

I. TITLE

“SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT PRACTICES AMONG PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN REGION I: BASIS FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PLAN”.

II. ABSTRACT

Title: SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT PRACTICES
AMONG PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN REGION I:
BASIS FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PLAN

Researcher: RITCHIE G. MACALANDA, Ph.D.

Division: FIELD TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE DIVISION
DepEd Region I

School Year: 2021-2022

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.

III. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The completion of this research project would not have been possible without the contributions and support of many individuals and organizations: DepED Regional Office I, the field offices, school heads and teachers.

The researcher would like to extend his sincere thanks to all the participants in our study, who generously shared their time, experiences, and insights with us. Their willingness to engage with our research was essential to the success of this project, and the researcher is deeply grateful for their participation.

IV. INTRODUCTION OF THE RESEARCH

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 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.

V. LITERATURE REVIEW

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 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, 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 r^2 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.

VI. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This study aimed to determine the school-based management practices of public schools in Region I as basis for technical assistance plan.

Specifically, this sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the profile of the school principals in Region I in terms of:

A. Personal variables:

- a. age;
- b. sex; and
- c. civil status?

B. Professional variables:

- a. position;

- b. number of years as school head;
- c. highest educational attainment;
- d. relevant in- service training/s attended (related to School-Based Management);
- e. membership to professional organization;
- f. monthly gross income;
- g. performance rating ?

2. What is the profile of the public schools in Region I in terms of:

- a. location;
- b. school category;
- c. school classification;
- d. promotion rate;
- e. completion rate;
- f. mean percentage scores;
- g. dropped out rate;
- h. average maintenance operations and other expenses?

3. What is level of school-based management practices in terms of:

- a. Leadership and governance;
- b. Curriculum and instruction;
- c. Accountability and continuous improvement;
- d. Management of resources?

4. Is there a significant relationship on the level of school-based practices and the profile of the school heads?

5. Is there a significant relationship on the level of school-based practices and the profile of the public schools?

6. What are the challenges encountered in the implementation of school-based management?

7. What technical assistance plan can be proposed based on the findings?

8. What is the level of acceptability of the proposed technical assistance plan?

VII. SCOPE AND LIMITATION

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. Complete enumeration will be observed.

The profile of the school principals in Region I in terms of personal variables such as age, sex, and civil status was identified. The professional variables which include position, number of years as school head, highest educational attainment, relevant in- service training/s attended, membership to professional organization, monthly gross income, and performance rating was determined.

The profile of public schools in Region I as to location, school category, school classification, promotion rate, completion rate, mean percentage scores, drop out rate, and average maintenance operations and other expenses was also gathered in the field. Moreover, 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 will be determined.

The relationship on the level of school-based practices and the a) profile of the school heads, and b) the profile of the public schools was determined. Meanwhile, the problems encountered by the school heads during the school-based management practices was identified. Finally, the findings served as basis in preparing the technical assistance plan.

VIII. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The methods to be followed in this study focused on how descriptive research will be conducted. The sampling technique, data collection, ethical issues, and plan for data analysis was considered in this part.

A. Sampling

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.

B. Data Collection

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.

IX. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Profile of the School Principals in Region I

This study identifies the profile of the respondents along personal and professional variables. The results are presented in tables 1 and 2.

Table 1. Personal Profile of the Respondents

Profile	f	%
Age		
30 and below	6	1.3
31 - 40 y/o	35	7.5
41 - 50 y/o	159	34.2
51 - 60 y/o	232	49.9
61 and above	33	7.1
Sex		
Male	197	42.4
Female	268	57.6
Civil Status		
Married	375	80.6
Separated	2	0.4
Single	63	13.5
Widow	25	5.4
Total	465	100

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 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.

Table 2. Professional Profile of the Respondents

Profile	f	%
Position		
HT	54	11.6
OIC/TIC	43	9.2
Principal I	92	19.8
Principal II	92	19.8
Principal III	67	14.4
Principal IV	117	25.2
Number of Years as Principal	197	42.4
1 - 5	142	30.5
6 - 10	147	31.6
11 - 15	70	15.1
15 y and above	106	22.8
Highest Educational Attainment	63	13.5
With MA/MS Units	76	16.3
MA/MS Graduate	78	16.8
With EdD/PhD Units	134	28.8
EdD/PhD Graduate	177	38.1
Relevant Trainings		
Division	327	70.3
Region	79	17
National	52	11.2
International	7	1.5
Membership to Professional Organizations		
Division	225	48.4
Region	15	3.2

National	219	47.1
International	6	1.3
Monthly Gross Income		
40k and below	65	14
40,001 - 45,000	26	5.6
45,001 - 50,000	53	11.4
50,000k and above	321	69
Performance Rating		
Outstanding	465	100
Total	465	100

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 attend 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

This study also determines the profile of the public schools in Region I. Profiles include location, school category, classification, promotion rate, completion rate, Mean Percentile Score, dropout rate, and MOOE. The details of the result of the investigation are shown in tables 3 and 4.

Table 3. Profile of the Public Schools in Region I

Profile	f	%
Location		
Rural	399	85.8
Urban	66	14.2
School Category		
Small	77	16.6
Medium	218	46.9
Large	106	22.8
Mega	64	13.8
School Classification		
Integrated	113	24.3
National High School	352	75.7
Total	465	100

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.

Table 4. Profile of School in terms of Performance Indicator and MOOE

School Profile	Average
Promotion Rate	98.96
Completion Rate	94.17
Mean Percentile Score	78.3
Dropout rate	0.48
MOOE	325,270

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

The level of SBM practices is measured along leadership and governance, curriculum and instruction, accountability and continuous improvement, and management of resources.

Table 5. 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
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 6. 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 7. 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 Torre Villas (2020), the stakeholders viewed that resource management is very evident.

Table 8. 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 of 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 9. 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 9 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 10. 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 11. 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 12.

Table 12. Proposed Technical Assistance Plan

Development Needs	Objectives	Activities	Persons Involved	Time Frame	Budget	Budget Source	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	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.

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.	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 13. 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

Legend:

Literal Rating	Numerical Rating	Mean Range	Transmuted Equivalent
A	7	6.12 – 7.00	Highly Acceptable
B	6	5.27 – 6.11	Acceptable
C	5	4.42 – 5.26	Moderately Acceptable
D	4	3.56 – 4.41	Neither Acceptable or Not Acceptable
E	3	2.71 – 3.65	Slightly Acceptable
F	2	1.86 – 2.70	Somewhat Acceptable
G	1	1.00 – 1.85	Not Acceptable

It can be seen from the table 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.

Recommendations

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 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.

X. Dissemination and Advocacy Plans

The results and findings of this study were published in a research journal. Furthermore, a copy of this study was given to the Learning Resources Management and Development System (LRMDS) of the 14 SDOs and in the Regional Office. The

researcher served as resource person in communicating and sharing the significance of the study during the SBM forum and other related activities.

XI. 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-on-professional-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_of_DepEd_Schools_Based_Management_Impact_Evaluation/auto=download&mailwork_.
- 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*. An article retrieved on
- 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. Retrieved on July 28, 2019 from pdfs.semanticscholar.org/68a8/4f1eadc5d48d48c7af910a48d9782172a2e.pdf
ga=2.87285208.1953526771.1604a78525.9869715.1604978525&_ga
c=1.797076 21.160.

- 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). <https://journals.e-palli.com/home/index.php/ajmri/article/view/516/275>
- 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_System_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 at <http://dx/doi/org/10.6007/IJARBS/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](http://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/depd-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%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.

XII. Financial Report

This study was funded by the Department of Education Region I through the Basic Education Research Fund pursuant to DepEd Order No. 43, s. 2015. The expenses were subjected to the usual accounting and auditing procedures of the agency.

Deliverables	Activities	Items of Expenditure	Estimated Cost
	Conduct of Research	Coupon bond	1000.00
		Photocopy of research questionnaires	1000.00
		Printing	3,000.00
		Binding	3,000.00
		Fare related to the preparation of the study.	5,000.00
	Technical assistance and monitoring in the schools, districts, and division offices.	Travel expenses and per diem	76,500.00
	Information Dissemination/ Publication		3,000.00
	Other incidental expenses		7,500.00
Total			Php 100,000.00

2. School category.
 Small Medium Large Mega

3. School classification;
 Elementary Secondary Integrated School

d. Promotion rate: _____

e. Completion rate: _____

f. Mean Percentage Scores: _____

g. Dropped out rate: _____

h. Average maintenance operations and other expenses: _____

III. School-Based Management Practices. (This questionnaire is patterned after the SBM Tool issued by the Department of Education Region I through Regional Memorandum No. 77, s. 2022).

Instructions: Determine the SBM level of practice of your school using the given tool. Rate your SBM status from 1-3 based on the given indicators. In case you did not practice as per the indicators and suggested MOVs, your rating score will be zero (0).

A. LEADERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE	Indicators	Suggested MOVs	Rating	Remarks
1. In place is a development plan (e.g. SIP) developed collaboratively by the stakeholders of the school and the community.	1. The development plan guided by the school's vision, mission and goal (VMG) is developed through the leadership of the school and the participation of some invited community stakeholders.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approved copy of School Improvement Plan/Annual Implementation Plan/ School Basic Education Learning Continuity Plan and other relevant documents showing the actual practice like the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Signed resolutions o Approved /signed minutes of the meetings 		
	2. The development plan is evolved through the shared leadership of the school and the community stakeholders.			
	3. The development plan is enhanced with the community performing the			

	leadership roles, and the school providing technical support.			
2. The development plan (SIP) is regularly reviewed by the school community to keep it responsive and relevant to emerging needs, challenges and opportunities.	1. The school leads the regular review and improvement of the developed plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual accomplishment reports and report cards • Other relevant documents showing the actual practice like the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Narrative Report and attachments o Minutes of Meetings o Notice of Meeting/Agreements/Summary of Findings 		
	2. The school and community stakeholders working as full partners, lead the continual review and improvement of the development plan.			
	3. The community stakeholders lead the regular review and improvement process; the school stakeholders facilitate the process.			
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.	1. The school defines the organizational structure, and the roles and responsibilities of stakeholders.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manual of Operation/Handbook / Constitution-by-Laws of any existing organizational structure such as School Governing Council (SGC), Parents-Teachers Association (PTA) and others with defined roles and responsibilities of the different working committees in the School PLanning Team. • Other relevant documents showing the actual practice like the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Approved Minutes of the Meeting o Approved Resolution o Attendance, Pictorial, Notice of Meetings 		
	2. The school and community collaboratively define the structure and the roles and responsibilities.			
	3. Guided by an agreed organizational structure, the community stakeholders lead in defining the organizational structure and the roles and responsibilities; school provides			

	technical and administrative support.			
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.	1. A network has been collaboratively established and is continuously improved by the school community.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of channels of communication established in the school such as meetings, forums, consultative conferences, summits and performance review via official social media like facebook page, official email address of the school, and others, • Additional evidence/s that manifest actual practice of the indicators such as Minutes of Meetings, Agreements of Committees, SRC, School MIS, transparency reports, dashboard, online platforms etc. 		
	2. The network actively provides stakeholders information for making decisions and solving learning and administrative problems.			
	3. The network allows easy exchange and access to information sources beyond the school community.			
5. A long-term program is in operation that addresses the training and development needs of school and community leaders.	1. Developing structures are in place and analysis of the competency and development needs of leaders is conducted; result is used to develop a long-term training and development program.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long-term Learning and Development Plan for school heads and community leaders • Additional evidence/s that manifest actual practice of the indicators such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o LAC PAn and Accomplishment Reports o Accomplishment Report on Coaching and Mentoring 		
	2. Leaders undertake training modes that are convenient to them (online, offline, modular, group, or home-based) and which do not disrupt their regular functions. Leaders monitor and evaluate their			

	own learning progress.			
	3. Leaders assume responsibility for their own training and development. School community leaders working individually or in groups. Coach and mentor one another to achieve their VMG.			
Sub-total				
Percentage Weight of Leadership and Governance (30%)				

B. CURRICULUM AND LEARNING	Indicators	Suggested MOVs	Rating	Remarks
1.The curriculum provides for the development needs of all types of the learners in the community.	1. All types of learners of the school community are identified, their learning curves assessed; appropriate programs with its support materials for each type of learner is developed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report on the documentation and implementation of differentiated programs addressing the development needs of the learners • Copy of the assessment results /pretest-posttest results such as Early Childhood Care Development (ECCD)/ Multi-Factoral Assessment Tool (MFAT /Philippine Informal Reading Inventory (PHIL-IRI) /Functional Literacy Assessment Test (FLAT)/and other assessment tests for special curricular programs 		
	2. Programs are fully implemented and closely monitored to address performance discrepancies; benchmark best practices; coach low performers; mentor potential leaders; reward high achievement, and maintain environment that makes learning			

	<p>meaningful and enjoyable.</p> <p>3. The educational needs of all types of learners are being met as shown by continuous improvement on learning outcomes and products of learning. Teachers' as well as students' performance are motivated by intrinsic and extrinsic rewards. The school's differentiated program is frequently benchmarked by other schools.</p>			
<p>2. The implemented curriculum is localized to make it more meaningful to the learners and applicable to life in the community.</p>	<p>1. Local beliefs, norms, values, traditions, folklores, current events and existing technologies are documented and used to develop a lasting curriculum. Localization guidelines are agreed to by school community and teachers are properly oriented.</p> <p>2. The localized curriculum is implemented and monitored</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Localized guidelines on curriculum implementation • Copy/ies of Contextualized Learning Materials with documentation of its utilization o Documentation of best practices in localizing curriculum and benchmarking by other schools • Additional evidence/s that manifest actual practice of the indicators o Monitoring Report on the utilization of the contextualized Learning materials o Sample of teachers learning plan integrating the contextualized curriculum 		

	<p>closely to ensure that it makes learning more meaningful and pleasurable; produces desired learning outcomes and directly improves community life. Ineffective approaches are replaced and innovative ones are developed.</p> <p>3. Best practices in localizing the curriculum are mainstreamed and benchmarked by other schools. There is marked increase in number of projects that uses the community as learning laboratory, and the school as an agent of change for improvement of the community.</p>			
<p>3. A representative group of school and community stakeholders develop methods and materials for developing creative thinking problem solving.</p>	<p>1. A representative team of school and community stakeholders assess content and methods used in teaching creative, critical thinking and problem solving. Assessment results are used as guide to</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report on the documentation of the culminating programs and activities of the school/documentation of students performance such as robotics/exhibits/research and development projects/reading projects/campus journalism/any contests that develop the creative and critical thinking of the learners 		

	develop materials.			
	2. Learning materials and approaches to reinforce strengths and address deficiencies are developed and tested for applicability on school, family and community.			
	3. Materials and approaches are being used in school, in the family and in community to develop critical, creative thinking and problem-solving community of learners and are producing desired results.			
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.	1. A school-based monitoring and learning system is conducted regularly and cooperatively; and feedback is shared with stakeholders. The system uses a tool that monitors the holistic development of learners.	o Conduct Quarterly Card Day with relevant documents such as Minutes of the Meeting, Attendance Sheets, Learners' Portfolio and Narrative Report		
	2. The school-based monitoring and learning systems generate feedback that is used for making decisions that enhance the			

	total development of the learners.			
	3. The monitoring system is accepted and regularly used for collective decision-making. Monitoring tool has been improved to provide both quantitative and qualitative data.			
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.	<p>1. The assessment tools are reviewed by the school and assessment results are shared with the school's stakeholders.</p> <p>2. The Assessment tools are reviewed by the school community and results are shared with community stakeholders.</p> <p>3. School assessment results are used to develop learning programs that are suited to community, and customized to each learner's context, results of which are used for collaborative decision making.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report on the Review of Summative Assessment Tools • Results of Assessment • Report on the evaluation of culminating activities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Copies of summative assessment tools which include written tests and other authentic assessments o Report on the Culminating Program Activities 		

<p>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 organization's vision, mission and goals.</p>	<p>1. Stakeholders are aware of child/learner-centered, rights-based, and inclusive principles of education. Learning Managers and facilitators conduct activities aimed to increase stakeholder's awareness and commitment to fundamental rights of children and the basic principle of educating them.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary reports on stakeholders' participation such as Brigada Eskwela, Oplan Balik Eskwela, Enrollment Campaign, WASH, WINS, and other implemented programs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Child Protection Policy Implementation Report o Documentation/ implementation of Child Friendly School System o Additional evidence/s that manifest actual practice of the indicators such as Lesson plans / weekly home learning plans and learning materials integrating child-centered, right-based, and inclusive principles of education 		
	<p>2. Stakeholders begin to practice child/learner-centered principles of education in the design of support to education. Learning managers and facilitators apply the principles in designing learning materials.</p>			
	<p>3. Learning environments, methods and resources are community driven, inclusive and adherent to child's rights and protection requirements. Learning managers and facilitators observe learners' rights</p>			

	from designing the curriculum to structuring the whole learning environment.			
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.	1. Practices, tools and materials for developing self-directed learners are highly observable in school, but not in the home or in the community. Learning programs are designed and developed to produce learners who are responsible and accountable for their learning.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report on the implementation of Independent-Cooperative Learning (ICL) / Parent-Teacher Conference <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Learning Management System o Copy of designed and developed learning programs (Remediation/Intervention Programs/Activities) offered in the school ADM/SLMs 		
	2. Practices, tools and materials for developing self-directed learners are beginning to emerge in the homes and in the community. The program is collaboratively implemented and monitored by teachers and parents to ensure that it produces desired learners.			
	3. There is continuous exchange of information, sharing of			

	expertise and materials among the schools, home and community for the development of self-directed learners. The program is mainstreamed but continuously improved to make relevant to emergent demands.			
Sub-total				
Percentage Weight of Curriculum and Learning (30%)				

C. ACCOUNTABILITY AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT	Indicators	Suggested MOVs	Rating	Remarks
1. Roles and responsibilities of accountable person/s and collective body/ies are clearly defined and agreed upon by community stakeholders.	1. There is an active party that initiates clarification of the roles and responsibilities in education delivery.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of active and recognized organizations (SGC, PTA, Faculty and Employees Association, SSG/SPG, Alumni, BAC and other stakeholders' organization) • Availability of Constitution and By-Laws of the Organizations / Terms of reference indicating specific roles and responsibilities • Any of the following additional documents that manifest actual practices of indicators: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Minutes of the Meeting of the Organizations, Attendance, Pictorial o Signed Memorandum of Agreement/ Memorandum of Understanding with stakeholders o Resolutions 		
	2. The stakeholders are engaged in clarifying and defining their specific roles and responsibilities.			
	3. Shared and participatory processes of determining roles, responsibilities, and accountabilities of stakeholders in managing and			

	supporting education.			
2. Achievement of goals is recognized based on a collaboratively developed performance accountability system; gaps are addressed through appropriate action.	1. Performance accountability is practiced at the school level.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •OPRF and IPCRF (midyear and year-end) results AIP/ BELCP/ (Annual Evaluation) Results •School Report Card •Additional relevant documents that manifest actual practices of indicators such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Narrative/Accomplishment Report, pictorials o Approved and signed minutes of the meeting, attendance and pictorial o Approved resolutions o School PRAISE Committee for recognition and incentive system (guidelines and criteria) 		
	2. A community-level accountability system is evolving from school-led initiatives.			
	3. A community accepted performance accountability, recognition and incentive system is being practiced.			
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.	1. The school articulates the accountability assessment framework with basic components, including implementation guidelines to the stakeholders.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School Report Card • Liquidation Reports • Updated Transparency Board • Any of the following additional documents that manifest actual practices of indicators such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Approved and signed minutes of the meeting, attendance, and pictorial o Accomplishment reports. 		
	2. Stakeholders are engaged in the development and operation of an appropriate accountability assessment system.			
	3. The school community stakeholders continuously and			

	collaboratively review and enhance accountability systems, processes, mechanisms and tools.			
4. Accountability assessment criteria and tools, feedback mechanisms, and information collection and validation techniques and processes are inclusive and collaboratively developed and agreed upon.	1. The school, with the participation of stakeholders, articulates an accountability assessment framework with basic components, including implementation guidelines to the stakeholders.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School M & E evaluation results (SMEA processes and tools) with recommendations and agreements • Feedback mechanism results • Additional documents that manifest the actual practice such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Approved and signed minutes of the meeting, attendance and pictorial o Approved resolutions 		
	2. Stakeholders are engaged in the development and operation of an appropriate accountability assessment system.			
	3. Stakeholders continuously and collaboratively review and enhance accountability systems, processes, mechanisms and tools.			
5. Appropriate assessment tools for teaching and learning are continuously reviewed and improved and	1. School initiates periodic performance assessments with the participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report on the conduct of School Monitoring, Evaluation, Plan and Adjustment (SMEA) Results • Additional documents that manifest the actual 		

assessment results are contextualized to the learner and local situations and the attainment of the relevant life skills.	of stakeholders.	practice such as: o Minutes of the Meeting o Report on identified CIGPs on PPAs for TA (presence of Technical Assistance Plan and M&E Plan) o Technical Assistance accomplishment report		
	2. Collaborative conduct of performance assessment informs planning, plan adjustments and requirements for technical assistance.			
	3. School-community developed performance assessment is practiced and is the basis for improving monitoring and evaluation systems, providing monitoring and evaluation systems, providing technical assistance, and recognizing and refining plans.			
Sub-total				
Percentage Weight of Accountability and Continuous Improvement (25%)				

D. MANAGEMENT OF RESOURCES	Indicators	Suggested MOVs	Rating	Remarks
1. Regular resource inventory is collaboratively undertaken by learning managers,	1. Stakeholders are aware that a regular resource inventory is available and is used as a basis for resource allocation and mobilization.	o Updated inventory of school resources such as the Report on the Physical Count of Property, Plant, and Equipment		

learning facilitators, and community stakeholders as basis for resource allocation and mobilization.	2. Resource inventory is characterized by regularity, increased participation of stakeholders, and communicated to the community as the basis for resource allocation and mobilization.	(RPCPPE) and Report on the Physical Cost Inventories (RPCI)		
	3. Resource inventories are systematically developed and stakeholders are engaged in a collaborative process to make decisions on resource allocation and mobilization.			
2. A regular dialogue for planning and resource programming, that is accessible and inclusive, continuously engage stakeholders and support implementation of community education plans.	1. Stakeholders are invited to participate in the development of an educational plan in resource programming, and in the implementation of the educational plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Documentation in the participation of stakeholders in the Approved ESIP/AIP/ BELCP/APP o Additional documents that manifest the actual practice such as Minutes of the meetings, resolution, and attendance 		
	2. Stakeholders are regularly engaged in the planning and resource programming, and in the implementation of the education plan.			
	3. Stakeholders collaborate to ensure timely and need-based planning and resource programming and support continuous implementation of the education plan.			
3. In place is a community-developed resource management	1. Stakeholders support judicious, appropriate, and effective use of resource.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated MOOE Liquidation Report and School Financial Reports in all activities • 		

system that drives appropriate behaviors of the stakeholders to ensure judicious, appropriate, and effective use of resources.	2. Stakeholders are engaged and share expertise in the collaborative development of resource management system.	Validated and Approved Disbursement report• Inventory of purchased materials• BAC Documents • Minutes of the Meetings• Deed of Donations		
	3. Stakeholders sustain the implementation and improvement of a collaboratively developed, periodically adjusted, and constituent –focused resource management system.			
4. Regular Monitoring, evaluation, and reporting processes of resource management are collaboratively developed and implemented by the learning managers, facilitators and community stakeholders.	1. Stakeholders are invited to participate in the development and implementation of monitoring, evaluation, and reporting processes on resource management.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reports on regular monitoring and evaluation of all assets of the school and audited by stakeholders • Any of the following additional documents such as compliance of audit memorandum observation report, notice of diasallowance (if any), property and accountability clearance (for those who will transfer), and others 		
	2. Stakeholders collaboratively participate in the development and implementation of monitoring, evaluation, and reporting process on resource management.			
	3. Stakeholders are engaged, held accountable and implement a collaboratively developed system of monitoring, evaluation and reporting for resource management.			
5. There is a system that manages the network and	1. An engagement procedure to identify and utilize partnerships with	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation on Network Linkages • Additional 		

linkages, which strengthens and sustains partnerships for improving resource management.	stakeholders for improving resource management is evident.	documents that manifest the actual practice such as: o List of Partners o Report/Status of External Linkages o Memorandum of Agreement is forged between the school and the identified linkages and networks o Stakeholders' appreciation activity/ commendation/ award		
	2. Stakeholders support a system of partnerships for improving resource management.			
	3. An established system of partnership is managed and sustained by the stakeholders for continuous improvement of resource management.			
Sub-total				
Percentage Weight of Management of Resources (15%)				

III. Challenges Encountered in the Implementation of School-Based Management

CURRICULUM VITAE

Personal Information

Date of Birth: July 19, 1985
Place of Birth: Bautista, Pangasinan
Age: 37 years old
Sex: Male
Civil Status: Single
Religion: Catholic
E-mail Address: ritchie.macalanda@deped.gov.ph
Mobile No.: 09999761509



Educational Background

Graduate Studies:

Virgen Milagrosa University Foundation - Graduate School
San Carlos City, Pangasinan
Doctor of Philosophy
Major in Science Education
27 Units

Pangasinan State University- Graduate School
Urdaneta City, Pangasinan
Doctor of Philosophy
Major in Development Studies
Graduated on April 14, 2015

Pangasinan State University- Graduate School
Urdaneta City, Pangasinan
Master of Arts in Education
Major in Science Education
Graduated on April 10, 2014

Pangasinan State University- Graduate School
Urdaneta City, Pangasinan
Master in Development Management
Major in Public Management
Graduated on April 6, 2011

College:

Pangasinan State University- Bayambang Campus
Bayambang, Pangasinan
Bachelor of Secondary Education
Major in Biological Science
Graduated Cum Laude on April 7, 2006
2002-2006

Secondary:

Bautista National High School
Bautista, Pangasinan
Class Salutatorian
1998-2002

Elementary:

Bautista Central School
Bautista, Pangasinan

Outstanding Graduate
1992-1998

Government Examinations

Civil Service Professional (Pursuant to P.D. 907)
Licensure Examination for Teachers (83.80%)
Career Executive Service Written Examination

Employment

Department of Education Region I
Field Technical Assistance Division
Education Program Supervisor
August 3, 2021 - Present

Robert B. Estrella Memorial National High School
Rosales Pangasinan
Principal I
March 22, 2021 – August 2, 2021

Lagasit National High School
San Quintin, Pangasinan
Principal I
August 2, 2019- March 21, 2021

Bautista National High School
Bautista, Pangasinan
Assistant Principal II
June 13, 2016 – August 1, 2019

Bautista National High School
Bautista, Pangasinan
Senior High School Master Teacher II
June 13, 2016 - Present

Bautista National High School
Bautista, Pangasinan
Master Teacher I
January 6, 2014- June 12, 2016

Bautista National High School
Bautista, Pangasinan
Teacher III
November 16, 2011- January 5, 2014

Bautista National High School
Bautista, Pangasinan
Teacher I
August 20, 2009- November 15, 2011

Bautista National High School
Bautista, Pangasinan
Administrative Assistant II
December 10, 2008- August 19, 2009

Bautista National High School

Bautista, Pangasinan
Teacher I - Substitute
June 10, 2008- December 9, 2008

Marianne College of Science and Technology
Bayambang, Pangasinan
Secondary Teacher/ College Instructor
May, 2006- March 30, 2007

Part-time Faculty:
Professor I
Perpetual Help College of Pangasinan
Malasiqui, Pangasinan
June, 2014- Present