

Implementation of School-Based Management Program in Bicol Secondary Schools

Dorren D. Arenque

Polytechnic University of the Philippines-Ragay Branch
Email: arenquedorren2013@gmail.com / ddarenque@pup.edu.ph

Received for publication: 14 September 2021.

Accepted for publication: 09 November 2021.

Abstract

A study investigates how well school managers implement the School-Based Management (SBM) Program in their respective schools. This employed the descriptive and comparative methods to analyze data which was utilized to measure the implementation of SBM programs by the 312 respondents from the Bicol Region's mainland provinces, namely, Albay, Camarines Norte, Camarines Sur, and Sorsogon, along with the four SBM principles, which include (a) leadership and governance; (b) curriculum and learning; (c) accountability and continuous improvement; and (d) management of resources. The samples were the school head, teachers, non-teaching personnel, parents, and students, respectively. The Independent Samples T-test was used to compare the degree of SBM implementation between schools classified as Implementing Units (IUs), also known as autonomous schools, and Non-Implementing Units (Non-IUs), also known as non-autonomous schools. Findings revealed that the extent of implementing the SBM program by IUs and Non-IUs on its four principles is high. Furthermore, the data revealed that the level of SBM implementation between IUs and Non-IUs does not significantly differ in the implementation of leadership and governance but is highly significant in implementing curriculum and learning accountability and continuous improvement and management of resources. The findings show that implementing SBM programs is highly observed, and there is still a pressing need to improve some implementation aspects. Thus, the outcome will serve as a foundation for school leaders to improve school efficiency and service delivery.

Keywords: School-Based Management, Bicol Secondary Schools, Implementation, Implementing Units, Non-Implementing Units.

Introduction

SBM (School-Based Management) is a method for improving educational outcomes. It allows individual schools a number of decision-making authority that was traditionally reserved for division and district offices (Kadtong 2015). It encourages the entire school group to participate in decision-making and contribute more diverse ideas. In other words, budget, staffing, and curriculum decisions are made by principals, staff, parents, students, and other members of the school community (Wooi 2013). SBM may improve children's learning environments by school stakeholders in these crucial decisions (Worldbank 2008). The program's underlying values are that the people who are actively interested in and influenced by school operations are the best people to prepare, run, and develop (Bernaldez 2011).

DepEd Order No. 83, s. 2012 established guidelines for the updated SBM process incorporating ACCEs in the Philippine Educational System (A Child and Community-Centered Education Systems) which is directed to the four values of a school system, namely a) leadership and governance; (b) curriculum and learning; (c) accountability and continuous improvement; (d) manage-

ment of resources. These concepts stress the learners' centrality and the participation of relevant groups as the primary education service providers. As a result, the Philippine Accreditation System for Basic Education (PASBE) has to use the SBM process based on the four SBM principles to evaluate the school's efficacy in implementing SBM practice.

However, according to a 2015 study conducted by Kadtong, despite the introduction of SBM in the Division of Cotabato City in DepEd Region XII, schools are decentralized, and school leaders and stakeholders are granted full authority and power to run the school, many school issues have not been resolved. High dropout rates, inadequate facilities, and a lack of parental follow-up are just a few of the problems. Similarly, Yau et al.'s research from 2014 discovered that all four facets of SBM are applied in primary schools, but the extent of implementation varies. Furthermore, there are significant gaps in principals' and teachers' perspectives on SBM contexts. The introductory statements in DepEd Order No. 83, s. 2012, in reality, support these findings, stating that:

“most schools are categorized under developing level in the implementation of SBM program simply because It has been seen as yet another DepEd Central Office mandate that schools must adhere to.”

As a result, the study looked into and evaluated how far the 312 IUs and Non- IUs of DepEd Secondary Schools in the Bicol Region's, namely Albay, Camarines Norte, Camarines Sur, and Sorsogon, have adopted the SBM programs, as well as how active each of the school's members, including the principal, teachers, non-teaching staff, students and parents in the said implementation.

The study assumes that the SBM program is being implemented in both IUs and Non-IUs of Department of Education Secondary Schools in the Bicol Region, with no significant difference in the degree of SBM implementation between these schools. As a result, the study aims to assess the level of SBM implementation along with the four principles of (a) leadership and governance; (b) curriculum and learning; (c) accountability and continuous improvement; and (d) resource management, and determine if there is a substantial difference in SBM implementation between IUs and Non-IUs.

The study's findings are intended to provide a clear picture of the state of SBM implementation and stakeholder engagement in schools in order to assist school administrators and leaders, as well as the Department of Education, in implementing policies and programs that will contribute to the country's continuous effort to achieve quality and competent education service delivery.

Methodology

The implementation and participation of secondary school stakeholders, IUs and Non-IUs, of the SBM program within the Bicol Region's mainland provinces, namely Camarines Sur, Camarines Norte, Albay, and Sorsogon, were investigated using descriptive and comparative research methods. The coastal provinces of Masbate and Catanduanes were excluded due to distance and other political factors that could pose threats to the researcher's security and safety. With 312 respondents, purposive sampling was used to assign representative groups from the 24 schools, 12 from IUs, and another 12 from Non-IUs. Every school had one school head, nine teachers, one parent representative (preferably a Parent-Teachers Association officer), one non-teaching staff member, and one student representative (preferably a Supreme Student Government officer). These respondents were school stakeholders who were supposed to play a direct role in the SBM program's implementation in the school.

Table 1 indicates the study's respondents by age group, school type (implementing or non-implementing), and province.

Table 1. Respondents of the Study

Group	Implementing Units				Non-Implementing Units				Total	%
	Cam. Sur	Cam. Norte	Albay	Sorsogon	Cam. Sur	Cam. Norte	Albay	Sorsogon		
School Head	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	24	7.69
Faculty	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	216	69.23
Parents	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	24	7.69
Students	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	24	7.69
Non-Teaching	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	24	7.69
TOTAL	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	312	100

The data was gathered using a self-made questionnaire with indicators based on DepEd data and built by item pooling. Part I enquires about the respondents' basic and personal knowledge, and Part II evaluates the respondent's level of implementation of the SBM program in terms of (a) leadership and governance; (b) education and learning; (c) transparency and quality improvement; and (d) resource management.

The questionnaire's draft was sent to a group of experts for feedback and revisions. All feedback and comments were taken into account before being resubmitted to the experts for final approval. To ensure the validity and reliability of the questionnaire, it was pre-tested in schools that were not included in the actual survey. A permit was obtained from the DepEd Regional Director V, and the four Schools Division Superintendents in the selected provinces, and a letter requesting data collection was sent to the respective school heads of the IUs and Non-IUs schools-respondents. The questionnaires were then personally distributed to the respondents, who were oriented by clarifying the intent and describing each section of the questionnaire that they might find confusing.

Following the administration of the instrument, the responses were carefully collected, tallied, and evaluated. The degree of stakeholder implementation of the SBM program along its four principles was measured using the weighted mean. The extent of SBM implementation between IUs and Non-IUs was compared using the independent samples t-test. After the rigorous analyses, the conclusions and recommendations were formulated.

Results and Discussion

Results

The findings of this study show the level of implementation of the SBM program by IUs and Non-IUs selected secondary schools in the Bicol Region along (a) leadership and governance; (b) curriculum and learning; (c) accountability and continuous improvement; and (d) resource management. The 312 respondents from the Bicol Region's mainland provinces, namely Albay, Camarines Norte, Camarines Sur, and Sorsogon, were polled using descriptive and comparative methods to assess their implementation of the SBM program. The school principals, teachers, non-teaching staff, parents, and students served as the samples. To evaluate data, the analysis used descriptive and comparative methods. The weighted mean was utilized to measure the degree to which stakeholders implemented SBM practices in the following areas: (a) leadership and governance; (b) education and learning; (c) accountability and quality improvement; and (d) resource management. The level

of SBM implementation between IUs and Non-IUs was compared using the Independent Samples T-test.

The extent of Implementation of the SBM Program

Tables 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 show the implementation of the SBM Program among IUs and Non-IUs in the Bicol Region, based on its four principles. The degree of involvement is graded on a scale of four, with four being very high, three being high, two being low, and one being very low. The level of implementation was evaluated using the weighted mean.

The extent of implementation of the SBM Program in Leadership and Governance

Table 2 shows that IUs and Non-IUs both had high levels of implementation in leadership and governance, with grand mean scores of 3.04 and 3.02, respectively. IUs were exceptionally high in developing implementation plans, such as the School Improvement Plan (SIP), in collaboration with school and community stakeholders. Non-IUs were very high. When it came to developing sustainable programs designed to satisfy the need to prepare and advance each community leader, IUs were high, while Non-IUs were very high. In terms of indicators 3, 4, and 5, on building a leadership network and addressing school-community-wide learning issues; updating the development plan by the school community to make it more accessible and relevant to changing demands, issues, and opportunities; and reviewing, tracking; and reviewing, monitoring and evaluating the SIP; high implementation was evident.

Table 2. The extent of SBM implementation in leadership and governance of IUs and Non-IUs in the Bicol Region, the school year 2017-2018

INDICATORS	IUs		NON-IUs		TOTAL	
	WM	EI	WM	EI	MEAN	EI
Developing an implementation plan (e.g., SIP) in collaboration with school and community stakeholders	3.06	H	3.33	VH	3.19	H
Developing sustainable programs designed to satisfy the need to prepare and advance each community leader	3.02	H	3.31	VH	3.16	H
Building a leadership network and addressing school-community-wide learning issues	2.98	H	3.05	H	3.01	H
Updating the development plan by the school community to make it more accessible and relevant to changing demands, issues, and opportunities	2.99	H	2.90	H	2.94	H
Reviewing, monitoring, and evaluating SIP	3.14	H	2.49	H	2.82	H
Grand Mean	3.04	H	3.02	H	3.03	H

Legend:

Mean Range (WM)
3.26-4.00

The extent of Implementation (EI)
Very High (VH)

2.51-3.25	High (H)
1.76-2.50	Low (L)
1.00-1.75	Very Low (VL)

The institutionalized DepEd initiatives that require enforcement by all schools, such as the School Improvement Plan (SIP) crafting, have resulted in a high level of adoption of the SBM program in leadership and governance. This is generally the case for the school principal, who is the one who is in charge of the implementation. In reality, Vally et al. (2015) backed up this point by stating that the principal is the most influential element in helping a school improve and reach its optimal level of success.

The extent of Implementation of Curriculum and Learning

Table 3 shows results in terms of curriculum and learning implementation. It reveals that both IUs and Non-IUs scored well, with grand mean scores of 2.98 and 2.65, respectively, interpreted as high. They scored exceptionally high in indicators 1-6, which include developing a curriculum that is relevant to life and society; developing a curriculum that meets the developmental needs of all types of learners; updating and enhancing evaluation methods for teaching and learning; in cultivating values and environments that protect all children; in developing materials and processes for creative thought and resolving issues; and in incorporating learner and community-friendly methods and resources that are fun, healthy, inclusive, and usable. In the community's monitoring of learning systems using appropriate instruments, IUs are high while Non-IUs are low.

Table 3. The extent of SBM implementation in curriculum and learning of IUs and Non-IUs in the Bicol Region, the school year 2017-2018

INDICATORS	IUs		NON-IUs		TOTAL	
	WM	EI	WM	EI	MEAN	EI
Developing a curriculum that is relevant to life and society	3.07	H	2.64	H	2.86	H
Developing a curriculum that meets the development needs of all types of learners	3.04	H	2.67	H	2.86	H
Updating and enhancing evaluation methods for teaching and learning	2.96	H	2.71	H	2.83	H
Cultivating values and environments that protect all children	2.98	H	2.69	H	2.83	H
Developing materials and processes for creative thought and resolving issues	2.98	H	2.66	H	2.82	H
Incorporating learner and community-friendly methods that are fun, healthy, inclusive, and accessible	2.97	H	2.66	H	2.81	H
Monitoring of learning systems by the stakeholders with the aid of suitable tools	2.90	H	2.49	L	2.70	H
Grand Mean	2.98	H	2.65	H	2.82	H

Legend:

<i>Mean Range (WM)</i>	<i>The extent of Implementation (EI)</i>
3.26-4.00	Very High (VH)
2.51-3.25	High (H)

1.76-2.50 *Low (L)*
 1.00-1.75 *Very Low (VL)*

However, the overall high implementation results in curriculum and learning may not guarantee an entirely positive outcome, especially in Non-IUs, which reported low monitoring of learning systems by its stakeholders using suitable tools. A school is required to consider that a well-designed and supported curriculum is essential to achieving its educational vision and goals (www.cambridgeinternational.org). In reality, however, only school heads and other DepEd supervisors are involved in tracking and evaluating school results, as customary in schools, while other stakeholders are excluded from the process. While SBM implementation is highly favored, according to OERI findings cited by Cedron (2012), it fails to specify the changes it adheres to undertake that are supposed to contribute to student learning. SBM entails a significant shift in people's perceptions of schools and an essential part of enhancing the capacity of school stakeholders to be leaders in developing responsive ways to meet educational needs and include them in school governance, according to Vernez et al. (2012). Similarly, Allawan (2012), quoted by Cabardo (2016), confirmed the study's findings that schools could not function in isolation from the community and that community linkages must be improved in order for schools to be progressive and achieve their goals.

The extent of implementation of Accountability and Continuous Improvement

Table 4 indicates that IUs and Non-IUs accountability and continuous improvement were high in execution, with grand mean values of 3.02 and 2.64, respectively. Both scored high on all metrics, including achieving targets identified on a collaboratively designed performance accountability framework; on defining the functions and obligations of responsible/accountable persons and collective bodies; on improving the accountability framework to keep management processes and structures flexible enough to respond to changing needs/demands of learners; on facilitating performance assessment involving school's stakeholders, and on developing standards and tools for feedback systems, as well as evidence-based data collection and validation approaches and procedures for transparent assessment and evaluation.

Table 4. The extent of SBM implementation in accountability and continuous improvement of IUs and Non-IUs in the Bicol Region, the school year 2017-2018

INDICATORS	IUs		NON- IUs		TOTAL	
	WM	EI	WM	EI	MEAN	EI
Achieving targets identified on a collaboratively designed performance accountability framework	3.17	H	2.67	H	2.92	H
Defining the functions and obligations of responsible/accountable persons and collective bodies.	3.08	H	2.61	H	2.85	H
Improving the accountability framework to keep management processes and structures flexible enough to respond to changing needs/demands of learners	3.02	H	2.64	H	2.83	H
Facilitating participatory performance evaluation	2.92	H	2.65	H	2.79	H

INDICATORS	IUs		NON- IUs		TOTAL	
	WM	EI	WM	EI	MEAN	EI
Developing standards and tools for feedback systems and evidence-based data collection and validation approaches and procedures for transparent assessment and evaluation.	2.93	H	2.63	H	2.78	H
Overall Mean	3.02	H	2.64	H	2.83	H

Legend:

<i>Mean Range (WM)</i>	<i>The extent of Implementation (EI)</i>
3.26-4.00	Very High (VH)
2.51-3.25	High (H)
1.76-2.50	Low (L)
1.00-1.75	Very Low (VL)

The evidence that the school is constantly growing its efforts by adopting policies that keep school administrators responsible and accountable for students' academic success backs up the findings above (Dictionary.com).

The extent of Implementation of Management of Resources

Table 5 reveals that both IUs and Non-IUs implemented resource management to a high degree, with grand mean scores of 2.95 and 2.81, respectively. All indicators show a high level of implementation in terms of establishing a community-developed resource management system that motivates stakeholders to behave appropriately; in strengthening and maintaining relationships across a network and linkage management framework for better resource management, in Bringing stakeholders together regularly for planning and resource allocation; in conducting routine resource inventories by the learning supervisors, facilitators, and group representatives execute regular resource inventories as a framework for resource distribution and mobilization.

Table 5. The extent of SBM implementation in management of resources of IUs and Non-IUs in the Bicol Region, the school year 2017-2018

INDICATORS	IUs		NON-IUs		TOTAL	
	WM	EI	WM	EI	MEAN	EI
Establishing a community-developed resource management system that motivates stakeholders to behave appropriately	3.01	H	2.68	H	2.84	H
Strengthening and maintaining relationships across a network and linkage management framework for better resource management	3.01	H	2.66	H	2.83	H
Bringing stakeholders together regularly for planning and resource allocation	2.97	H	2.68	H	2.82	H
Conducting routine resource inventories by the learning supervisors, facilitators, and community representatives for resource distribution and mobilization	2.98	H	2.66	H	2.82	H

INDICATORS	IUs		NON-IUs		TOTAL	
	WM	EI	WM	EI	MEAN	EI
Observing regular evaluation of resource management process by the learning administrators, facilitators, and group members.	2.78	H	2.75	H	2.76	H
Grand Mean	2.95	H	2.68	H	2.81	H

Legend:

Mean Range WM)	The extent of Implementation (EI)
3.26-4.00	Very High (VH)
2.51-3.25	High (H)
1.76-2.50	Low (L)
1.00-1.75	Very Low (VL)

According to Santibañez et al. (2014), the reported positive program results of SBM are most likely to provide financial resources to schools to meet urgent needs for facilities, equipment, materials, supplies, and other school-related needs. As a result, Heyward et al. (2011) recommended that programs, projects, and activities aimed at improving essential education management and governance be introduced to ensure proper implementation of the SBM program. Ayeni et al. (2013) suggest that a framework of interconnectedness should be implemented to improve SBM's organizational capacity for secondary schools to deliver effective service and high-quality learning outcomes backed up this argument.

Table 6 summarizes the application of the SBM program based on its four principles. With overall means of 2.87, 2.83, 2.82, and 2.82, respectively, IUs and Non-IUs were both high in all indicators, such as leadership and governance, education and learning, transparency and quality development, and resource management.

Table 6. Summary result of the extent of SBM program implementation and its four principles by IUs and Non-IUs in the Bicol Region, the school year 2017-2018

INDICATORS	IUs		NON-IUs		TOTAL	
	WM	EI	WM	EI	MEAN	EI
Leadership and Governance	3.04	H	2.71	H	2.87	H
Curriculum and Learning	3.02	H	2.64	H	2.83	H
Accountability and Continuous Improvement	2.99	H	2.65	H	2.82	H
Management of Resources	2.95	H	2.68	H	2.82	H
Grand Mean	3.00	H	2.67	H	2.83	H

Legend:

Mean Range WM)	The extent of Implementation (EI)
3.26-4.00	Very High (VH)
2.51-3.25	High (H)
1.76-2.50	Low (L)
1.00-1.75	Very Low (VL)

Significant Difference of the SBM Program Implementation between IUs and Non-IUs

A T-test, using independent samples, was used to identify whether there was a significant difference in SBM program implementation between IUs and Non-IUs. Table 7 indicates that the computed value of 0.892 in leadership and governance is less than the t-tabular value of 0.140 according to the SBM principles. The null hypotheses were not rejected at the 0.05 level of significance with 8 degrees of freedom. This shows no significant difference in the SBM implementation between IUs and Non-IUs schools in the Bicol Region along with this principle.

On the other hand, the hypotheses were dismissed in the curriculum and learning implementation because the computed value of 0.000 was less than the t-tabular value of 9.880 at .05 levels of significance with 12 degrees of freedom. In this case, the implementation shows a very high significant relationship. This is also applicable in applying transparency and quality improvement, where the computed value of 0.000 is less than the t-tabular value of 7.997 at a .05 level of significance and 8 degrees of freedom.

Table 7. The significant difference in the level of SBM implementation among implementing units and non-implementing units in the Bicol Region for SY 2017-2018

SBM PRINCIPLES	MEAN IUs	MEAN NON-IUs	t	df	Sig.	Stat. Sig
Leadership and Governance	3.0380	3.0160	0.140	8	0.892	NS
Curriculum and Learning	2.9857	2.6457	9.880	12	0.000	VHS
Accountability and Continuous Improvement	3.0240	2.6400	7.997	8	0.000	VHS
Management of Resources	2.9500	2.6860	5.699	8	0.000	VHS

Legend:

Sig. = $> .05$ – Not Significant (NS)

Sig. = $\leq .05$ – Significant (S)

Sig. = $\leq .01$ – Highly Significant (HS)

Sig. = $\leq .001$ – Very Highly Significant (VHS)

Reimers et al. (2007) support this assertion by suggesting three significant explanations why school-based management (SBM) struggles to narrow educational equity disparities. First, It favors the majority of performing schools that are based in urban areas and have significant financial support; second, SBM works well for people with adequate leadership and a shared mission among school employees because of the school's organizational processes and frameworks; and third, school management processes and politics undermine local initiative in the most disadvantaged schools.

First, SBM is implemented in the Division of Cotabato City in its five dimensions, specifically higher in school performance accountability, school improvement plan, and school leadership but low in stakeholders and resources management. Second, school operations, school safe and orderly environment is often observed, but there is a need to enhance school transparency, decision-making, school equipment, and physical facilities, and school communication. Third, SBM and NAT are not statistically significantly related, although there was an increase in NAT performance. Fourth, although enrollment increased in all five schools under this study, it cannot be significantly related to all the five dimensions of SBM except school leadership and school performance accountability. Therefore school leadership and school performance accountability may be significant

to increase school enrolment. Fifth, overall, SBM as a program has a contribution to school operations and performance.

Conclusion and Recommendation

This study, which aimed to evaluate SBM implementation in Bicol Secondary Schools, found that (1) the extent of SBM program implementation by IUs and Non-IUs on its four principles is high. Thus must be sustained to achieve full implementation of DepEd programs at the school level, and (2) the difference in the practice of SBM principles among schools is affected by the leadership and governance ability among school leaders and its stakeholders.

The following recommendations are made based on the initial findings and conclusions: (1) by including all stakeholders in the processes of leadership and governance, education and learning, transparency and quality improvement, and resource management, schools, can enhance the implementation of SBM programs. School officials can form strong relationships with parents and other stakeholders to involve them in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of school activities that are directly related to students' learning. As proven to be a group mover, collaborative initiatives must be a central feature of SBM implementation; (3) Through complete and active engagement in creating a favorable learning atmosphere for school children, school stakeholders will improve the institutionalization of sustainable initiatives projects, and practices.

References

- Allawan, F. (2012). *School's Community Partnership Practices and Stakeholders' Involvement in Digos City Division*. Southern Philippine Agri-Business and Marine and Aquatic School of Technology, Mati, Digos City.
- Ayeni A. and Williams O. (2012). *A Conceptual Model for School-Based Management Operation and Quality Assurance in Nigerian Secondary Schools*. Nigeria: Journal of Education and Learning 2.
- Cabardo, J. (2016). *Levels of Participation of the School Stakeholders to the Different School-Initiated Activities and the Implementation of School-Based Management*. Journal of Inquiry & Action in Education.
- Cedron, J. (2012). *Involvement of Stakeholders in School-Based Management and Educational Outcomes*. Philippines: Central Bicol State University of Agriculture.
- 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. Philippines: DepEd Complex, Meralco Avenue, Pasig City.
- Department of Education (2015). *Guidelines on the Enhanced School Improvement Planning (SIP) Process and the School Report Card (SRC)*. Philippines: DepEd Complex, Meralco Avenue, Pasig City.
- Reimers, F. and Sergio, C. (2007). *Who Benefits from School-Based Management in Mexico? Prospects*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11125-007-9015-0>.
- Santibañez, L., Lastra, R. and O'Donoghue J. (2014). *School-Based Management Effects: Resources or Governance Change? Evidence from Mexico*. Mexico: Economics of Education Review.
- Vally, G., Shoma, V. and Daud, K. (2015). *The Implementation of School-Based Management Policy: An Exploration*. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 172:693–700.
- Vernez, G., Karam R. and Marshall J. (2012). *Implementation of School-Based Management in Indonesia*. Monograph. Rand Corporation.
- World Bank (2008). *What is School-Based Management?* <http://www.glp.net/library/admin->

- management//asset_publisher/mnKN/bookmark/61285?redirect=%2Flibrary%2Fadmin-management%5Cnhttp://www.developmentgateway.com.au/cms/sectors/education/page6820.html;jsessionid=8E8BFF360A198EAFB365FD.
- World Bank (2010). *The Effects Of School-Based Management In The Philippines: An Initial Assessment Using Administrative Data*. <https://elibrary.worldbank.org/doi/abs/10.1596/1813-9450-5248>
- World Bank Group (2016). *Assessing School-Based Management in the Philippines*. World Bank, Washington, DC. © World Bank. <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/24743> License: CC BY 3.0 IGO.”
- Wooi, T. (2013). *SBM Latest Trend in School Management*. <https://www.slideshare.net/timothywooi/sbm-general-santos-2013-printout>
- Yau, J. and Fong, C. (2014). *Principals and Teachers' Perceptions of School-Based Management*. International Education Research ISSN 2291-5281.

Acknowledgment

The Polytechnic University of the Philippines, Sta. Mesa, Manila, provided technical and publication support for this study. The author acknowledges the Office of the Vice President for Research and Extension Development-Research and Management Office for the training and experience shared, significantly improving the manuscript.

Gratitude is also dedicated to the Central Bicol State University Graduate School Officials, headed by Dean, Dr. Charlito Cadag, and the experts. He scrutinized this dissertation paper and shared their pearls of wisdom which contributed to the realization of this study.

The author is also grateful to the officials from the Department of Education Region V, headed by the Regional Director V, Dr. Ramon Fiel G. Abcede, and to the 4 Schools Division Superintendents of the selected schools in the Bicol Region, namely Dr. Bebiano I. Sentillas of Albay Division, Dr. Loida N. Nidea of Sorsogon Division, Dr. Wilfredo J. Gavarra from Camarines Norte Division and Dr. Arnulfo M. Balane of Camarines Sur Division, as well as to all school heads, teachers, non-teaching staff, parents and SSG officers for granting permission, approval, and accommodations to conduct the survey that was used to collect data for this research.