external stakeholders, school improvement process, school-based resources, and school performance accountability

Proposed Technical Assistance Plan

Success and survival of a certain educational program depends mainly on planning and technical assistance given by the planners on curriculum aspects. This study proposed a technical assistance plan based on the results of the study. The study focusses on the five aspects: completion rate, dropout rate, Accountability assessment criteria and tools, feedback mechanisms, and information collection and validation techniques and processes are inclusive and collaboratively developed and agreed upon; appropriate assessment tools for teaching and learning are continuously reviewed and improved and assessment results are contextualized to the learner and local situations and the attainment of the relevant life skills; and the implemented curriculum is localized to make it more meaningful to the learners and applicable to life in the community. The details are presented in Table 8.

Table 8. The Proposed Technical Assistance Plan

Development Needs	Objectives	Activities	Persons Involved	Expected Output
Completion Rate	To increase completion rate	Monitoring and evaluation to identify and benchmark the best practices of schools in terms of completion rate	DepEd Regional Office I School Head Teachers	Best practices are identified and is planned for benchmarking activities.
Dropout rate	To decrease dropout rate	Monitoring and evaluation to identify and benchmark the best practices of schools in terms of dropout rate	DepEd Regional Office I School Head Teachers	Best practices are identified and is planned for benchmarking activities.
Accountability assessment criteria and tools, feedback mechanisms, and information collection and validation techniques and processes are inclusive and collaboratively developed and agreed upon.	To improve schools' accountability, feedback mechanisms, and information collection and validation techniques and processes	Conduct of seminar-workshop	DepEd Regional Office I School Head Teachers	Seminar workshop is conducted.
Appropriate assessment tools for teaching and learning are continuously reviewed and improved and assessment results are contextualized to the learner and local situations and the attainment of the relevant life skills.	To enhance teachers' knowledge and skills in using appropriate contextualized assessment tools and results for teaching and learning	Conduct of seminar-workshop	DepEd Regional Office I School Head Teachers	Seminar workshop is conducted.
The implemented curriculum is localized to make it more meaningful to the learners and applicable to life in the community.	To capacitate teachers with knowledge and skills in contextualization and localization.	Conduct of seminar-workshop on contextualization and localization	DepEd Regional Office I School Head Teachers	Seminar workshop is conducted.

The presented proposed technical assistance plan for the secondary schools was crafted by the researcher after the conduct study. It is with the combined views and suggestions by other stakeholders during the interview on this study that the ideas conceived and expressed in this proposal was made. The proposal is aligned with the principles of the existing School-Based Management of the public schools. Moreover, this proposed plan may be modified or improved by future researchers who would embark in the same endeavor.

Table 9. The Level of Acceptability of the proposed Technical Assistance Plan

Parts of the Developmental Plan	WM	Transmuted Ratings
Identified Needs	6.42	Highly Acceptable
Objectives	6.39	Highly Acceptable
Strategies	6.07	Acceptable
Time Frame	6.09	Acceptable
Persons Involved	6.43	Highly Acceptable
Budget	6.03	Acceptable
Sources of Funds	6.01	Acceptable
OVER-ALL TOTAL WM	**6.21**	Highly Acceptable

It can be seen from the Table 9 that in terms of the level of acceptability of the proposed technical assistance plan in School-Based Management to further improve its implementation, computed weighted mean has shown that the parts of the proposal have transmuted ratings of "Acceptable" and "Highly Acceptable". It can also be noted from the table that the overall total weighted mean in terms of the level of acceptability of the training program is 6.21 transmuted with "HIGHLY ACCEPTABLE" rating. The result indicates that despite areas needing enhancement/improvement to reach high level of acceptability, the proposed plan was found "HIGHLY ACCEPTABLE". Thus, the proposal is acceptable and can be implemented by schools who believe that it can help further improve their SBM implementation.

CONCLUSION

There is a significant relationship between the SBM level of practice along leadership and governance, curriculum and learning, accountability and continuous improvement, and management of resources and the profile variables of the school principals. Indicators on SBM in the four areas showed insignificant relationship.

SUGGESTIONS

Based on these findings, the following recommendations are forwarded. DepED must conduct more seminar, workshops on school-based Management in the division and regional levels to capacitate teachers with the knowledge and skills on school-based Management implementation. The school administrators shall develop strategies and interventions that would help improve the school performance especially in terms of completion rate, dropout rate, and MPS. DepEd must continuously monitor and regularly evaluate School-based Management implementation in the entire region to ensure the program's quality standards and outcomes. It is recommended that school head should still take an action for the continuous improvement of leadership and governance, curriculum and planning, managing

GMPI International Conference on Teacher Education and Graduate Studies for the SDGs 2024
GMPI Conference Series, Vol.4, No.1, 2025, pp. 15-41
e-ISSN 2829-0747. DOI. 10.52889/gmpics.v4.597

their people, as well as their resources. Concerted efforts must be made by the stakeholders in establishing a monitoring and evaluation team to validate the actual level of SBM implementation. The proposed technical assistance plan can be adapted for better implementation of the SBM. DepEd should exert efforts in resolving problems of schools like lack of adequate fund, and lack of school equipment and facilities. Further studies related to the SBM implementation must be conducted in a wider scope to gather relevant information and useful findings.

REFERENCES

Abucay, G. R. (2013). The responsiveness of the school-based management program towards school management – an *unpublished dissertation*. Northeastern College, Santiago City, Isabela, Philippines.

Abulencia, A. (2012). *School-based management: a structural reform intervention*. Researchgate Publication retrieved from https: www.researchgate.net/publication/277957224_School_Based_ManagementA_Structural_Reform_Interventions/link on December 18, 2021.

Alvarado, E. ,Sy, F. and Adriatico, C. (2019) Constraints on School Based Management Compliance of Public Schools Principals. Open Access Library Journal, 6, 1-11. doi: 10.4236/oalib.1105454

Barrera, Janet and Bilbao, Nanette and Opadia, Randy (2022). *Structural Equation Model of School-Based Management Practices and Teachers' Commitment In Secondary Schools*. Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4147361 or http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4147361

Batool, S., Khattak, S., and Saleem Z. (2016). *Impact of principal's age and administrative experience on conflict management styles at secondary school level.* Retrieved from City University Research Journal. Volume 6, No. 2

Bustamante, J. (2022). *School Based Management (SBM) Practices and Effective School Performance*. IJRP. 104(1), 638-653

Bush, T. (2020). *Losing the position and status of principal; implications for self-esteem and role identity.* Retrieved from Educational Management Administration Leadership at journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/174114219898943 on January 21, 2021

Cabardo, J. (2016). *Levels of participation of the school stakeholders to the different school-initiated activities and the implementation of school-based management.* Hagonoy National High School, Bulacan, Philippines. Retrieved from files.eric.ed.gov>EJ1133596 on July 18, 2020.

Cook, G. (2015). *Principal leadership: focus on professional development*. newsletter article retrieved on January 20, 2021 from ascd.org/publications.newsletters/policy-priorities/vol21/num01/principal-leadership@focus-onprofessional-development.aspx.

Fallahi, K., and Matin, N. (2016). *Components of school-based management in the educational systems of several countries*. Organizational Research Planning, Tehran, Iran. Retrieved from Canadian Center of Science and Education at http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/mas.v10n9p161.

Foley. B.(2018). *What is SPSS. A blog* retrieved from *surveygizmo.com/resources/blog/what-is-spss/*

Goden,L., Lumbab, N., Niez, R., and Coton, V. (2016). *Influence of school heads' instructional competencies on teachers' management in Leyte, Division, Philippines*. Naval State University, Biliran, Philippines. Published by International Journal of Engineering Sciences and Research Technology. Retrieved from http://www.ijesrt.com. on September 10, 2019.

Gutierrez, O. F. (2014). *The school-based management practices of the public elementary schools in the third congressional districts of Pangasinan I – an unpublished dissertation*. Saint Louis University, Baguio City, Philippines.

Hernandez, A. (2013). *Recommending an approach for the conduct of deped school-based management impact evaluation*. Retrieved from Impact Evaluation; Principles and Practice on December 18, 2020 at academia.edu/16063480/Recommending_an_Approach_for_the_Conduct_o_DepEd_S chools_Based_Management_Impact_Evaluation/auto=download&m ailwork_.

Isa, A., Mydin, A., Abdullah, A. (2020). *School-based management practices in Malaysia: a systematic literature review*. International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences. Retrieved on January 11, 2021 from hrmars.com/papers-submitted/7870/school-based-managemnt-sbm-practice-in-malaysia-a-systematic-literature-revuew.pdf.

Kadi, A. & Beytekin O. (2017). *Metaphorical perceptions of teachers, principals and staff on school management*. Retrieved from *How schools make school-based management work.*

Kadtong, M.L. (2015). *School-based management in the operations and performance of public elementary schools*. *schools division of Cotabato*. Retrieved from researchgate.net/publication/323949891.

Kelley, C., Heneman, H., and Milanowski, A.(2018). *School-based performance award programs, teacher motivation, and school performance: findings from a study of three programs*. University of Pennsylvania Scholarly Commons. Retrieved on January 18, 2021 from core.ac.uk.download/pdf/76392355.pdf.

Llego, M. (2019). *SBM Assessment Tool With Contextualized Means of Verification (MOVs).* Retrieved from:teach.ph.com/sbm-assessment-tool-with-contextualized- means-of-verification-movs/ on August 4, 2020.

Llego, M. (2016). *A comprehensive guide to school-based management*. Retrieved from teacherph.com/a-comprehensive-guige-to-school-based-mangment-sbm/on January 25, 2019.

Lubrica, P., Parcasio, I., Alvaro, M., Cuevas, J., Gallardo, A., Batani, R., and Garin, D. (2017). *Hallmarks of school-based management: their impact to quality improvement among public secondary schools*. Benguet State University, Philippines

Mehdinezhad, V. and Sardarzahi, Z. (2015). *Leadership behaviors and its relation with principals' management experience.* University of Sistan and Baluchestan, Iran. Retrieved from New Approaches in Educational Research at http://naerjournal.ua.es. /DOI:10.7821/near.2016.1.133.

Mejia, A., & Filus, A. (2018). *Exploring predictors of impact of school-based management in rural Mexico: Do student engagement, teacher attitudes and parent involvement predict better academic outcomes*? International Journal of Educational Research, 88, 95–108. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2018.01.010

Moradi, S., Beidokhti, A., and Fathi, K. (2016). *Comparative comparison of implementing school-based management in developed counties in historical context: from theory to practice.* Canadian Center of Science and Education, International Education Studies, Vol. 9, No. 9. Retrieved from files.eric.ed.gov>fulltext.pdf.EJ1112703 on March 12, 2020.

Palisoc, R. (2022). *School-Based Management Implementation in The Division of Pangasinan II.* Doctoral Dissertation. Universidad de Dagupan. Dagupan City.

Pepito, G. & L. Acibar (2019*). School-Based Management and Performance of Public Elementary School Heads: Basis for Technical Assistance Plan*. International Journal of Innovation and Research in Educational Sciences, 6(1), 67-83.

Pepugal, E. (2020). *Levels of Perception on School-Based Management Implementation in San Luis National High School, Philippines*. American Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation (AJMRI), 1(4).

Sabio C., Manalo, M. and Vigonte, F. (2020). *Determining students' learning outcomes in basic education: a proposed cpd for teachers*. Retrieved from International Journal of Information and Education Technology, Vol. 10, No. 1 at doi.10.19178/ijiet.2020.10.1.1340 on January 11, 2021.

San Pedro, I. (2015). *Implementation of programs and incentives for service excellence (PRAISE): basis for a school-based reward system manual.* Retrieved from researchgate.net/publication/280930580_Implementation_of_the_Program_of_Awards _and_Incentives_for_Service_Excellence_PRAISE_Basisfor_a_School_Reward_Syste m_Manual.

Sawati, M., Anwar, S., and Majoka, M. (2013). *Do qualification, experience and age matter for principal leadership styles?* Retrieved from International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences on April 10, 2020 athttp://dx/doi/org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v3-i7/63.

Sharma,V. (2017). *A study of the impact of school management trainings and head of school's attitude on student's learning outcomes.* Retrieved from globaljournals,org/GJHSS_Volume17/6_A-Study-of-the-Impact,pdf.

Shead, M. (2021). *The Definition of Management. Leadership.* Retrieved from leadership501.com/definition-of-management/21/ on December 12, 2020.

Tapayan, H., Ebio, F., and Bentor, C. (2016). *Impact of school-based management level of practices among secondary school implementing units on the k to12 program implementation in Leyte, Division, Philippines.* Naval State University,Biliran, Philippines. Retrieved from International Journal of Engineering Sciences and Research Technology at http://www.ijesrt.com on November 4, 2019,

Torrevillas, A. (2020). *School Based Management (SBM) As Correlates to Academic Performance of Secondary Schools in Quezon City.* Y Saber, 13(4), 57-85.

Walson, A. and Yellowe, A. (2018). *A conceptual framework of demographic and personality profile variables in principals' performance in the management of secondary schools.* Retrieved from International Journal of Scientific Research in Education at ijsre-com/assets/volume…-11(2)-walson---yellowe,pdf on November 18, 2020

Viggayan, E. (2017). *School-Based Management Practices of Public Secondary School Heads: Basis for Policy Recommendation.* The SPUP Graduate School Research Journal. https://ojs.aaresearchindex.com/index.php/spupgsrj/article/view/438

DepEd.(2006).*Operations manual on school-based management and its support system.* Pasig City, Philippines.

DepEd Manual (2009). *A primer on school leadership-SBM environment*

Department of Education (2010). *Deped 2010 Press release on School-based management.* Retrieved from www.deped.gov.ph./ officialgazette.gov,ph/2010/11/23/deped-to-strengthen-sbm-in-schools on September 5, 2019.

Department of Education. (2014). *Introduction to school-based management.* School-Based Management Section. Retrieved on June 10, 2019 from edb.gov.hk/attachment/en/sch-admin/sbm/gov-framework/introduction_sbm%20€%20Nov%202014%released%20ver.pdf.

Education and Manpower Bureau (2015). *Tips for school managers.* A School-Based Management Document retrieved from academia.edu/35937733/Tips_for_school_managers_org. on December 15, 2020.

The 1987 Constitution of the Government of the Philippines

World Bank Group and Australian Aid (2016). *Assessing school-based management in the Philippines.* Philippine Education Note No.5. Retrieved from https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/2473license:ccBY3.0160. on November 4, 2020.