

Impact Of School-Based Management (SBM) Implementation on School's Practices and Performance: Addressing Gaps in The Implementation

LURY FEL M. TORREGOSA

Department of Education
Schools Division of Zamboanga del Norte
Ubay National High School
luryfel85@gmail.com

Abstract — Objective: In this study, the researcher investigated the impact of School-Based Management (SBM) implementation on schools' practices and performance to distinguish the gaps in the implementation and present practical ways to address the gaps. Method: The participants filled out the School-Based Management (SBM) Level of Implementation survey and School Survey of Practices Associated with High Performance. The School Performance survey was also filled out by the school heads. Results: The participants ratings showed significant similarities as School-Based Management (SBM) Level of Implementation and Schools' Performance were equally perceived as maturing. In contrast, Schools' Practices were viewed as highly practiced. Conclusions: School-Based Management implementation has a slight impact on schools' practice and moderate impact on schools' performance. It concluded further that an advanced implementation of School-Based Management would result to productive schools' practices and enhanced schools' performance. Further research is advocated to probe the effect of School-Based Management implementation in the grounds of school management and learning efficacy.

Keywords — *Decentralization, Impact, and Implementation*

I. Introduction

The Philippine education system is continually changing as the drive to improve learning results grows in response to rapid societal change. The Department of Education (DepEd) has acknowledged the existence of the K to 12 Program, which is the answer of the country to the current need in education both in local and global settings. Despite the challenging situation, schools around the country are undergoing significant modifications and development to satisfy the demands of a more advanced educational system. To empower all teachers and stakeholders in promoting quality education, School-Based Management has been implemented in the country.

Under Republic Act 9155, School-Based Management is an educational management method that encourages shared governance in the educational system (Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001). The idea of shared governance acknowledges that each department within the education administration has a responsibility, duty, and obligation that are fundamental to the

position and for which it is largely accountable for results. The passage of Republic Act 9155 (An Act Establishing a Framework of Governance for Basic Education, Establishing Authority and Accountability, Renaming the Department of Education, Culture, and Sports as the Department of Education, and for Other Purposes) in 2011 gave decentralization legal cover (Abulencia, 2012).

Decentralization involves the transferring of authority, responsibility, and accountability to schools, which serve as the delivery system's grassroots. Decentralization of the educational system is promoted to achieve equity and quality. The student participation rate is used to measure equity because of decentralization. The average involvement rate in our country is already high. All Filipino students are entitled to free education under the 1987 Constitution. On the other side, the issue of quality education is evaluated in terms of student learning achievement, both in terms of the depth and quality of the instruction.

This research will aid in comprehending the importance of School-Based Management in assuring efficient and effective school management practices and improving school performance in terms of learning outcomes, particularly during this pandemic period. As a result, the research would address the gaps in the implementation of School-Based Management.

The existence of School-Based Management in public education empowers schools to make decisions and implement measures essential to the realization of school operations related to curriculum, personnel, and finance with the collaboration of internal and external stakeholders and the entire community, who are given authority to monitor and evaluate the progress of the schools' programs, projects, and activities.

School-Based Management with Quality Assurance is a proactive intervention management strategy that schools can use to leverage the participation of all stakeholders and intensify the school's operations in terms of improving learning outcomes, equipping teachers for innovative teaching approaches, and strengthening community links, all of which can greatly improve the quality of education.

School-Based Management was intended to improve transparency and accountability through the practice of annual implementation plans and school report cards, as well as by authorizing the school community to recognize educational urgencies and allocate funds for those goals from the school's operational and maintenance budgets (such as curriculum development programs). However, the SBM program made no specific assumptions about the time period in which student success increases were anticipated to occur.

To improve academic-related outcomes, the school heads must empower the teachers and provide students opportunities to own their privileges to safety, health, and recreation. SBM envisions empowered schools, proactive school leaders, creative educators, involved community stakeholders, and enhanced academic and psychosocial development for students. These are all congruent with the goal of the Department of Education for public schools in the country. This is the fundamental idea behind School-Based Management (SBM), a method that opens the path for

the all-inclusive development of schoolchildren and high-quality education. To ensure an efficient SBM implementation, schools can innovate activities such as educational campaign and social consciousness advocacies that promote awareness on shared governance and initiate strengthened engagement of all key stakeholders in creating a healthier and more productive learning environment which can immensely improve the quality of institutional governance, curriculum implementation, resource outputs, and students' learning outcomes.

The study then targets to discover the impact of SBM implementation on schools' practices and performance and suggest measures to address the gaps in the SBM implementation reflected in the schools' level of practice.

Literature Review

Development of School-Based Management Concept

Implementation of the Governance of Basic Education Act 2001 (RA 9155) provided the mandate to decentralize the school governance system and recognized the role of local government units and other stakeholders as partners in the delivery of educational services. As a result, in 2005 the Department launched the Schools First Initiative (SFI) to empower the school and its community stakeholders to effectively address access and quality issues in basic education (DepEd Order No.83,s. 2012).

In 2006, a broader package of policy reforms called the Basic Education Sector Reform Agenda (BESRA) was launched to maintain and expand SFI's achievements through SchoolBased Management (SBM). Along with teacher education development, national learning strategies, quality assurance, monitoring and evaluation, and organizational development, SBM has been identified as one of the Key Reform Focuses (KRFs) intended to bring about improvements at school level (DepEd Order No.83,s. 2012).

As such, several supporting policies for SBM have been formulated, including the establishment of a School Governing Council (SGC); conducting practice level assessment; School Improvement Planning (SIP); and reporting of achievement through School Report Cards (SRCs). These policies were supported by a budget line in the General Appropriateness Act (GAA) for the installation of SBMs in all primary and secondary public schools (DepEd Order No.83,s. 2012).

SBM and Educational Reform in the Philippines

In the Philippines, the current SBM model evolved into a hybrid form of school head empowerment in tandem with parent-teachers-community association (PTCA) and re-branded as a 'school governing council' (World Bank, 2016). This new governing body anticipated to carry out the duties of comparable organizations present in developed countries. It was with the help of the Australian government that SBM was introduced through the BEAM Program (Kadtong et. al.,2016)

School autonomy and local accountability are the underlying features defining school-based management. Autonomy is the capacity for educational institutions to make decisions on their own. Accountability usually stems in SBM from a higher level of participation from the community, usually through a school committee which includes school level administrators, parents, and teachers as members (World Bank, 2013). In an influential recent book (Bruns, Filmer and Patrinos, 2011), the authors describe possible areas of decision making decentralized to the school level. The list includes topics ranging from monitoring of student performance to the hiring and firing of teachers. Decisions can cover various pedagogical and administrative tasks. The school may be able to take decisions regarding the curriculum and the monitoring of teacher performance and the school may be able to allocate its own budget, and in some cases, even hire and fire teachers. Variations in the areas of decision making delegated to the school, and the degree of autonomy provided for those decisions are two of the inputs into a typology of school-based management (Bruns, Filmer and Patrinos, 2011).

Decentralizing decision-making to the school level is anticipated to boost academic achievement at each institution and, as a result, the effectiveness of the entire educational system. SBM is expected to lead to performance improvement because it refines and simplifies governance arrangements for service delivery – “By giving a voice and decision-making power to local stakeholders who know more about local needs than central policy makers do, it is argued that SBM will improve education outcomes...” (Bruns, Filmer and Patrinos, 2011). Bruns et.al. explained in detail the ‘SBM results chain’ between implementation of SBM and school performance. The increased participation of local stakeholders is expected to lead to greater transparency and effectiveness in the use of resources at the school level. There is an ‘increased understanding of the rules of the game.’ With better planning and performance measurement and monitoring to go with resources, the school would likely have more open and welcoming environments for all the actors. The services delivered of the school would then be of a higher quality, resulting in improvement in educational indicators such as lower repetition and drop-out and better test scores. The literature makes a difference between weak and strong forms of SBM, with stronger forms taken to mean greater decision-making authority at the school level (World Bank, 2013).

The Republic Act 9155 of 2001 regarding the governance of basic education in the Philippines sets out the roles and responsibilities of various administrative levels from the central to the school level (DepEd Order No.83,s.2012). Law RA 9155 forms an important historical milestone in the context of SBM in the Philippines. Section 3(f) of the law provides the legal basis for SBM by specifying the objective “To encourage local initiatives for the improvement of schools and learning centers and to provide how these improvements may be achieved and sustained.” The law specifies the structure of the Department of Education (DepED), with enumerated responsibilities at the national, regional, division, district, and school levels. The law does not mention school governing councils (which were to come later), but vests the authority regarding SBM in the office of the school head – this indicates that in the original conceptualization

the SBM model implicitly chosen was one of administrative and professional control focused on the school head rather than on the school community. Indeed, to back up the new “authority, accountability, and responsibility” of the school head under RA 9155, strict new guidelines were also introduced regarding the promotion of school heads based on performance (Republic Act 9155, 2001). Moreover, the success of every higher education institution is manifested by its quality of teaching, high performance of students, institutional achievements, and continual improvement which are interdependent to the institutional collaborative efforts or interconnection among members of the school community in providing quality control and effective management system (Luza-Tabiolo,C.D.,2018).

DepED administrative data indicates an impressive level of implementation for Key Reform Thrust 1 as measured by regularly monitored key indicators regarding three main elements of School-Based Management; organization, finance, and information. Organization: Every school needs to have a School Governing Council (SGC) or other form of school community partnership. The principal and other school staff are trained on various aspects of SBM, including the preparation of a mandatory school improvement plan; Finance: Selected schools receive an SBM grant of PHP 50,000 (since 2011, increased to variable amount up to PHP200,000) and all schools receive a Maintenance and Other Operational Expenditure (MOOE) grant that is proportional to school enrollment; Information: School officials are trained and expected to provide detailed monitoring reports on school performance to the community, including information on student learning. The eight indicators that are monitored as part of the joint World Bank supported National Program Support for Basic Education (NPSBE; 2006-2012 and AusAID-supported Support for Philippine Basic Education Reform (SPHERE; 2008-2012) indicate an impressive level of SBM implementation (World Bank, 2013).

The empirical evidence provides strong support towards the conclusion that School-Based Management in the Philippines has resulted in improved school performance. National Achievement Test scores have improved in all schools, but they have increased more in SBM schools. SBM was initially implemented in schools that tended to be disadvantaged and their NAT performance on average was lower than other schools. However, over the three-year period 2006-2009; it has been found out that SBM schools have been able to narrow down the initial difference. World Bank pointed out that the difference can be attributed to SBM and not to overall improvement in school resources (World Bank 2013).

Importance of School-Based Management

Quality Assurance in education is the efficient management, monitoring, supervision, assessment and reviews of the resource inputs and curriculum implementation process to produce quality learning outcomes (product value) that meet set standards and expectations of the society (Ayeni,Ibukun, 2013). School-Based Management and School Accreditation are integrated into a quality assurance system to enhance achievement of basic education goals (DepEd, 2012).

Domitrovich and her colleagues (Domitorvich et al., 2016) and Grinshtain and Gibton (2018) indicated that what was common to all the models of SBM was increased autonomy and responsibility for school leaders within a predetermined frame. Regarding school leadership ability, SBM involves the use of participatory management and school autonomy, which together are assumed to strengthen the school's ability to deepen teaching-learning processes (Domitrovich et al., 2016).

Growing appreciation for SBM as the vehicle to institute reforms at the ground level is evident by the increase in number of schools with School Improvement Plan (SIP); those receiving grants and MOOE on time; and those that conducted SBM assessment; systemic issues were noted in the operationalization of policies and guidelines at the filed level and their understanding on how to make SBM work in terms of improving governance practice and achieving organizational effectiveness (DepEd,2012).

The impact of SBM implementation has shown positive outcomes in various aspects of the school including student attendance, academic achievement, and school management (Arar & Nasra,2018; Bandur, 2012; Barrera-Osorio et al., 2009; Caldwell,2005; Grauwe, 2005; World Bank, 2013). For example, SBM in the Philippines has resulted in improved school performance within three years (2006-2009) of implementation (World Bank, 2013) while in Indonesia, a significantly positive effect on student learning outcomes since it was implemented in 2002 (Chen,2019).

It is argued that by decentralizing decision-making authority and responsibility for school operations from the federal level to local stakeholders, these decisions can better reflect local needs and priorities leading to improved student outcomes (Santibañez, Abreu-Lastra, & O'Donoghue, 2014). School-based management has frequently been proposed as a way of making schools more productive in both developing and developed countries (Edwards Jr. & DeMatthews, 2014), (Ganimian, 2016). Cross-country evidence using international student achievement tests show that students perform better in countries with higher levels of school autonomy in process and personnel decisions (Han, 2018). Among other outcomes, it is generally expected that, school-based management, in addition to strengthening the accountability of the teacher, which in turn will lead to better student learning (World Bank, 2004). Fostering a school governance structure that enables higher accountability and better use of resources is one of school-based managements' key tenets (Santibañez et al., 2014). School-Based Management, as a radical decentralization reform of the Department of Education, offers an opportunity to improve the quality of basic education in our country (Deped Order No. 83,s.2012).

Dimensions of the School-Based Management (SBM)

The Revised School-Based Management (SBM) Assessment tool is guided by the four principles of ACCESs (A Child and Community- Centered Education System):

Leadership and governance guide the education system to achieve its shared vision, mission, and goals making them responsive and relevant to the context of diverse environments (Deped Order No. 83,s.2012).

Curriculum and Instruction anchored on the community and learners' contexts and aspirations are collaboratively developed and continuously improved(Deped Order No. 83,s.2012).

Accountability and Continuous Improvement means having a clear, transparent, inclusive, and responsive accountability system is in place, collaboratively developed by the school

community, which monitors performance and acts appropriately on gaps and gains(Deped Order No. 83,s.2012).

Management of resources are collectively organized, judiciously mobilized, and managed with transparency, effectiveness, and efficiency to support targeted education outcome (Deped Order No. 83,s.2012).

Along these four dimensions of an ACCESs school system, the SBM practice will evolve within the context of “differentiated practice” as created and affected by the variations in the typology of schools, leadership quality, and characteristics, resources of the community, diversity of learners and extent and depth of community involvement (DepEd, 2012).

School Performance

School performance is an issue that deeply concerns students, parents, teachers, and authorities not only in the Philippines but also in many Latin American countries and continents(Lamas, 2015). It is an aspect of education that is influenced by varied school factors and supporting inputs.

The complexity of the academic performance starts from its conceptualization. Sometimes it is known as school readiness, academic achievement, and school performance, but generally the difference in concepts is only explained by semantics as they are used as synonyms (Nairaland Forum,2021). Conventionally, it has been agreed that academic performance should be used in university populations and school performance in regular and alternative basic education populations (Lamas, 2015).

In the Philippines, some issues besetting the school system, especially the public school include high dropout rate, quality educational service, high repetition rate, and limited holding capacity of the schools. Over the past decades many initiatives and reform efforts have been implemented to address these problems (Abulencia,2013).

One key response of the national government is the adoption and implementation of School-Based Management (SBM) anchored on the decentralization trend of the 70's (Kadtong et al, 2016).

Cabardo (2016) and Tapayan et al. (2016) have demonstrated that school-based management can improve access to quality education and student achievement. However, the type of SBM modernization that is implemented varies significantly by continent and can take a long time to produce results. Furthermore, the effectiveness of SBM is critically dependent on family involvement, popular support, and total management (World Bank Group, 2016).

School Practices

Practices are organized human activities (Schatzki, 2005). School practices are the activities that are purposely done to achieve common goals such as high learning outcomes, productive school culture, and empowered teachers and learners. According to Schatzki, a practice is organized by three phenomena: understandings of how to do things, rules, and teleoaffective structure". Rules are the regulations, norms, and organizational guidelines. Understanding implies what to do, how to do, how to say and understand, as well as stimulate desired actions and attitudes in other members of the group. The teleoaffective structure refers from the group's projects to the emotions accepted by the participants (Schatzki, 2005).

The School-Based Management system aims to improve learning outcomes through effective schools (DepEd Order No.83,s.2012). School administrators received trainings in leadership, stakeholder management, school planning, monitoring and evaluation, resource mobilization and school project management (DepEd, 2012).

The effectiveness of a school's operations is enhanced through school-based management. The success of these reforms has been greatly influenced by the availability of rising heights of operational financing at the school level along with the transfer of greater control over these finances to schools. The additional cash allowed schools to carry out programs and initiatives listed in their School Improvement Plans. To ensure that additional resources are available to address concerns with learning outcomes, it is necessary to establish an evaluation process that examines the quality and viability of ideas. (DepEd Order No.83,s. 2012).

II. Methodology

Research Method

Descriptive method was used to describe the school heads' profile, school-based management implementation, schools' practices and performance through frequency, percent, weighted mean, and standard deviation. Mann-Whitney U-test and Kruskal-Wallis H-test were also used to test the difference in the school heads' implementation of SBM when analyzed

according to profile. Spearman-Rho Correlation Coefficient was also used to test the strength of relationships between the independent and dependent variables.

The data were gathered through a survey using the standardized assessment tool of School-Based Management. The items in the questionnaire were gathered from the Department of Education's Implementing Guidelines on the Revised School-Based Management (SBM) Framework, Assessment Process and Tool (APAT). For schools' practices, the questionnaire was adopted from the study on How to Use the School Survey of Practices Associated With High Performance. The schools' performance questionnaire was based on the indicators set by the Department of Education.

Research Environment

The study was conducted in the Schools Division of Zamboanga del Norte, City Schools of Dipolog City and Dapitan City for the school year 2021-2022. The study took place in the selected public national high schools of the three schools divisions of Zamboanga del Norte province.

Research Respondents and Sampling

In this study, there were 371 respondents who comprised the 350 public secondary school teachers and 21 public school heads from the three schools divisions in the province of Zamboanga del Norte. Respondents are selected through simple random sampling by lottery method. With this method, units are chosen based on random draws. First, a distinct number is given to each person or component of the population. The numbers are then written separately on cards that are physically comparable to one another in terms of size, color, form, and so forth. After that, they are completely combined in a basket. The slips are removed at random and without inspection in the last step. The required sample size is represented by the number of slips drawn. The selection of respondents adheres the stipulated health and safety protocols. The distribution of respondents is shown below.

Schools Division	No. of Principals	No. of Teachers	Total
Zamboanga del Norte	11	185	196
Dipolog City	5	87	92
Dapitan City	5	78	83
Total	21	350	371

Research Instruments and Validity

The data-gathering instruments in this study were the questionnaires based on the standardized assessment tool for School-Based Management as stipulated in the Implementing Guidelines of School-Based Management Framework, Assessment Process and Tool by DepEd (2012).

Triangulation of instruments was used in this study to ensure valid results. A questionnaire was given to determine the level of SBM implementation in the participating schools. Another questionnaire was used to determine the schools' practices and the third questionnaire was used to determine the schools' performance.

The three instruments shared common indicators that participants in the field responded to. The SBM level of practice (LoP) indicators reflect the goal of the schools which is to achieve an improved learning outcomes and enhanced school operations. The result of this assessment by the school principals and teachers was obtained and subjected to statistical treatment to determine the impact of SBM implementation on schools' practices and performance.

The questionnaire was drawn from the SBM Level of Practice (LoP) indicators outlined in the implementing guidelines of the revised School-Based Management (SBM) Framework, Assessment Process and Tool (APAT) which is organized according to the four principles of leadership and governance, curriculum and learning, accountability and continuous improvement and management of resources. The questionnaire was presented to the research adviser for validation and for further comments and inputs. After the questionnaire was constituted, it was presented to the research committee during the proposal hearing for scrutiny, evaluation or additional inputs.

Research Procedure

Gathering of Data

After the researcher was given approval to conduct the study, she obtained permission from the Division Superintendents of Schools of Zamboanga del Norte, Dipolog City and Dapitan City to allow her to administer the questionnaire to the respondents. She then approached the secondary school principals and the teachers in order to obtain their consent and arranged for a schedule to conduct the study.

The researcher personally conducted and administered the questionnaire and arranged for a specific time to retrieve the answered questionnaire. When all the instruments were gathered, the responses were tallied and presented in tabular form to the statistician for statistical computations. The data were then analyzed and interpreted and presented in chapter four of this study.

Treatment of Data

The frequency and percentage were used to determine the number of responses for every item and the percentage of the responses to the total number of items. Mann-Whitney U-test and Kruskal-Wallis H-test were also used to test the difference in the school heads' implementation of SBM when analyzed according to profile. Spearman-Rho Correlation Coefficient was also used the strength of relationships between the independent and dependent variables.

In determining the level of School-Based Management implementation, the following scores were used:

Scale	Rating	Interpretation
3	2.51 – 3.00	Advanced
2	1.51 – 2.50	Maturing
1	1.00 – 1.50	Beginning

School's practices were rated using the following scores:

4	3.26 – 4.00	Strongly Agree/Highly Practiced
3	2.51 – 3.25	Agree/Moderately Practiced
2	1.76 – 2.50	Disagree/Less Practiced
1	1.00 – 1.75	Strongly Disagree/Least Practiced

School's performance was determined qualitatively with the use of the following scoring and categorization:

3	99.45 & above	Advanced
2	94.5-99.44	Maturing
1	94.44 & below	Beginning

III. Results and Discussion

Table 1
The Summary of the Level of Schools' Practices

Indicator	Dipolog City			Dapitan City			ZaNorte		
	Mean	SD	Imp	Mean	SD	Imp	Mean	SD	Imp
School Heads									
Effective Leadership	3.95	.207	Highly Practiced	3.79	.402	Highly Practiced	3.45	.809	Highly Practiced
Strong Curriculum	3.70	.458	Highly Practiced	3.87	.361	Highly Practiced	3.61	.649	Highly Practiced
Professional Development	3.74	.434	Highly Practiced	3.82	.364	Highly Practiced	3.54	.658	Highly Practiced
School Culture	3.90	.313	Highly Practiced	3.64	.500	Highly Practiced	3.58	.653	Highly Practiced
Ongoing Data Use for School Improvement	3.83	.382	Highly Practiced	3.86	.355	Highly Practiced	3.67	.637	Highly Practiced
Overall Mean	3.82	.365	Highly Practiced	3.80	.440	Highly Practiced	3.57	.684	Highly Practiced
Teachers									
Effective Leadership	3.55	.541	Highly Practiced	3.45	.654	Highly Practiced	3.59	.593	Highly Practiced
Strong Curriculum	3.52	.503	Highly Practiced	3.53	.605	Highly Practiced	3.58	.518	Highly Practiced
Professional Development	3.49	.519	Highly Practiced	3.45	.602	Highly Practiced	3.55	.543	Highly Practiced
School Culture	3.48	.561	Highly Practiced	3.48	.590	Highly Practiced	3.55	.534	Highly Practiced
Ongoing Data Use for School Improvement	3.45	.554	Highly Practiced	3.42	.592	Highly Practiced	3.50	.546	Highly Practiced
Overall Mean	3.49	.541	Highly Practiced	3.47	.607	Highly Practiced	3.55	.544	Highly Practiced
1.00 – 1.75 Strongly Disagree/Least Practiced				1.76 – 2.50 Disagree/Less Practiced					
2.51 – 3.25 Agree/Moderately Practiced				3.26 – 4.00 Strongly Agree/Highly Practiced					

Table 1 presents the summary of the level of schools' practices. The table shows the indicator, weighted mean, standard deviation, grand weighted mean, and implication.

The collective rating of school heads of the three school divisions consistently described the schools' practices as highly practiced. The overall rating of the teachers also supported the declaration of the school heads. That the schools operated with the guidance of their vision and mission where stakeholders were valued, cared for, and respected. This ensured that effective teaching and learning took place.

The teachers are included in this study to support the findings of the administrators and avoid self-serving and bias in the evaluation. The school heads rated slightly higher than the teachers.

Epstein (2012) pointed out that when parents, teachers, students, and others view one another as partners in education, a caring community forms around students and begins its work.

Schools' Performance
Table 2
The Level of Schools' Performance

Indicator	Dipolog City			Dapitan City			Zamboanga del Norte		
	Mean	SD	Imp	Mean	SD	Imp	Mean	SD	Imp
Enrolment Rate	2.80	.447	Advanced	2.20	.447	Maturing	2.45	.522	Maturing
Percentage of Attendance	2.60	.548	Advanced	2.20	.447	Maturing	2.55	.522	Advanced
Retention Rate	2.40	.548	Maturing	2.00	.000	Maturing	2.18	.603	Maturing
Dropout Rate	2.40	.548	Maturing	2.40	.548	Maturing	2.55	.522	Advanced
Failure Rate	2.60	.548	Advanced	2.40	.548	Maturing	2.36	.505	Maturing
Graduation Rate	2.60	.548	Advanced	2.20	.447	Maturing	2.45	.688	Maturing
Promotion Rate	2.80	.447	Advanced	2.20	.447	Maturing	2.55	.522	Advanced
Mean Percentage Score	1.80	.837	Maturing	1.80	.447	Maturing	2.00	.632	Maturing
Grand Mean	2.50	.599	Maturing	2.18	.446	Maturing	2.39	.576	Maturing
1.00 – 1.50 Beginning			1.51 – 2.50 Maturing			2.51 – 3.00 Advanced			

Table 2 presents the level of schools' performance. The table shows the indicator, weighted mean, standard deviation, grand mean, and implication.

Dipolog City schools have higher enrolment rate and graduation rate than the schools in Dapitan City and Zamboanga del Norte. The percentage of attendance and promotion rate of the schools of Dipolog City and Zamboanga del Norte were higher than the schools of Dapitan City. The dropout rate of the schools of Zamboanga del Norte was higher than the schools of Dipolog

and Dapitan cities. This means that there were more students of the schools of Zamboanga del Norte who left school. The failure rate of the schools of Dipolog City was higher than the schools of Dapitan City and Zamboanga del Norte. This means that there were more students who were failed in the schools of Dipolog City.

In general, the level of schools' performance of the schools of the three schools divisions was maturing as indicated by their grand means and standard deviations.

Ko et al. (2016) found that the positive effects that school autonomy had on school governance and management, teachers' work, school-based curriculums, and student learning were all significant when there were also strong leadership, comprehensive continuous professional development, and a positive, collaborative school climate.

Relationship Between the School-Based Management Implementation and Schools' Performance

Table 3

The Relationship Between the Level of School-Based Management Implementation and The Level of Schools' Performance

Variables	ρ -Value	P-Value	Interpretation	Implication
Dipolog City				
Leadership and Governance and Schools' Performance	.456	.038	Significant	Moderate
Curriculum and Learning and Schools' Performance	.361	.045	Significant	Moderate
Accountability and Continuous Improvement and Schools' Performance	.363	.043	Significant	Moderate
Management of Resources and Schools' Performance	.395	.041	Significant	Moderate
Dapitan City				
Leadership and Governance and Schools' Performance	.356	.032	Significant	Moderate
Curriculum and Learning and Schools' Performance	.343	.038	Significant	Moderate
Accountability and Continuous Improvement and Schools' Performance	.337	.043	Significant	Moderate
Management of Resources and Schools' Performance	.392	.027	Significant	Moderate
Zamboanga del Norte				
Leadership and Governance and Schools' Performance	.555	.047	Significant	High
Curriculum and Learning and Schools' Performance	.684	.020	Significant	High

Accountability and Continuous Improvement and Schools' Performance	.664	.026	Significant	High
Management of Resources and Schools' Performance	.752	.006	Significant	High

Table 3 presents the relationship between the level of school-based management implementation and the level of schools' performance. The table shows the variables, computed ρ , P-value, and interpretation.

For Dipolog and Dapitan City schools divisions, the computed ρ -values for Leadership and Governance and Schools' Performance, Curriculum and Learning and Schools' Performance, Accountability and Continuous Improvement and Schools' Performance, and Management of Resources and Schools' Performance produced P-values that are less than .05 level of significance. This means that there was a significant relationship between the level of school-based management implementation and the level of schools' performance. The correlations coefficients indicate a moderate impact of school-based management on schools' performance.

For Zamboanga del Norte schools division, the computed ρ -values for Leadership and Governance and Schools' Performance, Curriculum and Learning and Schools' Performance, Accountability and Continuous Improvement and Schools' Performance, and Management of Resources and Schools' Performance also produced P-values that are less than .05 level of significance. This means that there was a significant relationship

between the level of school-based management implementation and the level of schools' performance. The correlations coefficients indicate a high impact of school-based management on schools' performance.

Cabardo (2016) and Tapayan et al. (2016) have demonstrated that School-Based Management can improve access to quality education and student achievement.

Gaps and Ways to Address School-Based Management Implementation

Based on the analysis and interpretation of the gathered data on the Impact of School-Based Management Implementation on Schools' Practices and Performance, certain gaps along Leadership and Governance, Curriculum and Instruction, Accountability and Continuous Improvement and Resource Management were found to be affecting the efficient implementation of SBM. The following ways are deliberately identified to address the gaps on School-Based Management implementation which affected the schools' practices and performance.

Gaps

1. Leadership and Governance-

Indicator 2: The development plan (SIP) is regularly reviewed by the school community to keep it responsive and relevant to emerging needs, challenges, and opportunities.

It is necessary to launch a strategic information campaign to raise public awareness of the School Governing Council's (SGC) and Parents-Teachers Association's (PTA) roles. This will ensure their active participation in the creation, implementation, and review of School Improvement Plans (SIPs), which must be responsive to the changing needs, challenges, and opportunities for providing high-quality education.

The process of routine review and implementation is led by community stakeholders, and it is facilitated by school stakeholders.

2. Curriculum and Instruction

Indicator 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 learning.

Learning environments, methods and resources are community driven, inclusive and adhered to child's rights and protection requirements. Schools should improve the training of their leaders and increase the capacity building of their faculty in order to equip and empower all teachers to provide a high-quality education to all students.

3. Accountability and Continuous Improvement

Indicator No. 4: Accountability assessment criteria and tools, feedback mechanisms, and information collection and validation techniques and processes are inclusive and collaboratively developed and agreed upon.

In order to achieve an advanced level of School-Based Management implementation, stakeholders including students, parents, teachers, government, regulatory bodies, institutions and communities should continuously and collaboratively review and enhance accountability, system's process, mechanisms and tools in making plans, setting assessment criteria, feedbacking and validating results.

4. Resource Management

Indicator No. 4: 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 resource.

The provision of safe, supportive and productive resource management system in the school community can boost schools' performance since students' needs and well-being will be properly addressed.

Stakeholders are engaged and accountable in implementing a collaboratively developed system of monitoring, evaluation and reporting for resource management.

IV. Conclusion

The implementation of the School-Based Management of school heads of the three (3) schools divisions: Dapitan City, Dipolog City, and Zamboanga del Norte, was maturing. The schools' practices of the three (3) schools divisions was high. Also, the schools' performance was maturing. Moreover, the School-Based Management implementation has a slight impact on schools' practice and moderate impact on schools' performance. It concluded further that a better implementation of School-Based Management would result to a desirable schools' practices and improved schools' performance.

Specifically, this study concluded the following:

1. the school heads' implementation of School-Based Implementation in the three (3) schools divisions was maturing;
2. male and female school heads of the three (3) school divisions similarly implemented School-Based Management, the school heads of Zamboanga del Norte of age group 46 – 55 years old implemented better the School-Based Management, the length of service of school heads does not ensure a better SBM implementation, the professional advancement of school heads did not guarantee a better implementation of SBM across three (3) school divisions, and the number of seminars/training attended on School-Based Management by school heads cannot ensure a better implementation of SBM, across three (3) school divisions;
3. the schools' practices in the three (3) schools division were above standards;
4. the School-Based Management implementation affected the schools' practices;
5. the schools' performances in the three (3) schools divisions were maturing; and
6. better implementation of School-Based Management is a key factor for schools to perform at higher standards.

REFERENCES

- [1] Abadzi, H. (2013). School-based management committees in low-income countries: Can they improve service delivery? *Prospects*, 43(2), 115–132. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11125-013-9267-9>
- [2] Abe, T. O., & Adu, E. I. (2014). The effect of teachers' qualifications on students' performance in mathematics. *Sky Journal of Educational Research*, 2(1), 010-014. Abulencia, A. A. (2013). School-based management: a structural reform intervention. Center for Linkages and Extension. Philippine Normal University.
- [3] Abun, D., Asuncion, S.B., Lazaro, J.R., Magallanes, T., Nimfa, C. C. (2021). The Effect of Educational Attainment, Length of Work Experience on the Self-Efficacy of Teachers and Employees. *International Journal of Business Ecosystem & Strategy*, 2021, 3, pp.16 - 28. 10.36096/ijbes.v3i2.258 . hal-03418003
- [4] Ahmad, I. & H. S. (2013). Effect of community participation in education on quality of education: evidence from a developing context. *Journal of Education and Vocational Research*, 4(10), 293–299, DOI: 10.22610/jevr.v4i10.133.g133
- [5] Ahmed, A. Y., & Mihiretie, D. M. (2015). Primary school teachers and parents' views on automatic promotion practices and its implications for education quality. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 43, 90–99. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2015.05.003>
- [6] Akiri, A. A. (2013). Effects of Teachers' Effectiveness on Students' Academic Performance in Public Secondary Schools; Delta State - Nigeria. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 3(3), 105. Retrieved from <https://www.richtmann.org/journal/index.php/jesr/article/view/548>
- [7] Al-Ghefeili, A. A. A. & Hoque, K. E. (2013). School-based management in Oman: Principals' views and understanding. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, 2(3), 84-96, <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARPED/v2-i4/47>
- [8] Allawan, F.D. 2012. School's Community Partnership Practices and Stakeholders' Involvement in Digos City Division. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Southern Philippines Agri-Business and Marine and Aquatic School of Technology, Mati, Digos City.
- [9] Allen, N., Grigsby, B., & Peters, M. L. (2015). Does Leadership Matter? Examining the Relationship among Transformational Leadership, School Climate, and Student Achievement. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 10(2), 1-22.
- [10] Abadzi, H. (2013). School-based management committees in low-income countries: Can they improve service delivery? *Prospects*, 43(2), 115–132. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11125-013-9267-9>
- [11] Abe, T. O., & Adu, E. I. (2014). The effect of teachers' qualifications on students' performance in mathematics. *Sky Journal of Educational Research*, 2(1), 010-014. Abulencia, A. A. (2013). School-based management: a structural reform intervention. Center for Linkages and Extension. Philippine Normal University.
- [12] Abun, D., Asuncion, S.B., Lazaro, J.R., Magallanes, T., Nimfa, C. C. (2021). The Effect of Educational Attainment, Length of Work Experience on the Self-Efficacy of Teachers and Employees. *International Journal of Business Ecosystem & Strategy*, 2021, 3, pp.16 - 28. 10.36096/ijbes.v3i2.258 . hal-03418003
- [13] Ahmad, I. & H. S. (2013). Effect of community participation in education on quality of education: evidence from a developing context. *Journal of Education and Vocational Research*, 4(10), 293–299, DOI: 10.22610/jevr.v4i10.133.g133

- [14] Ahmed, A. Y., & Mihiretie, D. M. (2015). Primary school teachers and parents' views on automatic promotion practices and its implications for education quality. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 43, 90–99. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2015.05.003>
- [15] Akiri, A. A. (2013). Effects of Teachers' Effectiveness on Students' Academic Performance in Public Secondary Schools; Delta State - Nigeria. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 3(3), 105. Retrieved from <https://www.richtmann.org/journal/index.php/jesr/article/view/548>
- [16] Al-Ghefeili, A. A. A. & Hoque, K. E. (2013). School-based management in Oman: Principals' views and understanding. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, 2(3), 84-96, <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARPED/v2-i4/47>
- [17] Allawan, F.D. 2012. School's Community Partnership Practices and Stakeholders' Involvement in Digos City Division. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Southern Philippines Agri-Business and Marine and Aquatic School of Technology, Mati, Digos City.
- [18] Allen, N., Grigsby, B., & Peters, M. L. (2015). Does Leadership Matter? Examining the Relationship among Transformational Leadership, School Climate, and Student Achievement. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 10(2), 1-22.
- [19] Arar, K. & Abu Nasra M. (2018). Linking school-based management and school effectiveness: The influence of self-based management, motivation, and effectiveness in the Arab education system in Israel. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/1741143218775428>
- [20] Ayeni, A.J. & Ibukun, W.O. (2013). A Conceptual Model for School-Based Management Operation and Quality Assurance in Nigerian Secondary Schools. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1078340.pdf>
- [21] Bambang, I. (2014). School Based Management: Issues and Hopes toward Decentralization in Education in Indonesia. Retrieved from <http://www.ewordedreform.com>
- [22] Bandur, A. (2012). School-based management developments: challenges and impacts. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 50(6), 845-873. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578231211264711>
- [23] Bandur, A. (2018). Stakeholders' responses to school-based management in Indonesia. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 32(6), 1082-1098, <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-08-2017-0191>
- [24] Barasa, T. (2014). Successful Decentralization : The Roles and Challenges of DEOs in Kenya. France: The International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP).
- [25] Bautista, R. (2013). Practices of school-based management (sbm) in the selected public elementary schools for a medium term development plan, Philippines
- [26] Beidokhti, A. A., Fatih, K. & Moradi, S. (2016). The structural relations of parameters of school-based management based on decentralization, responsibility, participation, organizational culture, and organizational commitment. *Review of European Studies*;, 8(2), 159-170, <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/res.v8n2p159>
- [27] Bhai, M., and Horoi, I. (2019). Teacher characteristics and academic achievement. *Appl. Econ.* 51, 4781–4799. doi: 10.1080/00036846.2019.1597963
- [28] Bird, D. O. (2017). Relationship between teacher effectiveness and student achievement: an investigation of teacher quality: Ball State University.
- [29] Bloom, N., Lemos, R., Sadun, R., & Van Reenen, J. (2015). Does management matter in schools? *The Economic Journal*, 125(584), 647-674.

- [30] Cabardo, J. R. O. (2016). Levels of participation of the school stakeholders to the different school-initiated activities and the implementation of School-Based Management. *Journal of Inquiry and Action in Education*, 8(1), 81-94.
- [31] Caldwell, B. J. (2015). School Management. In *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences: Second Edition (Second Edi, Vol. 21)*. Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.92069-5>
- [32] Capacite, R. (2021). School-Based Management Practices as Predictors of School Performance in Public Elementary Schools amid the Pandemic. <https://www.gnosijournal.com> › article › download
- [33] Carr-Hill, R., Rolleston, C., Pherali, T., & Schendel, R. (2015). The effects of school-based decision making on educational outcomes in low- and middle-income contexts: a systematic review. *International Initiative for Impact Evaluation (3ie)*, London, UK (2015) 206 pp. Retrieved from https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/57a0896940f0b652dd0001fa/61233_dfid-funded-decentralisation-review.pdf
- [34] Chen, D. (2019). School-Based Management, School Decision-Making and Education Outcomes in Indonesian Primary Schools. In *School-Based Management, School Decision-Making and Education Outcomes in Indonesian Primary Schools*. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781474209731.0002>
- [35] Chen, C.-H., & Yang, Y.-C. (2019). Revisiting the effects of project-based learning on students' academic achievement: A meta-analysis investigating moderators. *Educational Research Review*, 26, 71–81.
- [36] Cheung, R. (2014). Insight: School-based management brings opportunity and risk, www.google.com
- [37] Cramer, E. D., Little, M. E., & McHatton, P. A. (2014). Demystifying the Data-Based Decision-Making Process. *Action in Teacher Education*, 36(5-6), 389–400. <http://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2014.977690>
- [38] Day, C., Gu, Q., & Sammons, P. (2016). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: How successful school leaders use transformational and instructional strategies to make a difference. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 52 (2). 221–258. Retrieved from <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/33575906.pdf>
- [39] Department of Education. (2009). *A Manual on the Assessment of School-Based Management Practice*
- [40] <https://depedkoronadalcity.files.wordpress.com/2012/10/sbm-manual.pdf>
- [41] Department of Education. 2012. *Implementing Guidelines on the Revised School-Based Management (SBM) Framework, Assessment Process and Tool (APAT)*. In DepEd Order No. 83, s. 2012. DepEd Complex, Meralco Avenue, Pasig City.
- [42] Donley, J., Detrich, R., States, J., & Keyworth. (2020). *Principal Competencies*. Oakland, CA: The Wing Institute. <https://www.winginstitute.org/principal-competencies-research>
- [43] Duflo, E., Dupas, P. & Kremer M. (2014). School governance, teacher incentives, and pupil–teacher ratios: Experimental evidence from Kenyan primary schools. Retrieved from https://web.stanford.edu/~pdupas/DDK_ETP.pdf
- [44] Edwards Jr., D. B., & DeMatthews, D. (2014). Historical trends in educational decentralization in the United States and developing countries: A periodization and comparison in the Post-WWII context. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*. <https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v22n40.2014>

- [45] Elmelegy, R. I. (2015). School-based management: An approach to decision-making quality in Egyptian general secondary schools. *School Leadership and Management*, 35(1), 79–96. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2014.962499>
- [46] Epstein, J. L. (2018). *School, family, and community partnerships: Preparing educators and improving schools*: Routledge.
- [47] Filgona, J. et.al (2020). Teachers' academic qualification as a predictor of attitude and academic achievement in geography of senior secondary school students in Adamawa State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Research and Review (ijrrjournal.com)*
- [48] Ganimian, A. J. (2016). Why do some school-based management reforms survive while others are reversed? The cases of Honduras and Guatemala. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 47, 33–46. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2015.12.001>
- [49] Gerritsen, S., Plug, E., and Webbink, D. (2017). Teacher quality and student achievement: evidence from a sample of Dutch twins. *J. Appl. Econ.* 32, 643–660. doi: 10.1002/jae.2539
- [50] Hansen, K. Y., and Gustafsson, J. E. (2016). Causes of educational segregation in Sweden – school choice or residential segregation. *Educ. Res. Eval.* 22, 23–44. doi: 10.1080/13803611.2016.1178589
- [51]
- [52] Hansen, K. Y., and Gustafsson, J. E. (2016). Causes of educational segregation in Sweden school choice or residential segregation. *Educ. Res. Eval.* 22, 23–44. doi: 10.1080/13803611.2016.1178589
- [53] Harris, A., & Jones, M. (2015). Transforming education systems: comparative and critical perspectives on school leadership. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 35(3), 311-318.
- [54] Hopkins, D. (2015). *Improving the quality of education for all. A handbook of staff development activities*: Routledge.
- [55] Idrus, A. (2013). The implementation of school-based management policy in Indonesia: A survey on public junior high school principals' perceptions. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 4(7). Retrieved from <https://iiste.org/Journals/index.php/JEP/article/view/5271/11639>
- [56] Isa, A. M., Mydin, A-A., & Abdullah, A. G. K. (2020). School-Based Management (SBM) Practices in Malaysia: A Systematic Literature Review. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*. 10(9), 822-838. https://hrmars.com/papers_submitted/7870/school-based-management-sbm-practices-in-malaysia-a-systematic-literature-review.pdf
- [57] Jafari, M. S. (2014). *Concepts and definitions of school-based management and organizational theory and management role in the emergence and development of this comment*. Tehran: Institute of Education.
- [58] Jafarov, J. (2015). Factors affecting parental involvement in education: the analysis of literature. *Khazar Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 18(4), 35–44. Retrieved from <http://jhss-khazar.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/04/3.Javid-Jafarov-1.pdf>
- [59] Jaelani, A., & Masnun, M. (2019). The Implementation of School Based Management in Madrasah Ibtidaiyah. *Al Ibtida: Jurnal Pendidikan Guru MI*, 6(2), 256–270. <https://doi.org/10.24235/al.ibtida.snj.v6i2.3793>
- [60] Joshi, D. P. (2018). Does School-Based Management Help to Improve Quality of Education? A Case of Student Achievement in Nepal. *Educational Process: International Journal*, 7(4), 228–236. <https://doi.org/10.22521/edupij.2018.74.1>
- [61] Kaabi, A. A., & Ali, S. (2015). *An evaluation of the school-based management practices in the new school model: a study on al ain schools (Masters' thesis)*. United Arab Emirates

- University. Retrieved from <https://docplayer.net/60005985-An-evaluation-of-the-school-based-management-practices-in-the-new-school-model-a-study-on-al-ain-schools.html>
- [62] Kad Tong, M.L., Parcon, M.N., Monir, L.B. (2016). School-Based Management in the Operations and Performance of Public Elementary Schools. *Proceedings Journal of Education, Psychology and Social Science Research*. Vol03:Iss02: Pg200. DOI: 10.21016/OC18EF024O. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3139808
- [63] Kad Tong, M. L., Unos, M., Antok, T. D., & Midzid, M. A. E. (2017). Teaching performance and job satisfaction among teachers at region XII. *Proceedings Journal of Education, Psychology and Social Science Research*, 4(1).
- [64] Karmila, N., & Wijaya, A. (2020). Implementation of School Based Management in Tambilung Elementary School. *Jhss (Journal of Humanities and Social Studies)*, 4(1), 71–73. <https://doi.org/10.33751/jhss.v4i1.2044>
- [65] Khattri, N., C. Ling, and S. Jha. (2012). The Effects of School-Based Management in the Philippines: An Initial Assessment Using Administrative Data, *Journal of Development Effectiveness* 4: 277-295.
- [66] Kim, J. (2018). School accountability and standards-based education reform: The recall of social efficiency movement and scientific management. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 60(May 2017), 80–87. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2017.11.003>
- [67] Kiragu, J. W., King'oina, J. O., & Migosi, J. A. (2013). School-based management prospects and challenges: A case of public secondary schools in Murang'a South district. *International Journal of Asian Social Science*, 3(5), 1166–1179.
- [68] Koc, A. & Bastas, M. (2019). Project schools as a school-based management model. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET)*, 6(4). 923- 942. <http://iojet.org/index.php/IOJET/article/view/679>.
- [69] Kyriakides, L., Creemers, B. P., Antoniou, P., Demetriou, D., & Charalambous, C. Y. (2015). The impact of school policy and stakeholders' actions on student learning: A longitudinal study. *Learning and Instruction*, 36, 113-124
- [70] Ladd, H. F., and Sorenson, L. C. (2017). Returns to teacher experience: student achievement and motivation in middle school. *Educ. Finan. Pol.* 12, 241–279. doi: 10.1162/edfp_a_00194
- [71] Lamas, H. (2015). School Performance. *Propósitos y Representaciones*, 3(1), 313-386. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.20511/pyr2015.v3n1.74>.
- [72] Latorilla, E. (2012). School-based Management Implementation: Using the Lenses of the Schools' SBM Practices and School Leaders' Views toward Its Reinforcement. <https://rpo.ua.edu.ph/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/4-phd-elizabeth-latorilla-September-21-2018.pdf>
- [73] Lee, D. H. L. & Chiu, C. S. (2017), School banding: Principals' perspectives of teacher professional development in the school-based management context", *Journal of Educational Administration*, 55(6), 686-701, <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-02-2017-0018>
- [74]
- [75] Leithwood, K. (2013). Leadership and student learning: What works and how. In C. Wise, P. Bradshaw, & M. Cartwright (Eds.), *Leading professional practice in education* (pp. 25–37). Sage Publications.
- [76] Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2019). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. *School Leadership & Management*, 40(1), 5–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2019.1596077>

- [77] Leithwood, K., Sun, J., & Pollock, K. (Eds.). (2017). How school leaders contribute to student success: The four paths framework. Springer.
- [78] Lemanske, R. F., Kakumanu, S., Shanovich, K., & Antos, N. (2015). Workforce report creation and implementation of SAMPRO™: A school-based asthma management program. *National Center for Biotechnology Information - U.S. National Library of Medicine*, 138(3), 711–723, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaci.2016.06.015>
- [79] Lindberg E., & Vanyushy, Y. (2013). Do Community-Managed schools work? An Evaluation of El Salvador' Educo Program. Working paper No. 8, series on Impact Evaluation of Education Reforms, Development Economics Research Group, The World Bank.
- [80] Liu, J. (2021). Cognitive Returns to Having Better Educated Teachers: Evidence from the China Education Panel Survey. *J Intell. Dec* 3;9(4):60. doi: 10.3390/jintelligence9040060. PMID: 34940382; PMCID: PMC8706271.
- [81] Loeb, S., Soland, J., Fox, L. (2014). Is a good teacher a good teacher for all? Comparing value-added of teachers with their English learners and non-English learners. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*
- [82] Louis, K. (2015). Linking leadership to learning: state, district and local effects. *Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy*. NordSTEP 1:30321 DOI:<http://dx.doi.org/10.3402/nstep.v1.30321>
- [83] Luboya T. C; Liu, X. and Eugenio P. G. (2017). Impact of Governance System of Local School Boards on Pupils' Academic Performance in RD Congo Pilot Primary Schools, *Education* 2017, 7 (6): 124-137
- [84] Luza-Tabiolo, C.D. (2018). University Management System: Organizational Commitment and Performance Influences. *International Review of Social Sciences (IRSS)*. Volume 6, Issue(8). August 2018. pp 439-445. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/360755612_University_Management_System_Organizational_Commitment_and_Performance_Influences
- [85] Maca, M. (2019). School-Based Management in the Philippines: Fostering Innovations in the Public Education System. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/345341415_School-based_Management_in_the_Philippines_fostering_innovations_in_the_public_education_system
- [86] Macasaet, J. A. A. (2013). Governance of the education sector. Retrieved from <http://www.ombudsman.gov.ph/UNDP4/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/Chap7.pdf>
- [87] Makori, A. and H. O. (2013). An evaluation of secondary school principals' perception of learning resources in free secondary education era in Kenya. *African Educational Research Journal*, 1(3), 171–182. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1216963.pdf>
- [88] Mania-Singer, J. (2017). A Systems Theory approach to the District Central Office's role in school-level improvement. *Administrative Issues Journal: Vol. 7 : Iss. 1 , Article 7*.
- [89] Mansor, A. N., & Suliman, A. (2018). The Practice Of School-based Management : Special Reference To Malaysian Clusters Schools And Uk Autonomous Schools. *Journal of Adv Research Dynamical & Control System*, Vol. 10(02-Special Issue), pp-1618-1626.
- [90] 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. Retrieved from: http://ojs.upsi.edu.my/index.php/AJATeL/article/view/2314%0Ahttp://files/351/The_Implementation_of_School-Based_Management_in_Public_Elementary_Schools_2019.pdf%0Ahttp://files/352/2314.html

- [91] Masci, C., De Witte, K., & Agasisti, T. (2016). The influence of school size, principal characteristics and school management practices on educational performance: An efficiency analysis of Italian students attending middle schools. *Socio-Economic Planning Sciences*.
- [92] Mawanda, V., Karta, I. W., & Zm, H. (2018). Effectiveness of Implementation of School-Based Management In Elementary School 1 Puyung Central Lombok. *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education (IOSR-JRME)*, 8(3), 55–61. <https://doi.org/10.9790/7388-0803025561>
- [93]
- [94] Moradi, S. et al., (2016). Comparative Comparison of Implementing School-Based Management in Developed Countries in the Historical Context: From Theory to Practice. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1112703.pdf>
- [95] Murphy, C. B. (2014). School-based management as a school reform (the status quo) . Translation Farhad Karimi. Institute of Education.
- [96] Muslihah, O. E. (2015). Understanding the relationship between school-based management , emotional intelligence and performance of religious upper secondary school principals in banten province. *Higher Education Studies*, 5(3), 11–23. <https://doi.org/10.5539/hes.v5n3p11>
- [97] Nehez, J. & Blossing, U. (2022). Practices in different school cultures and principals' improvement work, *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 25:2, 310-330, DOI:10.1080/13603124.2020.1759828
- [98] Nyatsikor ,M.K., Sosu, E.M., Mtika, P., and Robson, D. (2020) Teacher Characteristics and Children's Educational Attainment in Ghana: Do Some Teacher Characteristics Matter More for Children Attending Disadvantaged Schools? *Front. Educ.* 5:162. doi: 10.3389/feduc.2020.00162
- [99] Orphanos, S., & Orr, M. T. (2014). Learning leadership matters: The influence of innovative school leadership preparation on teachers' experiences and outcomes. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 42(5), 680-700.
- [100] Pepito, G. C., & Acibar, L. B. (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.
- [101] Podolsky, A., Kini, T., and Darling-Hammond, L. (2019). Does teaching experience increase teacher effectiveness? A review of US research. *J. Profess. Capital Commun.* 4, 286–308. doi: 10.1108/JPCC-12-2018-2032
- [102] Poonsook, U. (2013). Causal analysis and effect on teachers' competency development in Southern Region based on professional standard in process of knowledge management development. Curriculum and Instruction, Faculty of Education, Taksin University.
- [103] Prasertcharoensuk, T., Somprach, K. L., & Ngang, T. K. (2015). Influence of teacher competency factors and students' life skills on learning achievement. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 186, 566-572. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.04.021>
- [104] Ramberg, J., Brolin Låftman, S., Fransson, E., & Modin, B. (2019). School effectiveness and truancy: A multilevel study of upper secondary schools in Stockholm. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth*, 24(2), 185–198. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02673843.2018.1503085>
- [105] Rini, R., Sukamto, I., Ridwan, R., & Hariri, H. (2019). School-Based Management in Indonesia: Decision-Making, Problems, and Problem-Solving Strategy. *International Conference on Progressive Education (ICOPE 2019)*, 422(47), 229–235.

- [106] Robson, D., and Mtika, P. (2017). Newly qualified teachers' professional learning through practitioner enquiry: investigating partnership-based mentoring. *Int. J. Mentor. Coach. Educ.* 6, 242–260. doi: 10.1108/IJMCE-03-2017-0027
- [107] Santibañez, L., Abreu-Lastra, R., & O'Donoghue, J. L. (2014). School based management effects: Resources or governance change? Evidence from Mexico. *Economics of Education Review*, 39, 97–109. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2013.11.008>
- [108] Savasci, H. S. & Tomul, E. (2013). The relationship between educational resources of school and academic achievement. *International Education Studies*, 6(4), 114–123, <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ies.v6n4p114>
- [109] Schildkamp, K. (2019). Data-based decision-making for school improvement: Research insights and gaps, *Educational Research*, 61:3, 257–273
- [110] Schildkamp, K., Karbautzki, L., & Vanhoof, J. (2014). Exploring data use practices around Europe: Identifying enablers and barriers. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 42, 15–24. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2013.10.007>
- [111] Siguroardottir, S. M. & Sigborsson, R. (2016). The fusion of school improvement and leadership capacity in an elementary school. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*. 44(4), 599–616.
- [112] Smylie, M.A., Murphy, J., & Louis, K.S. (2016). Caring school leadership: A multi-disciplinary, cross-occupational model. *American Journal of Education*. 123(1), 1–35.
- [113] Sosu, E. M., Mtika, P., and Colucci-Gray, L. (2010). Does initial teacher education make a difference? The impact of teacher preparation on student teachers' attitudes towards educational inclusion. *J. Educ. Teach.* 36, 389–405. doi: 10.1080/02607476.2010.513847
- [114] Surasak, P. (2013). Teacher competency development in the 21st Century. Paper presented in Seminar and Educational Staff, under the Office of Prae Primary Educational Service Area 1-2. Teacher development program by developing the mentor system. Prae: Nakon Prae Tower Hotel.
- [115] Takyi, H., Anin, E. K., & Asuo, Y. K. (2014). The level of stakeholder's participation in the district education strategic planning towards quality basic education: the case of salaga town council of Ghana. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 3(14), 95–105, DOI:10.18533/ijbsr.v4i2.365
- [116] Tansiri, I. Y., & Bong, Y. J. (2018). The Analysis of School-Based Management (SBM) Implementation to the Educational Quality Service of State Junior High School. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research (ASSEHR)*, 258(Icream 2018), 424–426. <https://doi.org/10.2991/icream-18.2019.89>
- [117] Tapayan, H. N., Ebio, F. M., & Bentor, C. T. S. (2016). Impact of school-based management level of practices among secondary school implementing units on the K to 12 program implementation in Leyte division, Philippines. *International Journal of Engineering Sciences & Research Technology*, 5(5), 558–574.
- [118] Torre Villas, A. (2020). School-Based Management (SBM) as Correlates to Academic Performance of Secondary Schools in Quezon City. <https://research-manila.lettran.edu.ph/article/162>
- [119] Uscher-Pines, L., Schwartz, H.L., Ahmed, F. et al. School practices to promote social distancing in K-12 schools: review of influenza pandemic policies and practices. *BMC Public Health* 18, 406 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-018-5302-3>

- [120] Vally, G. V. S., & Daud, K. (2015). The implementation of school based management policy: An exploration. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 172, 693-700. Retrieved from <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042815004589>
- [121] Wilkerson, S. B., Shannon, L. C., Styers, M. K., & Grant, B. J. (2012). A study of the effectiveness of a school improvement intervention (Success in Sight): Final report (NCEE No. 2012-4014). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance. <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED530416>
- [122] Wolff, C. E., Jarodzka, H., and Boshuizen, H. P. A. (2017). See and tell: differences between expert and novice teachers' interpretations of problematic classroom management events. *Teach. Teach. Educ.* 66, 295-308. doi: 10.1016/j.tate.2017.04.015