# Implementation of School-Based Management as Perceived by the School Governing Council

Naneth R. De Lara[a], Nick C. Pañares[b]

[a] nanethdelara123@gmail.com, [b]nick.pañares@deped.gov.ph
Southern de Oro Philippines College – Graduate School, Cagayan de Oro City, Philippines

## Abstract

School-Based management is a platform for better decision-making in Education. This study focused on finding the level of the School Governing Council's perception of the level of implementation in School-Based Management (SBM), the schools' current SBM level, and the relationship between Pearson r correlation and the level of the School Governing Council's perception on the level on implementation in School-Based Management and the schools' latest SBM level. This study was conducted among the one hundred-five (105) SGC member pupils in schools under West II District, Division of Gingoog City, for the School Year 2022-2023. This study used an adapted and modified 30-item research questionnaire based on the Revised School-Based Management Assessment Tool found in DepEd Order No. 83 s. 2012 while schools' SBM levels were determined by secondary data based on the results of the most recent SBM assessment conducted by the DepEd Regional Office X. The researcher utilized the descriptive–correlational research design. Statistical analyses like mean, standard deviation and Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (r) were employed to analyze the gathered data. Results showed that overall, pupils' perception of the implementation of SBM was to a very high extent. There was a moderately significant relationship between perceived pupils' perception of the implementation of SBM towards actual evaluation results. It recommended that stakeholders may encourage themselves to seek and achieve a high level of accomplishments to reach the pinnacle of SBM implementation, which is the advanced level.

Keywords: School Based Management, School Governing Council, Perceptions

_____

## 1. Introduction

School-Based management is a platform for better decision-making in Education. It empowers individuals on the front lines to make decisions that directly address authentic challenges and issues confronting the school. To strengthen the SBM practices in order to improve SBM practice across the nation, The SBM framework, evaluation, process, and instrument have recently been reviewed by the Department of Education (DepEd). This was done in order to highlight how important it is for students to participate in basic community services. delivery of educational services.

Practice of School-Based Management (SBM) helps to decentralize decision-making and empower schools to govern their own affairs. It entails the administrators, teachers, parents, and community members participating actively in decision-making about various elements of the school's operations. There are some common strategies for evaluating SBM using various approaches and by various stakeholders.

Self-Assessment evaluates the SBM implementation, schools can undertake self-assessment. This entails gathering data on several aspects of school administration, such as governance, curriculum creation, resource allocation, and student results. In conjunction with employees and other stakeholders, the school's leadership team can analyze the data and identify areas of strength and weakness.

External Evaluations objectively assess SBM's effectiveness and can make recommendations for improvement. External evaluators such as government education departments or independent groups can assess the implementation and impact in schools. To collect data, they may utilize a combination of approaches such as interviews, questionnaires, observations, and document reviews.

Moreover, performance indicators assess the progress and efficacy of SBM. Schools might establish performance indicators or benchmarks. Academic accomplishment, attendance rates, student and parent happiness, teacher professional development, and financial management are examples of such indicators. Data collection and analysis against these metrics on a regular basis can assist schools in tracking their performance and identifying opportunities for improvement.

Self-assessment, external evaluation, stakeholder feedback, and performance indicators are used to examine school-based management. Depending on the circumstances, the assessment might be undertaken by the school administration, education authorities, or outside organizations. It is critical to ensure that the evaluation process is complete, transparent and includes the opinions of all important stakeholders.

SBM implementation varies based on the educational system and the school or district's policies. However, at the national or local level, a legal framework or policy is formed to outline the scope, objectives, and procedures for adopting SBM in schools. This framework establishes the boundaries within which schools may function and make decisions. The need for competent school leadership is emphasized by SBM. By empowering teachers, including parents and community members, and leading decision-making processes, school principals and administrators play a critical role in fostering SBM. School Governing Body is a group in charge of making critical decisions about financing, curriculum development, staff employment, and other school policies. Schools have more control over managing their financial resources under SBM. They help to create their own budgets, distributing monies based on their individual requirements and priorities. SBM can modify the curriculum to match the specific requirements of their pupils, offer additional assistance or enrichment programs, and try out new teaching methods. SBM encourages the active participation of parents and community members in decision-making. While SBM gives schools greater autonomy, it also means more accountability. To monitor school progress, evaluation techniques such as performance assessments, standardized examinations, or school inspections may be used.

SBM is used to obtain a better understanding of social and behavioral phenomena, improve decision-making processes, simulate and train in many contexts, and frequently forecast and prepare for the future using modeled behaviors. In training simulations. It can be used to train people in leadership, conflict resolution, and emergency response scenarios.

Furthermore, making decisions at the school fosters success and autonomy. The assumption that effective school functioning and development are characterized by decentralized decision-making is supported by the contemporary approach of today. (Celinmar, 2021). Hence, the call for decentralized education is a fitting reform agenda to maximize the efficient and effective use of government-limited resources. However, there are still concerns among stakeholders about the accountability of teachers for possible abuse or misuse of the autonomy given (Md-Ali & Arsaythamby, 2017).

The lack of understanding among those responsible for SBM's implementation is one of its issues. The School Governing Council (SGC), which serves as the primary SBM implementer, should be actively involved in its implementation and ensure that the processes in the implementation are being followed.

Nevertheless, mechanisms that give schools chance buildings are designed to strengthen the application of SBM by inviting, involving, and influencing school stakeholders to participate in improving the performance of schools. Internal and external stakeholders can meet at the SGC, which was created as a school project. Collaborating to resolve school-related concerns and improve academic performance. It stimulates the involvement of stakeholders, gives locals the right to own the decisions made, and fosters the growth of current school networks.

The School Governance Council Implementation Guidelines require schools to establish School Governing Councils (SGC) by 2022. These guidelines are intended for SGC and will be established as a shared governance structure and feedback mechanism for parents, students, as well as Faculty and staff who are both teaching and non-teaching, local stakeholders, and the School Principal with a forum for discussion and collaboration on continually enhancing learning outcomes, in order to embrace the policy recommendation to institutionalize the SGC and create a greater relationship among stakeholders, which will

help to more effective SBM implementation.

. The SGC partners have a variety of important functions in school governance and management. It helps its partner to create school policies, guidelines, and procedures. They provide feedback, thoughts, and experience on a variety of educational and administrative issues. Their viewpoints aid in ensuring that policies are in line with the needs and expectations of students, parents, faculty, and the greater community. Budget planning, monitoring, and financial oversight may be entrusted to SGC partners. SGC helps to analyze the school's financial documents, ensure transparency, and prioritize budgetary allocations for academic programs, infrastructure development, and other critical areas. It offers assistance and mentoring to school leaders, teachers, and employees. It provides advice, exchange knowledge, and contribute to professional development programs. Overall, SGC partners bring knowledge and community engagement to decision-making processes, schools may play a vital role in good governance and administration.

The researcher seeks to establish the degree to which School-Based Management has been implemented, as determined by the School Governing Council (SGC) and its relationship with the existing SBM level as assessed by DepEd Region X in the West II District of Gingoog City.

This study is guided by Cabardo's (2016) study, which presents how different stakeholders are involved in putting School-Based Management into practice. The framework for evaluating SBM implementation in these areas is provided by this. SBM implementation is evaluated in terms of the attainment of objectives, Participation by members of the school administration committee, as well as involvement in decision-making supported.

SBM's approach is driven by four concepts: management and resources, leadership and governance, curriculum and learning, and accountability for improved learning outcomes (2012). Leadership and governance, curriculum and learning, resource management, and accountability for higher learning results (2012). Empowering schools and stakeholders to participate more actively in the management and decision-making processes of their particular schools is the main objective of school-based management in the Philippines. SBM seeks to decentralize power and resources in order to allowing administrators, teachers, parents, and other community members to participate in school governance and improvement.

## 2. Methodology

This study used a descriptive-correlational design. A correlational design systematically analyzes the nature of the link or associations between and among variables. A descriptive-correlational design, in particular, describes the variables and their naturally occurring correlations (Noah, 2021). It is used to gather quantitative data that can be evaluated to make statistical conclusions about the intended responders. This research design highlights the level of parental participation in terms of decision-making, communication, parenting, volunteering, at-home learning community collaboration, as well as learners' numeracy achievement levels. This descriptive-correlational study utilized questionnaires for survey responses to gather data on the respondents' views on School-Based Management techniques in the respective schools of the respondents and identify its correlation with their performance as SGC members.

To define the study's variables, descriptive statistics like mean and standard deviation were used. A descriptive-correlational design, in particular, describes the variables and their naturally occurring correlations (Noah, 2021). It is used to collect quantitative data that can be analyzed to draw statistical conclusions about the intended respondents. This research design emphasizes the level of SGC officers' participation in terms of parenting, communication, volunteering, learning at home, decision-making, and community collaboration, also the level of numeracy. The link between the study's dependent and independent variables was also determined using Pearson r correlation.

## 3. Results and Discussions

**Problem 1.** What is the level of the School Governing Council's perception of the level of implementation in School-Based Management in terms of the following:

      1.1      Leadership and Governance;
      1.2      Curriculum and Instruction;
      1.3      Accountability and Continuous Improvement; and
      1.4      Management of Resources?

**Table 1**

Level of Implementation of SBM in Terms of Leadership and Governance

| | INDICATORS | Mean | SD | Description | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | In place is a Development Plan developed collaboratively by the stakeholders of the school community. | 4.50 | 0.76 | All the Time | Very High Extent |
| 2. | The development plan (SIP) is regularly reviewed by the school community to keep it responsive and relevant to emerging needs, challenges, and opportunities. | 4.42 | 0.86 | All the Time | Very High Extent |
| 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. | 4.55 | 0.73 | All the Time | Very High Extent |
| 4. | A leadership network facilitates communication between and among school and community leaders to inform decision-making and solving of school-community-wide learning problems. | 4.48 | 0.75 | All the Time | Very High Extent |
| 5. | A long-term program that addresses the training and development needs of school and community leaders is in operation. | 4.46 | 0.72 | All the Time | Very High Extent |
| 6. | Leadership is the willingness and ability to take ownership in a part of an organization and to continually do what is best for the organization. | 4.56 | 0.71 | All the Time | Very High Extent |
| 7. | Effective corporate leaders stand on a foundation of solid governance principles. | 4.63 | 0.59 | All the Time | Very High Extent |
| 8. | Leadership and governance involve ensuring strategic policy frameworks exist and are combined with effective oversight, coalition-building, regulation, attention to system design and accountability. | 4.45 | 0.82 | All the Time | Very High Extent |
| 9. | A leadership network facilitates communication between and among school and community leaders for informed decision-making and solving of school community-wide. | 4.01 | 0.81 | All the Time | High Extent |
| 10. | A network of leadership that provides the vision and direction to the education system making it relevant and responsive to the contexts of diverse. | 4.33 | 0.79 | All the Time | Very High Extent |
| | **Overall Mean** | **4.44** | **0.75** | **All the Time** | **Very High Extent** |

Note:    4.21 – 5.00 Very High   Extent    3.41 – 4.20 High Extent      2.61 - 3.40 Neutral Extent
          1.81 - 2.60Low Extent    1.00 - 1.80 Very Low Extent

       Table 1 on the next page shows the Level of Implementation of SBM in terms of Leadership and Governance. It has an overall Mean of 4.44 with SD =0.75, which is described as a Very High Extent and interpreted as All the Time. This indicates that the respondents or members of the school governing council thought that leadership and governance were implemented to a very high degree in the schools. Given that leadership and governance oversee the execution, they are a critical component in charge of implementing school-based management because they monitor and evaluate all programs and activities carried out in accordance with the SBM program. School-based management, according to Torrevillas (2020), is a

methodical and consistent approach to public education that decentralizes power and decision-making on critical school operations under a centralized framework of objectives, guidelines, policies, curriculum, standards, andand accountability.Hence, leadership and governance have big responsibilities for their consistent and effective implementation.

In the same table, the indicator Effective corporate leaders stand on a foundation of responders stated that having effective and skilled leaders who lead the execution of SBM programs was essential and initiatives form an integral part of its successful campaign. This implies that leaders must possess the necessary leadership skills to ensure that goals and objectives will be achieved. Srivastava (2021) stated that leadership is essential to daily life. Leadership can be employed to create favorable circumstances and experiences, whether at work, at home, with coworkers, or with friends. Effective leaders in the workplace do not necessarily hold managerial roles; instead, they can use their leadership abilities to inspire all of their coworkers to follow their example, boosting morale and improving organizational results. These abilities can help someone become a better worker, colleague, and member of the team. Whatever their job title, a person can advance into a stronger leadership position by demonstrating characteristics that inspire, motivate, and generate great strategy. Effective leadership abilities have the power to transform a whole organization or program.

Meanwhile, the indicator A leadership network enables communication among and between school and community leaders in order to make well-informed choices and solve school-wide problems got the lowest Mean of 4.01 with SD = 0.81 described as All the Time and interpreted as High Extent. This implies that communication forms a key part of the implementation of SBM, especially in ensuring that everyone is informed so that they can perform and comply with their assigned tasks according to what is expected. Oco (2022) claimed that communication lines must be open at all times between school heads, teachers, and the rest of the stakeholders. School personnel and staff should always communicate with stakeholders for a better exchange of ideas that are necessary for the implementation of an activity or program.

Table 2 discloses the level of implementation of SBM in terms of Curriculum and Learning. It has an Overall Mean of 4.41 with SD = 0.78, which is described as All the Time with and interpreted as Very High Extent. This implies that the respondents believed that the schools were able to implement programs and activities on the curriculum and to learn to a very high extent. The teachers and the school personnel make sure that the goals and objectives of DepEd in the delivery of skills and lessons are effective and efficient. Roxas (2022) claimed that to facilitate activities on curriculum and learning the schools and community stakeholders conducts meetings and consultations to make sure that programs formulated and implemented are in response to the needs of the learners as well as the community. In this case, the alignment of goals and aspirations is achieved.

In the same table, the indicator The curriculum provides for the development needs of all types of learners in the school community got the highest Mean of 4.44 with SD = 0.84, which is described as All the Time and interpreted as Very High Extent. This means that the curriculum promotes inclusive education in the learning community. This implies that the respondents believed that the curriculum provided and needed by the learners is the one being implemented by the school. This is important as it will cater to and prepare the learners for the future and needs of the community which further means that as the learners graduates, they will have the opportunity to work and earn a living. Maca (2019) claimed that the beauty of the implementation of SBM is that it promotes programs and innovations that are in response to the current and possibly future needs of society, making the learners relevant to the society as to its knowledge and skills that are being developed. Thus, making it more cohesive and creating a sure and brighter future for the learners and the community as well.

**Table 2**
Level of Implementation of SBM in Terms of Curriculum and Learning

| | INDICATORS | Mean | SD | Description | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | The curriculum provides for the development needs of all types of learners in the school community. | 4.44 | 0.84 | All the Time | Very High Extent |
| 2. | The implemented curriculum is localized to make it more meaningful to the learners and applicable to life in the community. | 4.42 | 0.75 | All the Time | Very High Extent |
| 3. | A representative group of school and community stakeholders develop the methods and materials for developing creative thinking and problem-solving. | 4.42 | 0.81 | All the Time | Very High Extent |
| 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. | 4.42 | 0.68 | All the Time | Very High Extent |
| 5. | Appropriate assessment tools for teaching and learning are continuously reviewed and improved, and assessment results are contextualized to the learner and local situation for the attainment of relevant life skills. | 4.41 | 0.79 | All the Time | Very High Extent |
| 6. | Learning managers and facilitators (Teachers, administrators and community members) nurture values and environments that are protective of all children and demonstrate behaviors consistent to the organization's VMG. | 4.40 | 0.74 | All the Time | Very High Extent |
| 7. | Methods and resources are learner and community friendly, enjoyable, safe, inclusive, accessible, and aimed at developing self-directed learners. | 4.36 | 0.72 | All the Time | Very High Extent |
| 8. | Learners are equipped with essential knowledge, skills, and values to assume responsibility and accountability for their learning. | 4.38 | 0.78 | All the Time | Very High Extent |
| 9. | Contextualizing the curriculum can help students to develop critical thinking skills. | 4.40 | 0.86 | All the Time | Very High Extent |
| 10. | Teachers can help students see how the information they are learning applies to their lives. | 4.41 | 0.86 | All the Time | Very High Extent |
| | **Overall Mean** | **4.41** | **0.78** | **All the Time** | **Very High Extent** |

Note: 4.21 – 5.00 Very High Extent     3.41 – 4.20 High Extent  2.61 - 3.40 Neutral Extent
1.81 - 2.60 Low Extent    1.00 - 1.80 Very Low Extent

Meanwhile, the indicator Methods and resources are learners and community friendly, enjoyable, safe, inclusive, accessible, and aimed at developing self-directed learners got the lowest Mean of 4.36 with SD = 0.72, which is described as All the Time and interpreted as Very High Extent. This means that the respondents believed that the school was able to provide resources like books, modules, and other learning materials that allow learners to connect with their community and prepare and develop them to become independent learners as they proceed to much higher levels of their learning and studies. Oco and Comahig (2023) express that strategies and remedial activities given to learners are being considered before it was implemented to them. This includes their strengths and weaknesses in their academics, available facilities, and even the ability of technology that will aid them in their studies. These factors are important as it ensures that all parties are recognized and given accurate considerations.

Table 3 on the next page illustrates the level of implementation of SBM in terms of Accountability and Continuous Improvement. It has an Overall Mean of 4.41 with SD = 0.77,which is described as  Very High Extent and interpreted as  All the Time. This means that the respondents believed that the school through the implementation of SBM has been able to implement programs under accountability and continuous improvement to a very high extent.

Administrative accountability based on student outcomes and school process measures presents an alternative to complement other accountability mechanisms. Standardized measures of performance used for administrative accountability can better align curriculum with state standards, improve quality, and signal the skills that society wishes for students to build. However, they can be counterproductive if they are not reliable, valid, or comprehensive.

**Table 3**
Level of Implementation of SBM in Terms of Accountability and Continuous Improvement

| INDICATORS | Mean | SD | Description | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Roles and responsibilities of accountable person/s and collective body/ies are clearly defined and agreed upon by community stakeholders. | 4.40 | 0.72 | All the Time | Very High Extent |
| 2. Achievement of goals is recognized based on a collaboratively developed performance accountability system; gaps are addressed through appropriate action. | 4.40 | 0.79 | All the Time | Very High Extent |
| 3. The accountability system that is owned by the community is continuously enhanced to ensure that management structures and mechanisms are responsive to the emerging learning needs and demands of the community. | 4.40 | 0.73 | All the Time | Very High Extent |
| 4. Accountability assessment criteria and tools, feedback mechanisms, information collection and validation techniques, and processes are inclusive, collaboratively developed, and agreed upon. | 4.40 | 0.79 | All the Time | Very High Extent |
| 5. Participatory assessment of performance is done regularly with the community. Assessment results and lessons learned to serve as a basis for feedback, technical assistance, recognition, and plan adjustment. | 4.40 | 0.79 | All the Time | Very High Extent |
| 6. Promotes cooperative work among instructional leaders and classroom teachers. | 4.41 | 0.88 | All the Time | Very High Extent |
| 7. Accountable on the roles of teachers in teaching instruction. | 4.40 | 0.72 | All the Time | Very High Extent |
| 8. Promote shared instructional decisions. | 4.40 | 0.71 | All the Time | Very High Extent |
| 9. Involves teachers in the planning and preparation of the delivery of classroom lessons. | 4.40 | 0.77 | All the Time | Very High Extent |
| 10. Sets up specific sessions with the teachers to discuss curriculum implementation. | 4.39 | 0.76 | All the Time | Very High Extent |
| **Overall Mean** | **4.41** | **0.77** | **All the Time** | **Very High Extent** |

Note:      4.21 – 5.00  Very High Extent        3.41 – 4.20 High Extent            2.61 - 3.40 Neutral Extent
             1.81 - 2.60   Low Extent   1.00 - 1.80 Very Low Extent

They suggest that no measure is perfect and that the usefulness of test-based accountability depends on whether the measures enhance educational opportunities and reflect shared goals with reliability, validity, and comprehensiveness ( Loeb & Byun, 2019). Accountability showcases the responsibility and duties of each member, while continuous improvement is about improving the currently implemented programs. Being accountable means that each team member or group has a chance to contribute meaningfully and is responsible for ensuring the success of programs and activities will be fruitful.

Oco (2022) claimed that SBM is about being able to tap all members of society to contribute or provide help and assistance voluntarily. This will allow all stakeholders to think of their responsibility and act for the good of the school and the community. Moreover, Kenton (2022) claimed that accountability is taking ownership of one's duty to act in an honest and moral manner toward others. Accountability includes the company's shareholders, staff, and the larger community in which it conducts business. Accountability in a broader sense is a readiness to be evaluated on performance. Thus, shared responsibility can greatly impact whatever programs are being implemented.

Meanwhile, Catid (2022) stated that using many inputs and processes to attain desired results is the

goal of continuous improvement. To make the service or program more effective and efficient, there is always potential for improvement. All persons involved should be open to suggestions and criticisms for betterment and success. Thus, in every program or activity being implemented, it must be continuously monitored so that it will be improved on its next phase of implementation. Oco et al. (2022) stated that teachers' satisfaction is not just about accomplishing something but about being able to take part in making sure that a program or activity is continuously improved and innovated so that it will become more effective and efficient as to its intention, purpose and targeted outcomes.

In the same table, the indicator Promotes cooperative work among instructional leaders and classroom teachers got the lowest Mean of 4.41 with SD = 0.88, which is described as All the Time and interpreted as Very High Extent. This means that the school has strong partnerships with leaders and teachers in developing instructional materials suited for the learner's needs and in improving the teaching capabilities that will allow them to adjust to the current teaching and learning setting and environment. Kenton (2022) noted that cooperation between teachers, school heads, and stakeholders allows them to come up with the best plans and ideas that will aid the learners and the community. They were able to create materials that are innovative at the same time linked to the community's needs and resources.

Meanwhile, the indicator Sets up specific sessions with the teachers to discuss curriculum implementation got the lowest Mean of 4.39 with SD = 0.76, which is described as All the Time and interpreted as Very High Extent. This means that the school was able to determine the strengths, weaknesses, and threats of the school and carefully formulated a series of activities and pieces of training to continuously improve the implementation of the curriculum. The SGC and other organized groups in school usually have meetings and conferences to discuss different matters concerning the needs of the school, teachers, and learners that can be aided by stakeholders for enhancement and better implementation and execution. Catid (2022) expressed that brainstorming and meetings must be done to ensure that all persons involved can express their thoughts and opinions so that the final output is based on the problems and challenges at hand and it will surely enhance it to become part of the potentials and strengths rather than a problem.

Table 4 discloses the SBM implementation level in terms of resource management. It has an Overall Mean of 4.39 with SD = 0.76, which is described as All the Time and interpreted as Very High Extent. Moreover, all the indicators are rated to a very high extent. This means that the schools were able to implement programs and activities on the management of resources at very high extent. Managing resources is important as these resources can be enough or not sufficient for the needs of the school operations. There are also needed resources that surface during the school year that are originally not supposed to be part of the plans. Planning, scheduling, and allocating people, money, and technology to a project or program are all examples of resource management. In essence, it involves allocating resources to maximize organizational value. When resources are managed effectively, the appropriate resources are made accessible at the appropriate time for the appropriate work (Townsend, 2022).

In the same table, the indicator Capitalize the expertise of teachers to share supervisory knowledge, skills, and information, The highest Mean of 4.41 with SD = 0.80, which is characterized as All the Time with the meaning of Very High Extent, was obtained. This means that the schools highlight the instructors' innovativeness and initiatives in combating issues and concerns related to the obstacles they face. learners. As observed, in SBM Management, there is collaboration or teamwork so that whatever plan of activities is known to everybody. This also manifests that school heads are open to suggestions for the betterment of the entire school community.

According to Glover and Levacic (2020), Resource management is a key responsibility for educational institutions and their administrators, but it is one for which they are frequently ill-equipped. Good contextual knowledge and assistance are essential, particularly in light of the increased pressure that increased marketization, worldwide comparison, and decentralized governance place on leaders to manage their resources wisely. The work examines by presenting a complete overview of financial and resource management in the public and private sectors, standards by which the efficacy, efficiency, and equity of the

administration of educational resources may be evaluated. The book then discusses cost structures, budgeting, and asset management foundations. After providing a detailed review of funding and resource management in the public and private sectors, the efficacy, efficiency, and equity of educational resource administration can be assessed. These topics are all showed using case studies that draw on the experiences of practitioners and the writers' observations in various national contexts.

**Table 4**
Level of Implementation of SBM in Terms of Management of Resources

| | INDICATORS | Mean | SD | Description | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Regular resource inventory is collaboratively undertaken by learning managers, learning facilitators, and community stakeholders as the basis for resource allocation and mobilization. | 4.40 | 0.84 | All the Time | Very High Extent |
| 2. | There is a regular dialogue for planning and resource programming that is accessible and inclusive to continuously engage stakeholders and support the implementation of the community education plan. | 4.40 | 0.77 | All the Time | Very High Extent |
| 3. | There is in place a community-developed resource management system that drives appropriate behaviors of the stakeholders to ensure judicious, appropriate, and effective use of resources. | 4.40 | 0.71 | All the Time | Very High Extent |
| 4. | Regular monitoring, evaluation, and reporting process of resource management are collaboratively developed and jointly implemented by the learning managers, facilitators, and community stakeholders. | 4.40 | 0.69 | All the Time | Very High Extent |
| 5. | There is a system that manages the network and linkages that strengthen and sustain partnerships for improving resource management. | 4.40 | 0.80 | All the Time | Very High Extent |
| 6. | Focuses on teacher's knowledge, skills and ability towards curriculum improvement and staff development. | 4.40 | 0.81 | All the Time | Very High Extent |
| 7. | Improves instructional practices, student achievement and classroom management. | 4.40 | 0.72 | All the Time | Very High Extent |
| 8. | Capitalize the expertise of teachers to share supervisory knowledge, skills, and information. | 4.41 | 0.80 | All the Time | Very High Extent |
| 9. | Considers the specific needs and developmental stages of individual teachers. | 4.40 | 0.71 | All the Time | Very High Extent |
| 10. | Analyses and makes judgments about teacher's instructional efficiency and effectiveness. | 4.39 | 0.70 | All the Time | Very High Extent |
| | **Overall** | **4.39** | **0.76** | **All the Time** | **Very High Extent** |

**Note**:     4.21 – 5.00 Very High Extent          3.41 – 4.20 High Extent                    2.61 - 3.40 Neutral Extent
            1.81 - 2.60  Low Extent  1.00 - 1.80 Very Low Extent

Meanwhile, the indicator Analyses and makes judgments about *teachers'* instructional efficiency and effectiveness got the lowest Mean of 4.39 with SD = 0.70, which is described as All the Time and interpreted as Very High Extent. This means that the SGC members make analyses and interpretations of the gathered data before making decisions so that whatever plan of action is for the benefit of improving services and facilities as well. This implies that members of SGC entrusted the responsibility for teachers' instructional efficiency and effectiveness to the school heads and educational leaders. Townsend (2022) claimed that decisions and innovations to be made must be backed up with results and deep analysis so that it will be more advantageous compared to how it was first implemented. This means that loopholes were addressed in its continuous implementations. Moreover, Oco (2022) claimed that leaders or managers conduct conventions to discuss observations and data gathered as to the effectiveness and efficiency of all the programs and activities that were launched and implemented. This is to ensure that adjustments will be made so that resources are fully utilized and whatever is lacking will be attended to and appropriately addressed to avoid a negative

impact on the program and the beneficiaries.

**Table 5**
Overall Level of Implementation of SBM

| Variables | Mean | SD | Description | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Leadership and Management | 4.44 | 0.75 | All the Time | Very High Extent |
| Curriculum and Instruction | 4.41 | 0.78 | All the Time | Very High Extent |
| Accountability and Continuous Improvement | 4.41 | 0.77 | All the Time | Very High Extent |
| Management of Resources | 4.39 | 0.76 | All the Time | Very High Extent |
| Overall Mean | 4.41 | 0.77 | **All the Time** | **Very High Extent** |

Note:    4.21 – 5.00    Very High Extent          3.41 – 4.20 High Extent          2.61 - 3.40 Neutral Extent
            1.81 - 2.60    Low Extent                   1.00 - 1.80 Very Low Extent

Table 5 shows the Overall Level of SBM Implementation. It has an overall Mean of 4.41 with SD = 0.77, which is described as All the Time and interpreted as a Very High Extent. This demonstrates how respondents evaluate the use of SBM in schools to an extremely high extent. All the programs and projects implemented were exhausted to their full advantage and used for the benefit of the learners and even the participants in the schools. According to Oco (2022), SBM is important and serves as a showcase for the school's overall achievement. Additionally, it demonstrates how the school interacts with and collaborates with the community and its stakeholders. SBM definitely boosts camaraderie and shared responsibilities between the school and the community in ensuring the learners' better future. Moreover, Catid (2022) claimed that leadership styles not just from the school heads but even from the members are key to the successful implementation of SBM. Thus, members must be chosen according to their expertise and skills as to where they should be assigned and what are their functions.

In the same table, the variable leadership and management got the highest Mean of 4.44 with SD= 0.75, which is described as All the Time and interpreted Very High Extent. This means that in order for the implementation of SBM to be successful, effective and efficient leaders and managers must be tapped and assigned to manage the members and volunteers. These individuals will ensure the programs in question's success. Catid (2022) underlined that some people are born to be leaders. Despite not having had the required training, they are capable and have a wide range of potential. Consequently, they ought to give the chance to exercise it. Naturally, good leaders are good managers too.

Meanwhile, the variable management of resources got the lowest mean of 4.39 with SD = 0.76, which is described as All the Time and interpreted as Very High Extent. This means that if there is an area that needs to improve more, it is in the area of managing resources. In public schools, the needs always overcome the available funds. Thus, schools need to partner with various industries and sectors to fill in the gaps. Maca (2019) stressed that managing resources must be carefully and consistently done to ensure that the implementation of programs and projects is not just active in its launching stage but will sustain in all of its stages of implementation. Mismanaging of resources can have negative effects on the learning environment therefore, it must be monitored and carefully executed.

**Problem 2.** What is the schools' latest SBM level?

Table 6 exhibits the Schools' Latest or Actual SBM Implementation Level. It registered that 58.10% of the schools are at a maturing level while 41.90% of the schools are at a developing level. This indicates that SBM implementation was at a mature level as seen by the most recent results. It follows that the institution is can now accept the challenge of reaching the highest level which is the advanced or accredited level. Dela Fuente (2020) stated that schools and even The Department of Education recognized the benefits and

possibilities of implementing SBM, and as a result, the degree of implementation was raised significantly. DepEd even requests that the national government advocate for an additional money to support the school's ongoing efforts and SBM implementation operations. Furthermore, Camacho and Farrales (2020) asserted that more schools nationwide are now participating in the evaluation process by asking their division office to assess where they stand with SBM implementation and what is required to pass levels I, II, or III.

**Table 6**
*Schools' Latest or Actual* SBM Implementation Level

| SBM Level | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| 2.5 – 3.5 (Advanced/Accredited) | 0 | 0.00 |
| 1.5 – 2.4 (Maturing) | 61 | 58.10 |
| 0.5 – 1.4 (Developing) | 44 | 41.90 |
| **TOTAL** | **105** | **100.00** |

**Note:**   2.50 – 3.00 Advanced/Accredited         1.50 – 2.49 Maturing  0.50 – 1.49 Developing

**Problem 3.** Is there a significant relationship between the level of the School Governing Council's perception of the level of implementation in School-Based Management and the schools' latest SBM level?

**Table 7**
Test Correlation of Perceived Level of Implementation of SBM and Actual SBM Level

| Implementation of SBM | SBM Level results | | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|
| | r | P | |
| Leadership and Management | 0.724 | 0.001* | Significant |
| Curriculum and Instruction | 0.625 | 0.001* | Significant |
| Accountability and Continuous Improvement | 0.721 | 0.001* | Significant |
| Management of Resources | 0.625 | 0.001* | Significant |

**Legend**: r = correlation coefficient; P = probability value; * = Significant at 0 .05 level

Table 7 reveals the Test Correlation between the Perceived Level of Implementation of SBM and Actual SBM Level results. For leadership and management perceptions and actual SBM level results it registered an r-value of 0.724 and p-value of 0.001, which is less than the threshold of significance of 0.05. This implies that a meaningful partnership was registered between the two variables and the null hypothesis is rejected. Furthermore, leadership and management have a significant relation to the overall level of SBM. Thus, it must be given attention and importance. Catid (2022) and Oco (2022) both recognized the importance and impact of leadership and management in the successful implementation of SBM. Moreover, both researchers also commended the participation of all stakeholders to make sure that programs and activities are properly crafted, enhanced, and fully implemented.

For curriculum and instructions and actual SBM level results, it registered an r-value of 0.625 and a lower than the threshold of significance of 0.05, with a p-value of 0.001. The implication here is that a crucial partnership This means that a significant relationship was registered between the two variables, and the null hypothesis was rejected. Furthermore, curriculum and instruction have a significant relation to the overall level of SBM.

For accountability and continuous improvement and actual SBM level results it registered an r-value of 0.721 and p-value of 0.001 which is lower than the critical value of 0.05 level of significance. This means that a significant relationship was registered between the two variables and the null hypothesis is rejected.

Furthermore, The overall degree of SBM is significantly correlated with accountability and ongoing development. As a result, it demands consideration and importance. Bustamante (2022) asserted that the adoption of SBM has meaningful and outstanding accomplishments were achieved especially in making available resources that will aid the teachers and even the learners in their teaching and learning activities. Thus, it is just fitting to continue its implementation with proper and more accurate improvements.

For management of resources and actual SBM level results, it registered an r-value of 0.625 and p-value of 0.001, which is lower than the critical value of 0.05 level of significance. This means that a significant relationship was registered between the two variables, and the null hypothesis is rejected. Furthermore, The total level of SBM is strongly correlated with the management of resources. As a result, it demands consideration and importance. Ballarta et al. (2022) asserted that resource management was correlated to the better implementation of SBM. The researchers observed that it also promoted better transparency wherein stakeholders were able to view the expenditures and purchases of the school, allowing them to have ideas on the things to do in order to address challenges that surfaced during the implementations of the programs that were naturally not expected to be of importance.

## 4. Conclusions and Recommendations

Based on the outcomes of this investigation, the following conclusions were drawn.

1. The overall impression of SBM implementation among SGC members was Very positive. Leadership and management are rated as the most important variables. As a result, SBM is essential in educational activities. To secure the learners' better future, schools, stakeholders, and the community should coordinate responsibilities.

2. Actual evaluations of the implementation of SBM revealed that the schools were at a maturing level while others are at a developing level. Therefore, schools and stakeholders should give more efforts to achieve advanced accreditation levels.

3. SGC members' perceptions and results of evaluation registered a positive relationship. A positive mindset can lead to achieving difficult or challenging things, as people with this kind of thought will not easily give up on their goals and objectives.

The following recommendations are made based on the study's results and conclusions hereby may:

1. The school may improve its activities and programs through transparency and by allowing them to share ideas to address the doubts and questions of the stakeholders. Management of resources must be taken cared of to prioritize projects needed to be taken for the improvement of the school.

2. School administrators, teachers, pupils, and stakeholders may seek a higher level of accomplishments and continue to challenge themselves to reach the pinnacle of SBM implementation, which is the advance or accreditation level.

3. School administrators, teachers, pupils, and stakeholders may conduct benchmarking to schools from neighboring divisions to have ideas on how they achieve greater results in the implementation of SBM and reflect on what they can do more.

## REFERENCES

Ballarta, Liezel V., Carolyn M. Illescas, David R. Perez, Lovina A. Hamora, & Lovina A. Hamora. (2022). School-Based Management Level of Practice in Selected Public Elementary Schools in Mimaropa Region, Philippines. Journal of Pedagogical Inventions and Practices, 8, 134–146. Retrieved from https://zienjournals.com/index.php/jpip/article/view/1672

Bentor, Claire Theresa S., Hermalin N. Tapayan*, Francisco M. Ebio, Jr. (2016). Impact Of School-Based Management Level Of Practices Amongsecondary School Implementing Units On The K To 12 Programimplementation In Leyte Division, Philippines. www.ijesrt.com

Bustamante, J. D. (2022). School-Based Management (SBM) Practices and Effective School Performance. doi:.10.47119/IJRP1001041720223507

Camacho, R., Farrales, S. (2020). School-Based Management Validation of Schools. https://deped-olongapo.com/

Catid, M. (2022). Leadership practices: impact on brigadaeskwela level of implementation. DOI: 10.47119/IJRP100971320222973

Conklin, A. (2022, July 29). Comparing Curriculum and Instruction. Video Article. Retrieved on December 30, 2022 from https://study.com/academy/lesson/what-is-curriculum-instruction.html

Daniels, D., McBrayer, J. S., Griffin, M., Norman, T. Pannell, S. & Fallon, K. (2021). School Leaders' and Teachers' Preparedness for the Online K-12 Setting: Student Learning and Engagement, Curriculum and Instruction, and Data-Driven Decision-Making. Journal of Online Learning Research: 7(3), 269-291.

Daniels, E., Hondeghem, A. &Dochy, F. (2019). A review on leadership and leadership development in educational settings. Educational Research Review: 27(1), 110-125.

Dela Fuente, J. K. (2020). The Importance of a School-Based Management System (SBM). https://www.teacherph.com/

Department of Education. (2016). Basic education sector reform agenda (2016-2017).National Education for AllCommittee (NEC).

Department of Education(2017). School-based management: a manual in theassessmentofschool-basedmanagementpractices. PasigCity: TechnicalWorking Group, Basic Education Sector Reform Agenda (BESRA).

DepEd Order No. 83 s. 2012. Implementing Guidelines on the Revised School-Based Management (SBM) Framework, Assessment Process and Tool (APAT)

Ehren, M., Paterson, A. & Baxter, J. (2019). Accountability and trust: Two sides of the same coin?

Glover, D. &Levacic, R. (2020). Educational Resource Management: An International Perspective. Second Edition. UCL Press: United Kingdom.

Hanson, M. (2017). Educational decentralization: issues and challenges. Santiago,Chile: Program to Promote Educational Reform.Human Development Network. (2016). In search of a human face.

Kemal, I., Suryadi, Rosyidi, U. (2019). Management of Lecturers Resource Development at Higher Education. International Journal of Higher Education: 8(5), 246-256.

Kenton, W. (2022). Accountability: Definition, Types, Benefits, and Example. https://www.investopedia.com/terms/a/accountability.asp

Hoole, C. (2018). Leadership and Governance in a City-Regional Context: A Case Study of Doncaster. Dissertation: The University of Sheffield, England.

Lagrisola, V. (2019). Implication of Action Research and Individual Performance Commitment Review Form (IPCRF) on the Performance Rating of Public Elementary and Secondary School Teachers in the Division of Laguna. Ascendens Asia Journal of Multidisciplinary Research: 3(2), 34-42.

Loeb, S. & Byun, E. (2019). Testing, Accountability, and School Improvement. The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science: 683(1), 94-109.

Luz, J. M. (2019). The challenge of governance in a large bureaucracy (Department ofEducation): linking governance to performance in an under-performing sector.Philippine HDN(Human Development Network) Report 2008-09.Medium Term Philippine Development Plan 2004-2005.

Macquel, S. M., Salleh, U. K. M. &Zulnaidi, H. Assessing Prospective Teachers' Soft Skills Curriculum Implementation: Effects on Teaching Practicum Success. South African Journal of Education: 41(3), 1-21.

Martin, M. (2019). The implementation of school-based management in public elementary schools. Asian Journal of Assessment in Teaching and Learning: 9(1), 44–56.

Maca, M. (2019). School-Based Management in the Philippines: Fostering Innovations in the Public Education System. www. Researcgate.net

Md-Ali, R., Veloo, A. (2017). Teachers' Autonomy and Accountability in Assessing Students' Physical Education in School-Based Assessment. In: Amzat, I., Valdez, N. (eds) Teacher Empowerment Toward Professional Development and Practices. Springer, Singapore.

Moschella, L. (2020, August 18). Lessons in Leadership and Governance: Structures and Commitments for Scaling Regional College and Career Pathways Systems. Jobs for the Future. Retrieved on December 30, 2022 from https://glccpp.com/

Oco, R. M. (2022). Level Of Job Satisfaction Of Public High School Teachers: A Survey. Doi:10.47119/IJRP100951220222888. https://www.ijrp.org/paper-detail/2845

Oco, R. M., Jaudian, E.P., Janubas, C.E.G. (2022). Job Satisfaction and Performance of Junior High School Teachers. International Journal of Advanced Research (IJAR). Doi: 10.21474/IJAR01/14364

Oco, R. M. (2022). Leadership Styles of School Heads and Its Relationship to School Performance. Global Scientific Journals. Eoi     : 10.11216/gsj.2022.01.57744

Oco, R. M., and Comahig, A. G. (2023). Synchronous, Asynchronous and Modular Distance Learning: Effects on Students' Mathematics Performance. Asian Research Journal of Mathematics, 19(6), 84–102. https://doi.org/10.9734/arjom/2023/v19i6669

Oyetoro, O. S. & Kareem, A. O. (2022). Pre-Service Teachers' Metaphors of the Relationship between Curriculum and Instruction. International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction: 14(2), 1392-1418.

Özgenel, M. & Özkan, P. (2019). The Role of Teacher Performance in School Effectiveness. International Journal of Education Technology and Scientific Researches: 4(10), 417-434.

Paletta, A. (2019). How do school leaders respond to the growing intrusiveness of accountability policies? Evidence from Italy. Journal of Educational Administration and History: 51(4), 381-401.

Pansiri, N. O., Ugwu, C. I. &Maundeni, W. B. (2021). The Theoretical Analysis of Ethical Leadership Lapses: A Disturbing Concern about School Leadership in Botswana. Educational Research and Reviews: 16(8), 372-281.

Roxas, R. (2022). KASAPI: Knowledge And Skills Amid Pandemic Innovation: Impact On Students' Level Of Skills And Performance. www.globalscientificjournal.com

Setoaba, M. P. (2020). School-Based Management Practices at Secondary Schools in the Limpopo Province, South Africa. University of South Africa Institutional Repository.

Srivastava, Y. (2021). A Guide To Becoming An Effective Leader. https://www.betterup.com/blog/a-guide-to-becoming-an-effective-leader

Torrevillas, A. (2020). School Based Management (Sbm) As Correlates To Academic Performance Of Secondary Schools In Quezon City. https://research-manila.letran.edu.ph/article/162

Townsend, S. (2022). What Is Resource Management? https://www.planview.com/