



# SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT LEVEL OF PRACTICES AND ADMINISTRATORS' PERFORMANCE: A CORRELATIONAL STUDY

Ablin, Maria Carmela T.  
Completed 2020



**E - Saliksik**  
Department of Education  
Research Portal  
[e-saliksik.deped.gov.ph](http://e-saliksik.deped.gov.ph)

***E-Saliksik: the DepEd Research Portal is the official repository of education research in the Department of Education (DepEd). This research was funded by the Basic Education Research Fund.***

# **SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT LEVEL OF PRACTICES AND ADMINISTRATORS' PERFORMANCE: A CORRELATIONAL STUDY**

**MARIA CARMELA T. ABLIN, EdD**  
Chief Education Supervisor School Governance and  
Operations Division Division of Lanao del Norte



Accepted and approved in fulfillment of the requirements for the Basic Education  
Research Fund:

  
**EDILBERTO L. OPLENARIA, CESO V**  
School Division Superintendent

  
**MARY ANN M. ALLERA**  
Assistant Schools Division Superintendent

  
**MARIA CARMELA T. ABLIN**  
SGOD, Chief Education Supervisor

  
**BRIDGET E. ABALORIO**  
Senior Education Program Specialist

# **SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT LEVEL OF PRACTICES AND ADMINISTRATORS' PERFORMANCE: A CORRELATIONAL STUDY**

**MARIA CARMELA T. ABLIN, EdD**

Chief Education Supervisor  
School Governance and Operations Division  
Division of Lanao del Norte

## **Abstract**

School-based management (SBM) is a strategy to improve education by transferring significant decision-making authority from state and district offices to individual schools. SBM provides principals, teachers, students, and parents greater control over the education process by giving them responsibility for decisions about the budget, personnel, and the curriculum. Through the involvement of teachers, parents, and other community members in these key decisions, SBM can create more effective learning environments for children. This study assessed the School-Based Management (SBM) practices and work performance of the Lanao del Norte schools for the school year 2020-2021. This study utilized the descriptive method of research in order to determine the level of School-Based Management practices and work performance of the Lanao del Norte schools. Relevant data were taken from fifty (50) school administrators to answer the objectives of the study. Data revealed that the school-based management practices of the school administrators and their Office Performance Review and Commitment (OPRC) Rating are significantly correlated. This entails that the school administrators' practices in the School-Based Management reflects to their Office Performance Review and Commitment (OPRC) Rating. Hence, there is a significant relationship between the school-based management practices of the school administrators and their Office Performance Review and Commitment (OPRC) Rating with a p-value of  $<0.001$ . It is recommended to strengthen the implementation of School-Based Management in the school.

*Keywords: School-Based Management, Office Performance Review and Commitment, School Administrators, Correlational Study, Lanao del Norte*

## **Introduction and Rationale**

School-based management (SBM) is a strategy to improve education by transferring significant decision-making authority from state and district offices to individual schools. SBM provides principals, teachers, students, and parents greater control over the education process by giving them responsibility for decisions about the budget, personnel, and the curriculum. Through the involvement of teachers, parents, and other community members in these key decisions, SBM can create more effective learning environments for children.

Assessing the level of school-based management is imperative to determine the directions of improvement to attain the mature level of school-based management practice. Awareness of the current status of the school serves as a sound basis for the establishment of a plan of action to address certain gaps or challenges.

The study of Bandura (2018) in the implementation of school-based management in Indonesia identified some problems such as the increasing need to collaborate with school communities. School administrators had a difficulty in getting the involvement and participation of community groups. He or she needs to convince the other members of the partnership to arrive at a particular decision before instructions can be issued. Moreover, Bandura (2018) mentioned related problems in the implementation of SBM which include poor resources in schools, lack of professional development for school leaders and confusion on the part of school councils in relation to new roles and responsibilities. There are also difficulties of coordination, lack of decision making authority, low parental participation, and under funding of education by governments (Gamage & Sooksomchitra, 2014; Mulyasa, 2014; Munn, 2010; Schlegel, 2010;

Maksymjuk, 2010; Belk, 2018; Hancock, 1998; Oswald, 2015; Herman & Herman, 2013).

In the study of Wholstetter (2012), it was found out that the extent of decision-making responsibility devolved to the schools under the management of the school administrators is still limited. There is no full empowerment on the part of the school administrators since the decision-making authority still rests in the hands of the higher education officials. Schools practicing school-based management still experience inadequacy in school-based resources as well as participation and involvement of the stakeholders, especially the parents who are the important agents for educational change.

The implementation of the Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001 (RA 9155) provides the mandate for decentralizing the system of school management and recognizes the role of the Local Government Units and other stakeholders as partners in education service delivery. Consequently, the Department of Education launched the Schools First Initiative (SFI) in 2015 to empower the school and its community stakeholders to effectively address access and quality issues in basic education. To be able to deliver to the Filipino people the quality education they need, Republic Act 9155 or the Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001 was signed and enacted into law. Section 2 of RA 9155 states that the policy and principle for the governance of basic education shall be translated into programs, projects and services developed, adapted and offered to fit local needs.

To fully achieve the purpose, a School-Based Management (SBM) assessment tool was crafted with contextualized Means of Verifications (MOVs). This tool is in

consonance to DepED Order No. 83 s. 2012. The School-Based Management Assessment Tool is guided by the four principles of ACCESs (A Child (Learner) -and Community-Centered Education Systems). These are: (1) Principle of Collective leadership and Governance, (2) Principle of Community-Based learning, (3) Principle of Accountability for Performance and results, and (4) Principle of convergence to Harness Resources for education.

School-based management has been implemented in all elementary schools in the Division of Lanao del Norte. Out of the 452 schools, only 15% passed the Regional Validation for SBM Level 2 and Level 3 of practices. In addition, no research study has been conducted in the Division to determine the school-based management practices by the school administrators in relation to their performance. Thus, this research is proposed.

## **Literature Review**

SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT is the institutional expression of decentralization of education at the grassroots level. It is based on the national policy of decentralization originally set in the Philippine Local Government Code of 1991 (RA 7160). It responds to the new challenges for sustainable human development by enabling local communities to become self-reliant and more effective partners in the attainment of national goals.

Consistent with this policy, the Department of Education (formerly DECS) sought to hasten the decentralization of education management through its 10-year master plan (1995-2005). With the objective of improving its operations and delivery of

services, the Department intended to realize decentralization by giving more and more decision-making powers to local school officials in terms of school repairs and maintenance as well as the procurement of textbooks, supplies, and equipment. In 1999, DECS Order No. 230 further defined decentralization as: 1) promotion of school-based management; 2) transfer of authority and decision-making from central and regional offices to the divisions and schools; 3) sharing of education management responsibilities with other stakeholders such as LGUs, NGOs; and 4) devolution of education functions.

With the enactment of RA 9155 (An Act Instituting a Framework of Governance for Basic Education) on August 11, 2011, the legal mandate for decentralization of governance in basic education was finally articulated (Bautista, 2015).

The enactment of Republic Act 9155 otherwise known as Governance of Basic Education Act of 2011 gave added impetus to the earlier efforts of the Department of Education (DepEd) to decentralize the governance and management of basic education. This Act formally institutes the systems and procedures that would govern the exercise of school-based management (SBM) in public elementary and secondary schools nationwide.

It is hereby declared the policy of the State to protect and promote the right of all citizens to quality basic education and to make such education accessible to all by providing all Filipino children a free education at the high school level. Such education shall also include alternative learning systems for out-of-school youth and adult learners. It shall be the goal of basic education to provide them with the skills,

knowledge, and values they need to become caring, self-reliant, productive, and patriotic citizens.

The school shall be the heart of the formal education system. It is where children learn. Schools shall have a single aim of providing the best possible basic education for all learners (Bautista, 2015).

Governance of basic education shall begin at the national level. It is at the regions, divisions, schools, and learning centers-herein referred to as the field offices-where the policy and principle for the governance of basic education shall be translated into programs, projects, and services developed, adapted, and offered to fit local needs.

The State shall encourage local initiatives for improving the quality of basic education. The State shall ensure that the values, needs and aspirations of a school community are reflected in the program of education for the children, out-of-school youth, and adult learners. Schools and learning centers shall be empowered to make decisions on what is best for the learners they serve.

It is clear from this policy statement that the most important change in the governance of basic education must occur at the level of the school, “the heart of the formal education system”. School-Based Management (SBM) is the institutional expression of such change (Bautista, 2015). School-based management is defined as the decentralization of decision-making authority from central, regional and division levels to individual school sites, uniting school administrators, teachers, students as well as parents, the local government units and the community in promoting effective schools. Its main goal is to improve school performance and student achievement, where decision-making is made by those who are closely involved with resolving the



challenges of the individual schools, so that specific needs of students will be served more effectively. Its objectives are to 1. empower the school administrator to provide leadership; and 2. mobilize the community as well as local government units to invest time, money and effort in making the school a better place to learn, thus improving the educational achievement of the children.

The School administrator is the leader in SBM (Section 1.2 Rule 1. Principles of the Implementing Rules and Regulation of Republic Act 9155). A school administrator is defined as: “The principals, school administrators and teacher-in-charge who exercise instructional leadership and sound administrative management of the school”.

Section 7E of the same Republic Act states that the school administrators shall have authority, accountability and responsibility to: 1. set the mission, goals and targets of the school and develop the school improvement plan (SIP); 2. be accountable for higher learning outcomes, implement the curriculum, develop the school educational program, create an environment conducive to higher learning outcomes, 3. administer and manage all personnel, physical and fiscal resources of the school, recommend staff complement, encourage staff development, accept donations, and 4. establish school-community networks in support of school targets that would contribute to community development (Bautista, 2015).

The enactment of RA 9155 otherwise known as Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001, gave added impetus to the earlier efforts of the Department of Education to decentralize the governance of Basic Education at the grassroots level. School- Based Management (SBM) is defined as “decentralization of decision-making authority from central, regional and division levels to individual schools, uniting school administrators,

teachers, students as well as parents, the local government units and the community in promoting effective schools (Primer on School-Based Management and its Support Systems, 2015).

The main goal of SBM is to improve school performance and student achievement. Its objectives are to empower the school administrators to provide leadership and mobilize the community as well as the local government units to invest time, money and effort in making the school a better place to live in.

SBM is concerned with the decentralization of decision-making authority from the central, regional, and division offices to the individual schools. The DepEd has decentralized decision-making powers to local officials as its response to RA 7160 (Philippine Local Government Code) in 1999. DECS Order 230, defined decentralization as: (a) Promotion of school based management, (b) transfer of authority and decision-making powers from the central office to the divisions and schools, (c) sharing of responsibility of educational management of local schools with the local governments, parents, the community and other stakeholders, and (d) the devolution of education functions (DepEd, 2006).

The premise of SBM is that principals, teachers, parents, and the local communities are in the best position to know the needs of their schools and to make appropriate decisions in a timely manner. So, “involving local stakeholders in addressing local problems is the key to improving schools and even to mobilizing much-needed resources” (World Bank, 2014).

In SBM, it is the school principal who is given the responsibility to lead the process of shared governance. School administrators take on the new role of school

managers aside from being instructional leaders. School administrators have to set the climate for teaching and learning through participatory planning and governance in the school, developing teamwork, encouraging collaboration among teachers, and networking among the parents, the local government, the non-government organizations, and the community.

The greatest accountability of school administrators is to improve learning outcomes in their schools. Rule VI, section 6.2 of RA 9155 states that school administrators have to account for higher learning outcomes by setting the mission, vision, goals and objectives of the school; creating an environment that is caring and welcoming for all students, and where teaching and learning will thrive; the implementing and monitoring of curriculum at the same time offering educational programs and services that will benefit all students (SBM Primer, DepEd, 2006).

The school administrators being tasked to lead and implement SBM must continuously improve through assessment of its level of SBM practice along six dimensions which is also evident in their performance. These dimensions guide stakeholders in their commitment to support change efforts towards improved achieving the desired outcomes. However, three elements must be decentralized in order to facilitate the development of meaningful patterns of involvement oriented towards improved performance. Management of schools is enhanced through the different features of SBM. All these components are the focus in the delivery of this program so that the ultimate objective of SBM which is to improve the learning outcomes of pupils will be attained (SBM Primer, DepEd, 2016).

The importance of SBM in improving learning outcomes has been emphasized in different legal documents and issuances: The Local Government Code of the Philippines (RA 7160) enables communities to be more effective partners in the attainment of national goals; The Medium-Term Philippine Development Plan (MTPDP 2004-2010) requires localized educational management that would enable schools to focus on enhancing initiative, creativity, innovation and effectiveness, Governance of Basic Education Act (9155) emphasizes decentralization of school governance; Basic Education Sector Reform Agenda (BESRA) provides a package of policy reforms focused on Key Reform Thrusts (KRTs). KRT1 deals on continuous improvement through active involvement of stakeholders. It is anchored on the principles that those who are directly involved in an affected by school operations are in the best position to plan, manage and improve the school; and The Schools First Initiative (SFI) of 2004 empowers educational leaders and stakeholders to focus on school improvement and total well-being of school children. The school needs to continuously improve through assessment of its level of SBM practice along six dimensions. Management system in schools is anchored on the framework of these six dimensions of SBM. These dimensions guide stakeholders in their commitment to support change efforts toward achieving the desired outcomes.

Advocates of SBM assert that it should improve educational outcomes for a number of reasons. First, it improves accountability of principals and teachers to students, parents and teachers. Accountability mechanism that put people at the center of service provision can go a long way in making services work and improving outcomes by facilitating participation in service delivery, as noted in the World Banks'

2014 World Development report, Making Services Work for Poor People. Second, it allows local decision-makers to determine the appropriate mix of inputs and education policies adapted to local realities and needs (Trochim,2016).

Evaluations of SBM programs offer mixed evidence of impacts. Nicaragua's Autonomous School Program gives school-site councils- comprised of teachers, students and a voting majority of parents- authority to determine how 100 percent of school resources are allocated and authority to hire and fire principals, a privilege that few other school councils in Latin America enjoy. Two evaluations found that the number of decisions made at the school level contributed to better test scores (King and Ozler, 2011).

Mexico's compensatory education program provides extra resources to disadvantaged rural primary schools and all indigenous schools, thus increasing the supply of education. However, the compensatory package has several components. If one breaks the intervention up in its multiple components, then it is shown that empowering parent associations seems to have a substantial effect in improving educational outcomes, even when controlling the presence of beneficiaries of Mexico's large and successful conditional cash transfer program (Oportunidades, formerly Progressa). This is strong evidence of the positive effects of decentralizing education to the lower levels. Various evaluations of SBM programs in the United States have found no evidence of decreased dropout and student suspension rates but no impact on test scores.

School-Based Management (SBM) places significant decision-making power from the State and district offices to schools. An alternative approach to improve the

education system, it lets principals, teachers, students, and parents decide on educational-related issues like concerns on budget, personnel, and the curriculum.

According to the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP), the School-Based Management approach creates the following advantages to high schools: provides opportunity to competent school leaders in the schools to make decisions; boosts the morale of teachers and encourages leadership at all levels; allows participation of the entire school community in making key decisions; has wider pool of ideas in designing education programs; and focuses on resources on the goals and needs of each school (Trochim, 2016).

In any case, the SBM practice is ascertained by the existence of structured mechanisms, processes, and practices in all indicators. A team of practitioners and experts from the district, division, region and central office validates the self-study/assessment before a level of SBM is established. The purpose of self-assessment is to determine the school's level of SBM practice. An SBM assessment tool is used to gather data, which are analyzed for evidence using the DOD (Documentary Analysis, Observation, Discussion) process. DOD is an acronym of Document Analysis, Observation, and Discussion-three essential steps in evaluating the validity of an evidence of an SBM practice. Below are the steps: (1) Conduct Document Analysis (using artifacts), (2) Conduct observations to obtain process evidence (individual or group interviews), (3) Discuss the synthesized documentary and process evidence, (consensual decision).

To further check the level of implementation of SBM in the region, the Department of Education Regional Office I, through the Field Technical Assistance

Division (FTAD), contextualized the Means of Verifications/artifacts in each criterion of the SBM Assessment tool.

In fact, the contextualized Means of Verifications (MOVs)/artifacts of the tool was based on the collective efforts of both the region and divisions. A Focal Group Discussion (FGD) was conducted between and among the FTAD, QAD representative, SBM Coordinators, SGOD Chiefs, and selected school administrators to gather inputs, insights and appropriate Means of Verifications (MOVs)/artifacts of the schools.

Related researches are in support to the SBM Assessment Tool like that of Datu1 (2016) who states that SBM generate public confidence. She also states that the wide knowledge and skills of administrators, perseverance of teachers and pupils, cooperation of parents and community coupled with strong networking and linkages are ingredients to a successful SBM program. This also affirms the study of Bucud (2016), which states that community participation plays a vital role in the implementation of SBM.

### **Research Questions**

This study assessed the School-Based Management (SBM) practices and work performance of the Lanao del Norte schools for the school year 2020-2021. Specifically, the study sought to answer the following questions:

Specifically, the study seeks to answer the following questions:

1. What is the level of school-based management practices of the school administrators in terms of:
  - a. School Leadership,
  - b. Internal Stakeholders' Participation,
  - c. External Stakeholders' Participation,
  - d. School Improvement Processes,
  - e. School-based Resources and Financial Management,
  - f. School Performance Accountability?

2. What is the level of work performance of the school administrators in terms of their Office Performance Review and Commitment (OPRC) Rating?
3. Is there a significant relationship between the school-based management practices of the school administrators and their Office Performance Review and Commitment (OPRC) Rating?

### **Scope and Limitation**

This study assessed the School-Based Management (SBM) practices and work performance of the Lanao del Norte schools for the school year 2020-2021. Its findings served as bases for a school-based management training proposal. To meet the deadline in the submission of the completed research, the study utilized the Office Performance Review and Commitment (OPRC) Rating of the school administrators for the calendar year 2019.

This study utilized the descriptive method of research in order to determine the level of School-Based Management practices and work performance of the Lanao del Norte schools. Relevant data were taken from fifty (50) school administrators to answer the objectives of the study.

### **Research Methodology**

#### **a. Sampling**

Respondents of the study were the fifty (50) school administrators in the Division of Lanao del Norte for the School Year 2020-2021. The respondents were picked through random sampling method. Random sampling is a part of the sampling technique in which each sample has an equal probability of being chosen. A sample chosen randomly is meant to be an unbiased representation of the total population.

#### **b. Data Collection**



A formal letter of intent for the conduct of the research was sent to the Schools Division Superintendent to seek for approval. Upon approval was granted, another set of research intent letters were sent to four (4) District Supervisors and to the target research respondents, with a copy of the approved letter of request from the Schools Division Superintendent, as an attachment for each set.

After obtaining the approval, setting of schedules with the research respondents were established. Questionnaires were administered ethically and professionally for research purposes.

**c. Ethical Issues**

Proper code of conduct was observed in the collection of data. This was done by letting the participants sign an informed consent stating the purpose of the study, and that their participation was voluntary. They were oriented that they are free to back out anytime they want. More so, the data to be gathered were used solely for the purpose of the study.

**d. Plans for Data Analysis**

After gathering all the data, the researcher goes over the results and interpreted the data. The researcher used the following statistical formula in the processing of the data:

1. **Frequency and Percentage.** For the profile of the respondents, frequency count and percentage were used.

**Formula:**

$$\% = \frac{f}{n} \times 100$$

**Where:**

% = Percentage

F = Frequency

N= Number of Cases

- 2. Weighted Mean.** The weighted mean was used through the formula to answer question number 2, 3, and 4.

**Formula:**

$$\bar{x} = \frac{\Sigma x}{n}$$

**Where:**

$\bar{x}$  = weighted mean

$\Sigma$  = summation

n= number of respondents/ frequency

N= total number of respondents

- 3. Person Product Moment Coefficient of Correlation.** This was used to establish the relationship between the independent variable and dependent variables. Person's Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (rho) is named after Karl Person who developed the statistical tool.

**Formula:**

$$r = \frac{\Sigma_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})(y_i - \bar{y})}{\sqrt{\Sigma_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2} \sqrt{\Sigma_{i=1}^n (y_i - \bar{y})^2}}$$

**Where:**

r= correlation value

$\Sigma xy$ = the summation of variable x and y

$\Sigma x^2$ = the summation of the squares of the dependent variable

$\Sigma y^2$ = the summation of the squares of dependent variable

## Discussion of Results and Recommendation

Problem No. 1: What is the level of School-Based Management practices of the school administrators in terms of School Leadership, Internal Stakeholders' Participation, External Stakeholders' Participation, School Improvement Processes, School-based Resources and Financial Management, and School Performance Accountability?

Table 1: Level of School-Based Management (SBM) practices of the school administrators in terms of School Leadership.

<b>Dimension</b>	<b>Particular</b>	<b>Mean Rating</b>
School Leadership	School Head is fully accountable to stakeholders for school performance.	3.67
	School Heads shares SBM experiences and leading practices to other schools.	3.84
	School Heads establishes effective work relationship with organized stakeholders to champion SBM for continuous school improvement.	3.95
	School Heads have effective working relationship with Local School Board and School Governing Council.	3.89
	School Heads acts as fund manager and devotes more attention to instructional leadership and supervision.	3.79
<b>Total</b>		<b>3.83</b>

Table 1 presents the Level of School-Based Management (SBM) practices of the school administrators in terms of School Leadership. The data revealed that school administrators very well implemented the School-Based Management (SBM) activities under the School Leadership dimension with an average mean rating of 3.83. Among the particulars, "School Heads establishes effective work relationship with organized stakeholders to champion SBM for continuous school improvement" item was very well observed with a mean rating of 3.95 (Very well implemented).

Table 2: Level of School-Based Management (SBM) practices of the school administrators in terms of Internal Stakeholders' Participation.

<b>Dimension</b>	<b>Particular</b>	<b>Mean Rating</b>
Internal Stakeholders' Participation	Teachers are co-leaders and co-managers of the school.	3.67

	Teachers hold themselves accountable for student performance and positively influence learning and school outcomes.	3.54
	Parents co-manage and co-monitor learning process.	3.71
	Parents are also held accountable for the performance and achievement of their children.	3.85
	Students engage themselves in leading and management.	3.61
	Students are held accountable for their performance.	3.78
	Students, teachers and parents champion SBM.	3.67
	Organized stakeholders pro-actively engage themselves in school governance and continuous improvement process.	3.77
<b>Total</b>		<b>3.70</b>

Table 2 shows the Level of School-Based Management (SBM) practices of the school administrators in terms of Internal Stakeholders' Participation. The data revealed that school administrators very well implemented the School-Based Management (SBM) activities under the Internal Stakeholders' Participation dimension with an average mean rating of 3.70. Among the particulars, "Parents are also held accountable for the performance and achievement of their children" item was very well observed with a mean rating of 3.85 (Very well implemented).

Table 3: Level of School-Based Management (SBM) practices of the school administrators in terms of External Stakeholders' Participation.

<b>Dimension</b>	<b>Particular</b>	<b>Mean Rating</b>
External Stakeholders' Participation	External stakeholders share in the responsibility and accountability towards students' learning outcomes.	3.67
	Organized stakeholders engage themselves in school governance and school wide improvement process.	3.66
	External stakeholders are mobilized to support SBM and the implementation of SIP.	3.68
	Community leaders/POs/NGOs are fully enabled to institutionalize support community-wide programs to continuously improve learning outcomes (including ALS).	3.75
	Local government stakeholders institutionalize Local School Board support for SBM practices.	3.70
	Organized stakeholders help create a community environment that supports basic education.	3.59
<b>Total</b>		<b>3.68</b>

Table 3 shows the Level of School-Based Management (SBM) practices of the school administrators in terms of External Stakeholders' Participation. The data revealed that school administrators very well implemented the School-Based Management (SBM) activities under the External Stakeholders' Participation dimension with an average mean rating of 3.68. Among the particulars, "Community leaders/POs/NGOs are fully enabled to institutionalize support community-wide programs to continuously improve learning outcomes (including ALS)" item was very well observed with a mean rating of 3.75 (Very well implemented).

Table 4: Level of School-Based Management (SBM) practices of the school administrators in terms of School Improvement Processes.

<b>Dimension</b>	<b>Particular</b>	<b>Mean Rating</b>
School Improvement Processes	School conducts assessment of SBM practices using assessment tool.	3.73
	School Governing Council supports continuous school improvement process.	3.65
	SIP/AIP formulation involved full and sustained engagement of stakeholders.	3.51
	School surpasses National/Regional/Division performance standards.	3.53
	A system of incentives and rewards based on performance contract is institutionalized.	3.69
	A system of technical assistance (policy support, institutional strengthening and training) is optimized for continuous school improvement process.	3.67
<b>Total</b>		<b>3.63</b>

Table 4 presents the Level of School-Based Management (SBM) practices of the school administrators in terms of School Improvement Processes. The data revealed that school administrators very well implemented the School-Based Management (SBM) activities under the School Improvement Processes dimension with an average mean rating of 3.63. Among the particulars, "School conducts assessment of SBM practices using assessment tool" item was very well observed with a mean rating of 3.73 (Very well implemented).

Table 5: Level of School-Based Management (SBM) practices of the school administrators in terms of School-based Resources and Financial Management.

<b>Dimension</b>	<b>Particular</b>	<b>Mean Rating</b>
School-based Resources and Financial Management	The school has an Annual School Budget (ASB) aligned with the Annual Improvement Plan (AIP).	3.59
	ASB is executed with best practices and innovations resulting in improved school performance.	3.61
	The school manages and controls funds with minimum fiscal authority/autonomy.	3.72
	School budget is sustained and institutionalized by LGU and community partners through supplemental budget and community equity.	3.66
	The allocation is optionally utilized and disbursement of funds is aligned to SIP/AIP/ASB and recorded, reported and accounted for.	3.69
<b>Total</b>		<b>3.65</b>

Table 5 shows the Level of School-Based Management (SBM) practices of the school administrators in terms of School-based Resources and Financial Management. The data revealed that school administrators very well implemented the School-Based Management (SBM) activities under the School-based Resources and Financial Management dimension with an average mean rating of 3.65. Among the particulars, “The school manages and controls funds with minimum fiscal authority/autonomy” item was very well observed with a mean rating of 3.72 (Very well implemented).

Table 6: Level of School-Based Management (SBM) practices of the school administrators in terms of School Performance Accountability.

<b>Dimension</b>	<b>Particular</b>	<b>Mean Rating</b>
School Performance Accountability	The school is fully transparent and accountable.	3.79
	Stakeholders and school jointly develop and implement multi-dimensional M/E system with no innovations.	3.68
	Stakeholders hold themselves accountable for school performance.	3.53
	The school has a fully functional monitoring and evaluation system participated by stakeholders.	3.55
	Improvement in learning outcomes are tracked for benchmarking with other SBM schools.	3.64
<b>Total</b>		<b>3.64</b>

Table 6 presents the Level of School-Based Management (SBM) practices of the school administrators in terms of School Performance Accountability. The data revealed that school administrators very well implemented the School-Based Management (SBM) activities under the School Performance Accountability dimension with an average mean rating of 3.64. Among the particulars, “The school is fully transparent and accountable” item was very well observed with a mean rating of 3.64 (Very well implemented).

Problem No. 2: What is the level of work performance of the school administrators in terms of their Office Performance Review and Commitment (OPRC) Rating?

Table 7: Office Performance Review and Commitment (OPRC) Rating of School Administrators for Calendar Year 2019.

<b>School Administrator</b>	<b>OPCRF Rating 2019</b>	<b>Description</b>
School Administrator 01	4.52	Outstanding
School Administrator 02	4.36	Very Satisfactory
School Administrator 03	4.57	Outstanding
School Administrator 04	4.44	Very Satisfactory
School Administrator 05	3.89	Outstanding
School Administrator 06	4.23	Very Satisfactory
School Administrator 07	4.68	Outstanding
School Administrator 08	4.79	Outstanding
School Administrator 09	4.72	Outstanding
School Administrator 10	4.80	Outstanding
School Administrator 11	4.41	Very Satisfactory
School Administrator 12	4.46	Very Satisfactory
School Administrator 13	4.52	Outstanding
School Administrator 14	4.19	Very Satisfactory
School Administrator 15	4.38	Very Satisfactory
School Administrator 16	4.48	Very Satisfactory
School Administrator 17	4.49	Very Satisfactory
School Administrator 18	4.56	Outstanding
School Administrator 19	4.67	Outstanding
School Administrator 20	4.62	Outstanding
School Administrator 21	4.58	Outstanding
School Administrator 22	4.66	Outstanding
School Administrator 23	4.58	Outstanding
School Administrator 24	4.19	Very Satisfactory
School Administrator 25	3.99	Very Satisfactory
School Administrator 26	4.17	Very Satisfactory

School Administrator 27	4.24	Very Satisfactory
School Administrator 28	4.22	Very Satisfactory
School Administrator 29	4.48	Very Satisfactory
School Administrator 30	4.37	Very Satisfactory
School Administrator 31	4.58	Outstanding
School Administrator 32	4.67	Outstanding
School Administrator 33	4.85	Outstanding
School Administrator 34	4.72	Outstanding
School Administrator 35	4.81	Outstanding
School Administrator 36	4.61	Outstanding
School Administrator 37	4.49	Very Satisfactory
School Administrator 38	4.61	Outstanding
School Administrator 39	4.72	Outstanding
School Administrator 40	4.77	Outstanding
School Administrator 41	4.66	Outstanding
School Administrator 42	4.64	Outstanding
School Administrator 43	4.68	Outstanding
School Administrator 44	4.58	Outstanding
School Administrator 45	4.50	Outstanding
School Administrator 46	4.57	Outstanding
School Administrator 47	4.64	Outstanding
School Administrator 48	4.44	Very Satisfactory
School Administrator 49	4.49	Very Satisfactory
School Administrator 50	4.39	Very Satisfactory
<b>Mean</b>	<b>4.51</b>	<b>Outstanding</b>

Table 7 presents the Office Performance Review and Commitment (OPRC) Rating of School Administrators for Calendar Year 2019. Data revealed that for calendar year 2019, 20 out of 50 or 40% of the respondents received a “Very Satisfactory” rating while 30 out of 50 or 60% of the respondents received an “Outstanding” rating. Furthermore, the average Office Performance Review and Commitment (OPRC) Rating of School Administrators for Calendar Year 2019 is outstanding with a mean rating of 4.51.

Problem No. 3: Is there a significant relationship between the school-based management practices of the school administrators and their Office Performance Review and Commitment (OPRC) Rating?



Table 8: Significant relationship between the school-based management practices of the school administrators and their Office Performance Review and Commitment (OPRC) Rating

<b>Solid Waste Management (Variables)</b>	<b>Correlation Coefficient</b>	<b>p-value</b>	<b>Remarks</b>
School-Based Management (SBM) practices and Office Performance Review and Commitment (OPRC) Rating	.216**	<.001	<i>Highly Significant</i>

Table 8 presents the significant relationship between the school-based management practices of the school administrators and their Office Performance Review and Commitment (OPRC) Rating. The data revealed that the school-based management practices of the school administrators and their Office Performance Review and Commitment (OPRC) Rating are significantly correlated. This entails that the school administrators' practices in the School-Based Management reflects to their Office Performance Review and Commitment (OPRC) Rating. Hence, there is a significant relationship between the school-based management practices of the school administrators and their Office Performance Review and Commitment (OPRC) Rating with a p-value of <0.001.

## **Recommendations**

Based on the findings cited by the researcher, it is recommended to strengthen the implementation of School-Based Management in the school. School may conduct orientations, meetings, and other interventions to inform and encourage all internal and external stakeholders in participating all School-Based Management practices in schools. Schools= administrators may prioritize in their Annual Implementation Plan the programs, projects and activities that will fortify the practices under the dimensions School Leadership, Internal Stakeholders' Participation, External Stakeholders' Participation, School Improvement Processes, School-based Resources and Financial Management, and School Performance Accountability.

**Dissemination and Advocacy Plans**

The researcher will present the findings of the study in the research congress. Thus, the findings will be presented and shared to all personnel of the Division of Lanao del Norte through personnel's conferences and meetings. The researcher will also utilize the findings as basis for policy recommendation.

## References

- Analoui, F (2012). What motivates senior managers? The case of Romania. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, Volume 15, Number 4, pp: 324-340. University of Bradford, Bradford, UK
- Sansone & Harackiewicz, (2013) *the extrinsic and intrinsic motivation the search for optimal motivation and performance : A Academic Press a Harcourt and Science Technology company in United States of America*
- Corpuz, Brenda B.,Ph.D., and Gloria G. Salandanan, Ph.D. *Principles of Teaching* 1 -2nd Edition. Quezon City: Lorimar Publishing, Inc., c2011.
- Cole, G.A. (2013) *Management Theory and Practice*, Lens Educational Aldine Place: London p. 28.
- Alam, Muhammad T. (2014) *Factors Affecting Teachers Motivation Vol. 2 No.1 International Journal of Burners' and Social Scene*
- Alikira Richard (2013) *Job Satisfaction from Herzberg's pp: 28. GRIN verlag UK*
- Afe, John O. (2002) *Reflections on Becoming A Teacher and the Challenges of Teacher Education Inaugural lecture series 64, University of Benin, Benin City, Nigeria.*
- Kanu, O.C. (2017) *Teachers' Motivation as a Viable Option for the Survival of Nigerian Educational System. Journal of Quality Education Vol. 4 p. 31.*
- Berelson, B and Steiner, G.A. (2013). *Human Behaviour: an Inventory of Scientific Findings*, New York: Harcourt, Brace and World p.234.
- Centra, J. (2013) *Reflective Faculty Evaluation: Enhancing Teaching and Determining Faculty Effectiveness*. Sam Francisco Jossey-Bass.
- Kim, Tracy (2013) *Intrinsic Motivation. Teachers Net Gazette Vol. 1 No 6*
- Robbins, Stephens P. (2001) *Organizational Behaviour Prentice-Hall Internal Inc. P. 184.*
- Bear, G. G., & Minke, K. M. (Eds.). (2010). *Children's needs III: Development, prevention, and intervention*. Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists

- Ala-Adeyemi, F.B.O. and Afolabi, F.O. (2010) Job Satisfaction among Primary School Teachers in Udo S.U; Akpan, G.O. and Gang, K.P. (eds) Towards Functional Primary Education in Nigeria. NAEAP: Jos, p.14
- Maehr, Martin L. and Carol Midgley (2011) Enhancing Student Motivation: A School wide Approach. Educational Psychology 26, 3 and 4, 399-427.
- Disomimba, Jonairah M. (2011) Elementary Teaching Career Fulfillment and Administrators Proficiency in Tamparan District, Lanao Del Norte. Master Thesis, Iligan Medical College Center.

## Research Instrument

Dear Ms./Mr. \_\_\_\_\_,

You are hereby requested to be a respondent of this research study, entitled: **SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT LEVEL OF PRACTICES AND ADMINISTRATORS' PERFORMANCE: A CORRELATIONAL STUDY**. Please answer the questions according to how it relates to your current school situation. Rest assured, your responses will be treated with high confidentiality and shall solely be used for research purposes only.

**INSTRUCTION:** Kindly rate the extent of implementation of school-based management practices by checking the blanks under the number provided after each item, 4 being the highest and 1 being the lowest:

SCALE	DESCRIPTION OF SBM IMPLEMENTATION	
4	-VERY GOOD	(Very well implemented)
3	- GOOD	(Well implemented)
2	- FAIR	(Fair implemented)
1	-POOR	(Not implemented)

DIMENSION	PARTICULAR	4	3	2	1
1. School Leadership	1.1. School Head is fully accountable to stakeholders for school performance				
	1.2 School Heads shares SBM experiences and leading practices to other schools				

	1.3 School Heads establishes effective work relationship with organized stakeholders to champion SBM for continuous school improvement.				
	1.4 School Heads have effective working relationship with Local School Board and School Governing Council				
	1.5 School Heads acts as fund manager and devotes more attention to instructional leadership and supervision				
2. Internal Stakeholders' Participation (Teachers, Parents and Students)	2.1 Teachers are co-leaders and co-managers of the school.				
	2.2 Teachers hold themselves accountable for student performance and positively influence learning and school outcomes.				
	2.3 Parents co-manage and co-monitor learning process.				
	2.4 Parents are also held accountable for the performance and achievement of their children.				
	2.5 Students engage themselves in leading and management.				
	2.6 Students are held accountable for their performance.				
	2.7 Students, teachers and parents champion SBM.				

	2.8 Organized stakeholders pro-actively engage themselves in school governance and continuous improvement process.				
3. External Stakeholders' Participation (alumni, parents of alumni, local leaders, retired teachers, youth leaders/SK, business communities, etc.	3.1 External stakeholders share in the responsibility and accountability towards students' learning outcomes.				
	3.2 Organized stakeholders engage themselves in school governance and school wide improvement process.				
	3.3 External stakeholders are mobilized to support SBM and the implementation of SIP.				
	3.4 Community leaders/POs/NGOs are fully enabled to institutionalize support community-wide programs to continuously improve learning outcomes (including ALS).				
	3.5 Local government stakeholders institutionalize Local School Board support for SBM practices.				
	3.6 Organized stakeholders help create a community environment that supports basic education.				
4. School Improvement Process	4.1 School conducts assessment of SBM practices using assessment tool.				
	4.2 School Governing Council supports continuous school improvement process.				
	4.3 SIP/AIP formulation involved full and sustained engagement of stakeholders.				

	4.4 School surpasses National/Regional/Division performance standards.				
	4.5 A system of incentives and rewards based on performance contract is institutionalized.				
	4.6 A system of technical assistance (policy support, institutional strengthening and training) is optimized for continuous school improvement process.				
5. School-Based Resources	5.1 The school has an Annual School Budget (ASB) aligned with the Annual Improvement Plan (AIP).				
	5.2 ASB is executed with best practices and innovations resulting in improved school performance.				
	5.3 The school manages and controls funds with minimum fiscal authority/autonomy.				
	5.4 School budget is sustained and institutionalized by LGU and community partners through supplemental budget and community equity.				
	5.5 The allocation is optionally utilized and disbursement of funds is aligned to SIP/AIP/ASB and recorded, reported and accounted for.				
6. School Performance Accountability	6.1 The school is fully transparent and accountable.				
	6.2 Stakeholders and school jointly develop and implement multi-dimensional M/E system with no innovations.				
	6.3 Stakeholders hold themselves accountable for school performance.				



	6.4 The school has a fully functional monitoring and evaluation system participated by stakeholders.				
	6.5 Improvement in learning outcomes are tracked for benchmarking with other SBM schools.				

Source: A Manual on the Assessment of School-Based Management Practices (2009), DepEd

Complex, Meralco Avenue, Pasig City