The Implementation of School-Based Management in Public Elementary Schools

Matronillo M. Martin

Faculty, College of Education, Ifugao State University Potia Campus, Philippines

matt_martin122680@yahoo.com

Abstract

This study was intended to evaluate the implementation of School-Based Management (SBM) in Alfonso Lista District 1 and District 2, Division of Ifugao through formative evaluation. The Stufflebeam's Context, Input and Process (CIP) model was used to evaluate the implementation of SBM. Mixed Methods of Research (MMR) design was utilized. Triangulation of data through the use of data analysis, questionnaires, face-to-face interviews and focus group discussions (FGD) were employed. Mean rating and thematic approach were used to determine the extent of SBM and elaborated based on themes. The results showed that there was a moderate attainment of school objectives and the operational aspects of SBM were not fully implemented by the school heads. Results of the study showed that the strengths of the implementation are categorized in two discrete yet dominating themes: the value of cooperation and motivation; and the worth of collaboration and delegation. Correspondingly, the two major breakdowns of the communal description as regards the weaknesses of the implementation which includes the poor enactment of transparency and low value of support mechanism. With regard to the remedial measures on issues or problems, three underlying and dominant themes were revealed: consultative meeting, administrative protocol and open communication and decision making as the heart of the organization. A policy implication is then put forward since SBM accounts for four major principles or domains. This calls for the decentralization of authority which originally comes from the school head who solely and directly implements SBM to the operation relegated to teachers managing their respective domains such as: leadership and governance; curriculum and learning; accountability and continuous improvement; and management of resources based on their qualifications or skills. In doing such, devolution or a dispersed authority builds on teachers who are more directly involved with the beneficiaries like the pupils and their parents.

Keywords: School-Based Management, implementation, evaluation, school heads

INTRODUCTION

Public education worldwide has given impetus to periodic trends where school management emphasis shifted from centralization to decentralization influenced by the modern management in industrial and commercial organizations. The dissatisfaction with the central approach of education and the move towards decentralization have introduced various school reform movements – all of which aimed at improving efficiency, equity, and quality of education. Many researchers affirm that one of the most significant reforms in the current restructuring of school systems has been the devolution of decision-making authority to school levels through the move towards SBM (Nidhi et al., 2012; Caldwell, 2005).

In the same manner, the primer on SBM and its support system defined School-Based Management (SBM) as "decentralization" of decision-making authority from central and regional and division levels to individual schools, uniting school heads, teachers, students, parents, the local government units and the community in promoting effective schools (Caldwell, 2005).

Likewise, SBM is an institutional expression or decentralization of education at the grassroots level. It is based on the national policy of decentralization originally set by the Philippine Government Code of 1991 (R.A. 7160) as a response to the new challenges to sustainable human development by enabling local communities to become self- reliant and more effective partners in the attainment of national goal (DepEd, 2006). This dovetails with Caldwell (2005) defining SBM as "the systematic decentralization to the school level of authority and responsibility to make decisions on significant matters related to school operations within a centrally determined framework of goals, policies, curriculum, standards, and accountability.

One of the targets of School-Based Management is improving outcomes of learning by getting all schools to continuously improve through school-based management. That is, management framework must look into what suits the needs of the pupils and the community. Thus, DepEd rolled out School-Based Management officially to all public schools in 2012.

The implementation, as well as the impact of School-Based Management on management, remains a contentious issue with some researchers arguing that School-Based Management leads to enhanced educational leadership, while others contend that School-Based Management leads to the deterioration of educational quality especially among the weakest schools. Nonetheless, some studies in recent years have found that School-Based Management reforms are associated with improved education outcomes and processes (Gertler et al., 2006).

School-Based Management seeks to involve parents and local community members in school decision-making in a meaningful way to improve schools. The expectation underlying the community involvement is that "the schools will be more responsive to local demands and that decisions will be taken from the interests of children rather than adults" (World Bank, 2012).

With the introduction of SBM, the government devolves more responsibilities to the schools and provides them with greater autonomy and flexibility in their daily operations, resource management and planning for school development. Through SBM, autonomy and transparency in the operations of the school were heightened.

School-Based Management contributes to the small but growing empirical literature on SBM practices by extending the research to the entire country or even in East Asia. Likewise, this research study provides an initial analysis and formative evaluation of the implementation of School-Based Management to improve educational management in the grassroots level particularly in Alfonso Lista District, Division of Ifugao using aggregated school-level formative evaluation and administrative data.

In many, if not most developing countries, the trend towards School-Based Management and the wider decentralization of public services including education has been the result of an internal debate. The conviction might have existed that such a policy will lead to higher quality, but that argument was more of an afterthought (Bullock, 2011).

Based on DepEd Order #83, series of 2012, School-Based Management (SBM) is a DepEd thrust that decentralizes the decision-making from the Central Office and field offices to individual schools to enable them to better respond to their specific educational needs. One way to empower the schools is through the SBM grant.

Accordingly, the Philippine educational system is constantly evolving, embracing new trends in the educational policies and practices to ensure that the output of the system will be able to adapt and respond to the needs of the changing times and eventually improve the good leadership and school governance and contribute to the progress of the educational system.

Principals or school heads provided valuable insights into their daily practices that foster an environment which is supportive of high-level of school governance. These practices are categorized in developing personnel and facilitating leadership, responsible empowering team or responsible delegation, recognizing accountability, communicating and rapport, and facilitating instruction and managing change (Crum and Sherman, 2008).

Likewise, student learning gains are impacted by school capacity through the elements of school culture, principal role modelling and leadership decisions by the school head. This is supported by Brady (2008) asserting that administrative actions or inactions indirectly impact pupils' learning gains, while teachers have a direct impact on student learning gains.

In an attempt to develop a model of effective school culture, Brady (2008) conducted an analysis of literature and found out that school cultures are influenced by a framework of the school head's communicated vision and mission.

To give furtherance to this, the studies of Billger (2007) and Leithwood and Riehl (2005) examined the relationship between principals' performances and their benefits and its impact on school outcomes purporting that principals are committed to raising school improvement through their actions.

William (2012) mentioned in his study that converting solely from one management style to the other does not guarantee a hallmark. In many education systems, recognitions have exposed that SBM has the potential to bring improvement in the quality of education. Also, the positive outcomes of the SBM as a form of decentralization make it superior to centralization. With SBM, schools will develop a management system to ensure the quality of teaching and learning. Besides, most SBM programs try to empower principals and teachers and "strengthen their professional motivation, thereby enhancing their sense of ownership of the school" (Barrera-Osorio et al., 2009). Indeed, the principal's role as the primary decision maker is dramatically changed under SBM to involve the combination of principals, teachers, parents, and other school members in responsibility and decision-making.

Therefore, School-Based Management flourishes leadership skills by allowing competent individuals in the schools to make decisions that will improve learning. Also, it will increase the accountability of the school leader to the school members, students and parents as there are fewer orders from above. Lindgerg and Vanyushyu (2013) suggested in their study on Swedish school principals that the combination of School-Based Management and instructional leadership facilitates school success.

The participation of community may also improve the morale of teachers. For instance, "parental participation in school management has reduced teacher absenteeism in a number of diverse countries such as India, Nicaragua, and Papua New Guinea. There has been a growing realization among SBM proponents that a major reason for proposing SBM is the achievement of better student results. This might explain why "most governments have adopted it as part of their educational reform policies" (Caldwell, 2005).

This study is aimed at evaluating the implementation of School-Based Management (SBM) in the public elementary schools in Alfonso Lista District, Division of Ifugao through formative evaluation. Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions: (1) What is the extent of the implementation on School-Based Management in terms of: attainment of objectives; involvement of the school support committee; and participation in decision-making? (2) What is the extent of contribution of decision-making, authority and participation of stakeholders in the implementation of School-Based Management in terms of: operational aspects of SBM; and school heads' leadership and governance? (3) What are the strengths and weaknesses of School-Based Management? (4) What are the remedial measures undertaken regarding the problems and issues in the implementation of School-Based Management?

METHODOLOGY

This study utilized a mixed method of research (MMR) design by combining quantitative and qualitative research techniques. Quantitative research was used to determine the extent of implementation of SBM in terms of attainment of objectives, involvement of School Support Committee, participation in decision-making, extent of contribution in the operational aspects of SBM and school heads' leadership and governance. On the other hand, qualitative research was used to identify the strengths and weaknesses of SBM and remedial measures undertaken regarding the problems and issues. The Stufflebeam's Context, Input and Process (CIP) evaluation model was used to evaluate the extent of implementation of SBM. Triangulation of data was undertaken in gathering the data and information from school heads, teachers and stakeholders.

A total enumeration of school heads and teachers in the public elementary schools was used in selecting the respondents. Respondents for stakeholders such as pupils' parents, alumni, NGOs, LGU and other community members were chosen through purposive sampling. On the other hand, participants such as school heads, teachers and stakeholders for the interview sessions/ focus group discussion were selected through convenient sampling.

The researcher-made questionnaire served as the primary data gathering instrument of the study based on the guidelines of SBM. The said questionnaire sought to evaluate the extent of implementation of SBM. The instrument underwent pre-testing from among the selected school heads, teachers and stakeholders who can look into the questionnaires, fill them out, and comment on the applicability and clarity of the questions contained therein. The participants of the pre-testing were not included in the actual study. The results of the said pre-test were subjected to the reliability testing and coefficient of 0.78 was obtained using Cronbach alpha which signifies that the instrument is reliable. The final instrument for actual administration was revised based on the comments, feedback and suggestions of language and content experts.

On the other hand, thematic analysis was used to analyze the data which were gathered from personal interviews. The data were coded and categorized to generate interrelated thoughts and themes. The data gathered from different sources and methods were collated and subjected to statistical analysis. Average was used to determine the performance key indicators while mean rating was used to elaborate on the data gathered in the rational and operational aspects of the implementation of SBM. A 5-point rating scale was utilized to determine the extent of implementation of School-Based Management.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Implementation of School Based Management

Attainment of Objectives. The grand mean rating and description of respondents on extent of attainment of objectives in implementing School-Based Management is presented in Table 1. The production of instructional materials was improved to a large extent with 3.95 as perceived by the respondents.

Indicator number 1 obtained the highest mean of 3.95 as testified by School Principal Aries, one of the respondents, who said that: *"We have SIP to be followed, School Improvement Plan covers for three years. We have our AIP (Annual Improvement Plan) to identify the priority and our projects. We need to allot funds to finance Instructional Materials to improve our instruction in our school."* The grand mean rating of 3.68 implies a "moderate extent." Thus, the objectives of SBM were not fully carried out.

On the other hand, the implementation of eliminating start-school fee year policies is described as "moderate extent" (3.57). Similarly, for participatory decision-making approach and increase in the effectiveness and efficiency of budget management, implementation was described as "moderate extent" as indicated by their overall mean rating of 3.57 and 3.63, respectively.

Involvement of School Support Committee (SSC). The implementation of SBM in terms of involvement of School Support Committee is shown in Table 2. As reflected by the Table, all indicators from numbers 2 to 7 were rated "moderate extent" while indicator number 1 about the enhancement of the enrolment of pupils through education campaign and encouragement of parents was rated to a "large extent" as perceived by the respondents.

Seemingly, the involvement of SSC in the revenue mobilization and budget, improvement of school property maintenance, school construction and repair, prevention of irregularities, school planning and monitoring pupils' learning was not fully considered.

Table 1. Implementation of School-Based Management in terms of attainment of objectives

Indicators	SH	T	ST	Overall Mean Rating	Description
1. The quality of education was improved by making necessary instructional materials available at schools.	4.00	4.14	3.70	**3.95**	Large Extent
2. Access to education was expanded by eliminating start- school fee year policies	3.50	3.94	3.26	**3.57**	Moderate Extent
3. The participatory decision-making approach was encouraged by delegating decision-making authorities to various local stakeholders.	3.43	4.04	3.25	**3.57**	Moderate Extent
4. Increased in the efficiency and effectiveness of budget management in the school.	3.50	4.13	3.26	**3.63**	Moderate Extent
Grand Mean Rating	**3.61**	**4.06**	**3.37**	**3.68**	Moderate Extent

* SH-School Head * T-Teacher * ST-Stakeholder

Table 2. Implementation of School-Based Management in terms of involvement of the school support committee

Indicators	SH	T	ST	Overall Mean Rating	Description
1. Enhancement of the enrolment of pupils through education campaign and encouragement of parents.	4.07	4.39	3.56	**4.01**	Large Extent
2.Taking part in revenue mobilization and budget through school development plan.	3.00	3.99	3.23	**3.41**	Moderate Extent
3.Improvement of school maintenance and property.	3.21	4.19	3.25	**3.55**	Moderate Extent
4. Involvement in school construction and repair through fund raising and engaging parents.	3.00	4.13	3.32	**3.48**	Moderate Extent
5. Prevention of irregularities inside and outside the school.	3.64	4.11	3.49	**3.75**	Moderate Extent
6. Participation in school planning and implementation.	3.57	4.29	3.37	**3.74**	Moderate Extent
7. Monitoring pupil learning through community-parent meeting	3.21	4.28	3.63	**3.71**	Moderate Extent
Grand Mean Rating	**3.39**	**4.20**	**3.41**	**3.66**	Moderate Extent

* SH- School Head * T- Teacher * ST- Stakeholder

Master Teacher B, one of the respondents attested that: *"In order to generate funds, we are tapping the stakeholders, the homeroom PTAs, the parents because they need to help us in providing the important needs of our pupils.* "This means that School Support Committee (SSC) has its great role in improving the system of the school.

Participative decision-making. The extent of implementation of SBM in terms of participative decision-making is shown in Table 3. As perceived by the respondents, the participative decision-making approach and school supports to community involvement were rated "moderate extent" as indicated by their overall mean ratings of 3.21 and 3.62, respectively.

Based on the grand mean rating of 3.42, the extent of implementation of SBM in terms of participative decision-making is to a "moderate extent". Hence, the participative decision-making as one of the aspects of SBM is not fully implemented. The indicators mainly focused on the participative decision-making of both internal and external stakeholders with a grand mean rating of 3.42 which means "moderate extent."

Table 3. Implementation of School-Based Management in terms of participative decision-making

Indicators	SH	T	ST	Overall Mean Rating	Description
1. The participative decision-making approach has promoted the concept of democracy among local stakeholders as they become participative in school development.	3.00	4.14	2.48	**3.21**	Moderate Extent
2. The school supports the importance the community members' and parents' involvement in the school activities.	3.00	4.37	3.51	**3.62**	Moderate Extent
Grand Mean Rating	**3.00**	**4.25**	**2.99**	**3.42**	Moderate Extent

* SH- School Head * T- Teacher * ST- Stakeholder

Many researchers affirmed that one of the most significant reforms in the current restructuring of school systems has been the devolution of decision-making authority to school levels through the move towards School-Based Management (Nidhi et al., 2012; Caldwell,2005). This was affirmed by some of the respondents that: *Teacher Y: "If you will decide, you will be scolded." Teacher Z: "School head will decide by herself." Teacher X: "School head decides first."* The results pointed out that stakeholders must be considered in decision making, planning and even monitoring. Teachers play a vital role in decision making so, the school administrator should initiate parliamentary procedure and democratic system in decision making to identify the thoughts and value-laden ideas of the other members of the organization.

Operational Aspects of School-Based Management

Operational Aspects of SBM. The grand mean rating and the description of the respondents on the contribution of the operational aspects of implementation School-Based Management is presented in Table 4.

Based on the Table, there is a "moderate extent" of contribution of decision-making authority and participation to operational aspects of SBM as indicated by the unanimous description of the respondents. It means that the operational aspects of School-Based Management were not fully implemented among the school heads of both districts.

The item regarding the relevance of lessons and learning activities to the needs of the children in the schools obtained the highest overall mean rating of 3.79 while the item on the arrival of budget that funds some activities and programs obtained the lowest overall mean rating of 3.15. It implies that the ultimate objective of implementing the operational aspects of School-Based Management focused on the instruction on how to cater to the needs of the pupils. It infers that the administrators strategize different programs on how to help teachers to carry out the important competencies being taught to the pupils.

On the other hand, the findings are attuned to the statement of Gropello (2006) that the success of the SBM models depends on a large extent on the assets of the school financial and material resources, capability building programs, and competent human resources teachers.

Table 4. Implementation of operational aspects of School-Based Management

Indicators	SH	T	ST	Overall Mean Rating	Description
1. There is a systematic and consistent delegation of authority and responsibility from the principal to the section chiefs and teachers to decide on day-to-day school operation	2.86	4.11	3.23	**3.40**	Moderate Extent
2. The principals and teachers have greater power to decide on what should be the agenda of the school operational plan and how this should be implemented.	3.14	4.19	3.21	**3.51**	Moderate Extent
3. Regular meeting is held at the beginning of the academic year that the principals, teachers and SSC assemble to develop the school plan by integrating the ideas collected from the participants, aligning them to the national education policies.	3.14	4.27	3.33	**3.58**	Moderate Extent
4. The stakeholders are free to go for their school vision-mission, structure, and date of various meetings grounded on their decision agreed by the participants.	3.21	4.13	3.26	**3.54**	Moderate Extent
5. The local stakeholders were allowed to make decision over the establishment of regulations related to students, employee, and other matters that differ from the given set of guidelines but are relevant to the needs and practicalities of the context.	2.64	3.84	3.05	**3.18**	Moderate Extent
6. The teachers have been empowered to review and adjust the curriculum to the needs and relevance of the student.	3.14	4.13	3.34	**3.54**	Moderate Extent
7. Lessons and learning activities are relevant to the needs of the children in the schools.	3.36	4.38	3.63	**3.79**	Moderate Extent
8. The human resources or the personnel are placed to fit the school vision-mission, school structure and their expertise in the field.	3.29	4.25	3.56	**3.70**	Moderate Extent
9. The authority for decision making on personnel management and mobilization transferred to the principals.	3.14	4.04	3.42	**3.54**	Moderate Extent
10. The principals have a power to recruit or fire any staff in the school.	3.00	3.46	3.10	**3.19**	Moderate Extent
11. The principals have the power to mobilize any staff in the school as posted by the provincial office of education in accordance with needs of the school.	3.64	4.07	3.45	**3.72**	Moderate Extent
12. The principals were empowered to assign task and responsibility for teaching and non-teaching staff based on their expertise.	3.50	4.28	3.44	**3.74**	Moderate Extent
13. The principals were empowered to nominate the staff for promotion and award.	3.50	4.01	3.30	**3.60**	Moderate Extent
14. The distribution of the budget known as Program-Based Budget to the schools is mainly computed on the population of the students regardless of school size, location and needs	3.21	4.06	3.25	**3.51**	Moderate Extent
15. The budget usually arrives regularly that funds some activities and programs.	2.86	3.72	2.86	**3.15**	Moderate Extent

Grand Mean Rating	3.18	4.06	3.30	3.51	Moderate Extent

School Heads' Leadership and Governance. The grand mean rating and the description of respondents about the contribution of school heads' leadership and governance in implementing SBM is shown in Table 5.

Table 5. Implementation of SBM through school heads' leadership and governance

Indicators	SH	T	ST	Overall Mean Rating	Description
1. The principal plays the leading role and responsibility in all aspects of school decision making.	3.43	4.33	3.53	**3.76**	Moderate Extent
2.The teachers have most authority and responsibility on teaching and learning, planning and development as well as environment.	3.79	4.25	3.59	**3.88**	Moderate Extent
3. The parents do not have any participation in school decision making process, but they have taken part in various school activities such as opening school ceremony, fund raising, teacher-parent meeting, and awarding ceremony at schools.	2.36	3.44	3.04	**2.94**	Minimal Extent
4. The participatory decision-making approach which engages the principals, teachers, SSC members, parents and community in the school management is encouraged in the school.	3.00	4.15	3.33	**3.49**	Moderate Extent
5. The principals are the main decision makers who usually take most control over staff management and monitoring and evaluation, leaving marginal gap for the teachers and SSC members to make decision.	3.50	3.88	3.25	**3.54**	Moderate Extent
Grand Mean Rating	**3.10**	**3.91**	**3.26**	**3.42**	Moderate Extent

* SH- School Head * T- Teacher * ST- Stakeholder

Noticeably, the respondents perceived that teachers have moderate authority and responsibility on teaching and learning, planning and development. It implies that in terms of instruction, teachers play a vital role in designing any strategies and techniques in teaching with the help of the school head or the director on school empowerment and governance. On the other hand, parents have minimal participation in school decision-making process but taken part in various school. Thus, the contribution of the parents in the school activities and programs is not fully recognized.

Based on Table 5, the contribution of the School Support Committee representatives usually take part in some aspects of school operation and knowledge of school management is to a moderate extent as indicated by their overall mean rating of 3.31 and 3.04 respectively. Similarly, for contribution of school heads' leadership and management in terms of participatory decision-making approach and taking control over staff management in monitoring and evaluating marginal gaps for teachers and SSC members were to a moderate extent as indicated by their overall mean rating of 3.49 and 3.54 respectively.

The grand mean rating of 3.42 implies a moderate extent. Thus, contribution of the implementation of SBM through school heads' leadership and governance is not competently performed.

Strengths and Weaknesses in Implementing School-Based Management

1. Strengths of School-Based Management

The analyses on the sharing of the key informants regarding their collective description of their experiences on the implementation of School-Based Management led to the emergence of two distinct themes that include: (1) the value of cooperation and motivation; and (2) the worth of collaboration and delegation.

The value of cooperation and motivation. Human behavior is always generated by either an inner force commonly known as internal motivation or an outside force referred as external motivation (Keany & Mundia, 2014). The term motivation has been defined in many ways.

According to Flanagan (2000), motivation is an internal state that drives an organism to act in one way or another. As articulated by the respondents during the interview: *School Principal Aries: "There is the cooperation of the inside and outside stakeholders. To ensure full participation of the stakeholders, there are motivations and we call them during planning, then hand in hand we implement and then, we give feedbacks." Master Teacher A: "SBM can help the teachers and even the school head to be motivated to work. Through School-Based Management problems can be easily solved."*

It is clearly depicted on the statement of School Principal Aries that, "to ensure full participation of the stakeholders, there are motivations," it means that motivation is an instrument to be used in governing the school. Additionally, Master Teacher A clearly emphasized that "SBM can help the teachers and even the school head to be motivated to work" hence, motivation is a way on how to encourage every member of the organization to participate.

Furthermore, according to Harmer (1988), motivation is a kind of internal drive that pushes someone to do some things to achieve something. Consequently, cooperation brings about creativity and innovation. When schools are committed to collaborate new ideas and strategies to achieve goals emerge (Anderson & Limerick, 2006) as School Principal Aries mentioned during the interview: *"Cooperation of the parents, harmonious relationships, school and community harmonious relationship will be needed. Besides, motivation should not be neglected to realize the objectives of the school programs especially our vision and mission"* School Principal Aries evidently emphasized that in today's trends of leadership, cooperation is not just a "nice to have." It is essential in achieving good governance to develop good rapport among the member of the school organization. Cooperation is indeed very valuable. The administrators must strategize activities on how to develop the essence of cooperation among the stakeholders.

Additionally, based on the statement of a key informant: *Master Teacher A: "SBM helps to improve instruction, especially now, pupils need to work in school through Computer Aided Instruction not using chalk. This is a great opportunity for pupils and even the teachers so that they will be motivated to work."* Fundamentally, the findings supported the statement of Meyer (1996) that "motivation is a need or desire that serves to energize behavior and to direct it towards a goal." Besides, Gardner (2*014*) defines motivation as "the combination of efforts plus desire to achieve the goal."

The worth of collaboration and delegation. In an interview, School Principal Taurus mentioned: *"Here in our school, the strength is… there is delegation of works, as school head, I will designate chairmanship in every domain of School-Based Management. Then, there is a collaborative in decision making. All of the teachers have part. I will encourage them to work and they need it for their IPCR. They are cooperative and willing to work. Ahhh...all of them have the chance to work with each other. Their domains, assignments and chairmanship."* It is clearly stated based on the statement of Principal Taurus that, "… there is delegation of works, as school head, I will designate chairmanship in every domain of School-Based Management. Then, there is a collaborative in decision making. All of the teachers have part," that in her line, through the implementation of SBM, the value of collaboration is intensified and the essence of working as a team is fully developed (Dempster, 2000).

Additionally, in the line of Principal Taurus that, "I will encourage them to work and they need it for their IPCR. They are cooperative and willing to work," it means that, if colleagues or co-teachers are not collaborating, you've got some deeper issues than understanding what it is. The fact of the matter is that effective collaboration is essential for today's workplace (Cruz, 2010). In implementing the SBM, competition

doesn't exist as, Principal Aries, one of the key informants affirmed when he was asked if there are competitions in the implementation of SBM: *"Competition, what do you mean? Is there a competition in the implementation? I think, none!"* It implies that, in a certain school, it is necessary to build a harmonious relationship in order to achieve the desired goals and objectives of the school. Besides, in a certain school, competition must be avoided. Hence, the school administrator must provide scheme on the division of work to avoid competition in the school.

2. Weaknesses of School-Based Management

The breakdown of the occurring statements of the key informants about their communal description of the weaknesses in the implementation of SBM in their school are classified into two discrete themes that include: (1) the poor enactment of transparency; and (2) low value of support mechanism.

The poor enactment of transparency. When it comes to building solid workplace relationships, trust takes center stage. It took transparency to another level when window in the organization be. Not only does this demonstrate transparency to some employees, but it also keeps employees involved and up to date on organization happenings, successes and feedbacks (Lee & Smith, 2001). These statements reinforced by one of the respondents: *Master Teacher A: "Sometimes, especially here, our school head is uncertain. We are lack of the things we need. We need to be opened to others to solve problems. One thing more, it is easy to decide if we value transparency."* It is clearly depicted that the belief is that the more open an organization is – the better off employees and organizations, the entire working community will be in the end.

Furthermore, transparency gives us clarity, direction, and most important a basis for sound decision making (Lee, 2001). One of the respondents affirmed: *Teacher Q: "The weakness of the implementation of School-Based Management is money. Mostly, teachers and stakeholders have their agreement. Sometimes, there are problems here in our school such as lack of transparency of our school head, about money matters, programs and school funds."* Teacher Q intensely stated that "The weakness of the implementation of School-Based Management is money." This means that being transparent in managing the school institution, conflicts and other commotions as regards to money will be avoided. Also, the level of commitment among the teachers must be heightened and developed through trainings and School Learning Acton Cell (SLAC) sessions.

Low value of Support Mechanism. Based on the results of the interview in terms of weaknesses on the implementation of School-Based-Management, there is no clear empirical evidence of the consequences of School-Based Management. Implementing SBM is a long drawn out process.

In addition, there are many factors that affect the improvement of the school. However, components of School-Based Management have been shown to improve governance of the school. One of these, stakeholders' involvement, has been associated with: positive attitudes and behavior, more successful programs, and more effective school governance. This was affirmed by one of the stakeholders: *Stakeholder Narra: "Sometimes, as parents we need to participate to programs in the school because this is for the benefits of our children."* As Stakeholder Narra clearly mentioned, it indicates that the parents have a counterpart in improving the management of the school. Hereafter, the parents need to join different programs in the school.

In line with this, the findings supported the study of Banicky, Rodney & Foss, (2000) that SBM brings all of the stakeholders together in a more cooperative approach to solve problems and improve schools.

3. Remedial Measures to Solve Issues and Problems in Implementing School-Based Management

Having identified the problems, issues and concerns as regards School-Based Management, the dominant responses as revealed by the respondents highlighted three underlying themes that include:(1) significance of consultative meetings;(2) administrative protocol; (3) open communication; and (4) decision making as the heart of the organization.

Significance of consultative meetings. Based on the responses of the respondents in terms of remedial measures in solving problems and issues as regards SBM, meetings, and consultations play a vital role in

resolving problems. This implies that discussion and meeting are deemed important in solving problems thereof. Similarly, School Principal Aries affirmed this contention: *"Usually we have meetings, consultative meeting, so we should plan, the teacher relay to the parents about the problems and explain the problems."* This statement underscores that schools could only realize the thrust of School-Based Management if a plan of action is drafted beforehand to incorporate enhanced flexibility, accountability and transparency.

Administrative protocol. When every member of the organization adheres to policies and procedures, the organization could run smoothly. Management structures and teams operate as they are expected. Also, mistakes and delays in processes could be identified and addressed quickly. All respondents were guided by administrative protocol as a sign of respect both for the school's system of etiquette and for the teachers and school heads involved. In a more general sense, ignoring protocol creates an atmosphere of suspicion which will eventually result to conflict.

Open Communication and decision making as heart of the organization. Organization builds on communication as it is essential to establishing relationships across hierarchies within the organization, both on a professional and social level. An atmosphere of open communication makes it safe for employees to express freely their ideas; as a result, you will have the benefit of your staff's combined experience in coming up with innovative solutions (Smith, *2*014*).* The valued endpoint of SBM directly manifests in the community; thus, SBM implementers, school heads and teachers, must account for information dissemination with the community officials as representatives of the benefactors from the educational sector to heighten open communication, by extension, participative and transparent governance.

The mobility of information within the organization passes through a channel where all members of the organization speak up and listen. This is elaborated by one school principal: *School Principal Virgo: "It is always the leader that initiates. And the teachers can help the leader (school head). Because it is a two-way process communication. Whatever problem may arise, they will request the school head to have a meeting."* This signifies that communication and decision making within the organization go together in order to achieve the common goal of the school. Communication being a two-way process is a chief tool used to access information regarding issues and solutions to enable a responsive (educational) institution.

The revealed solutions and measures to cope with the issues and problems regarding SBM adhere to the Department Order No. 83, series of 2012 highlighting the security and management of inputs, the establishment of appropriate structures and mechanism that affect governance in order to produce the desired level of outputs that lead to improve the School-Based Management.

CONCLUSIONS

This research study evaluated the implementation of School-Based Management, research study, based on the findings, it is concluded that, (1) The school heads, as main implementers of SBM, uphold policies and regulations religiously based on memoranda and DepEd orders. Utilizing democratic ways of leadership, these implementers also employ fairness and impartiality as they deal with teachers and stakeholders. Furthermore, SBM implementers initiate firm and stable management practices adhering to the policies in utilizing MOOE. Merit system on awards and recognitions is also utilized to develop full cooperation among the SBM implementers. However, documentary requirements in implementing SBM was evidently inaccessible. Nonetheless, both internal and external stakeholders share possible solutions to cope with issues and concern in implementing SBM; (2) In congruence with administrative protocol process, the operational aspect of leadership of the administrators is structured. The administrators developed mechanisms to perform leadership tasks in order to employ good governance particularly on decision-making, planning and monitoring. These administrators have continuously integrated core values as the heart of managing the school. In terms of fiscal management, the administrators considered the critical effects of transparency and support among the teachers and stakeholders. Consequently, they designed strategic monitoring instrument to liquidate funds on time; (3) Issues and problems were solved technically to sustain the positive working environment among school heads, teachers and stakeholders; and (4) Through SBM, schools have more autonomy and assume greater responsibility to create a school environment that is conducive to continuous school improvement and to put in place mechanism to assure the quality of management. Further, SBM improves the standard of management

and leadership outcomes through the concerted efforts among key stakeholders, the leadership and commitment of school heads and the support of the government.

REFERENCES

Anderson, C., & Limerick, B. (2006*)*. Female Administrators and School-Based Management: New Models in an Era of Change? *Education Management &Administration,* 27(4), 401-414.

Banicky, G. L., Rodney H.C. & Foos, G.D. (2000). Local Responses to School-Based Management in Hong Kong. *Educational Studies*, 32(2), 171-185.

Barrera-Osorio, F., Fasih, T., Patrinos, H.A, & Santibáñez, L. (2009*). Decentralized Decision- Making in Schools: The Theory, Concepts, Impressions and Evidence on School-Based Management* (SBM). Washington: The World Bank.

Brady, H, (2008). School-Based Management (SBM) as a Factor in School Effectiveness. *International Review of Education*, 44(4), 319-333.

Billger, S.H. (2007). *The Effects of School-Based Management on The Work life of Elementary Teachers: A Case Study.* Unpublished Thesis. University of North Florida.

Bullock, A. (2011). *Evalutaion and Study of Devolution of the School Manager and Decentarlization* London: Routledge. Retrieved on January 13, 2018

Caldwell, B. J. (2005). *School-Based Management (SBM)* Retrieved November 2017, from Education Policy Series

Crum, K.S., & Sherman, W.H. (2008). Facilitating high achievement: High school principals' reflections on their successful leadership practices. *Journal of educational administration*, 46(5), 562-580.

Cruz, P. T. (2010). School-Based Management (SBM) Transparency. *Forum Magazine*, 43(2), 35-38.

Dempster, N. (2000). Guilty or not: The Impact and Effects of Site-Based Management on schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 38(1), 47-63.

DepEd. (2006). *Operations Manual on School-Based Management (SBM) and its Support Systems.* January 9, 2006. Pasig City: Department of Education.

Flanagan, F.K. (2000*).* EFL Teachers' Perception of University Students' Motivation and ESP Learning Achievement. *Journal of Education, Values and Practice*, 7(14), 28-37.

Gardner, M.A. (2014). The Examples of Current Issues in the Multicultural Classroom. *Journal of Education and Practice,* 6(10), 86-89.

Gertler, P.J., Patrinos, H.A., & Rubio-Codina, M. (2006). *Empowering Parents to Improve Education: Evidence from Rural Mexico.* Impact Evaluation Series Number 4. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 3935.

Gropello, E.D. (2006). *A Comparative Analysis of School-Based Management (SBM) in Central America.* The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. Washington: The World Bank.

Harmer, G.H. (1988). Looking Deeper than the Gradebook: Assessing Cultural Diversity Attitudes among Undergraduates. *Journal of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 12(3), 142-164.

Keany, M. & Mundia, L. (2014). Foreign Language Learner's Motivation and Its Effect on their Achievement: Implications for Effective Teaching of Students Studying in Japan at University Brunei Darussalam. *International Education Studies*, 7(9), 122-135.

Lee, V. E. (2001). The Key Elements of a Successful School-Based Management Strategy. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement,* 14 (3), 351-372.

Lee, V. E., & Smith, J. B. (2001). Restructuring High Schools for Equity and Excellence: What Works? Who does? *Harvard Educational Review*, 71(4), 766-67.

Leithwood. K., & Menzies T. (1998). A Review of Research Concerning the Implementation of Site-Based Management. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement,* 9(33), 233-285.

Leithwood, K., & Riehl, C. (2005). *What do we already know about educational leadership. A new agenda for research in educational leadership*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Lindberg E., & Vanyushyu, Y. (2013). *Do Community-Managed schools work? An Evaluation of El Salvador's EDUCO Program.* Working paper No. 8, series on Impact Evaluation of Education Reforms, Development Economics Research Group, The World Bank.

Meyer, D (1996). *Multilingualism and Multiculturalism in the Swedish-Medium Primary School Classroom in Finland - Some Teacher Views.* International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education, 6(1), 117-136.

Nidhi, K., Cristina, L., & Shreyasi, J. (2012). *The Effects of School-Based Management in the Philippines: An Initial Assessment using Administrative Data.* Journal of Development Effectiveness, 4 (2), 277-295.

Smith, J.B. (2014). Restructuring High Schools for Equity and Excellence: What Works? Who does? *Harvard Educational Review*, 71(4), 766-67.

William, M. T. (2012). Implementing School-Based management. *School Effectiveness and Usefulness*, 15(14), 154-159.

World Bank (2012). *The Effects of School-based Management in the Philippines: An Initial Assessment Using Administrative Data.* Policy Research Working Paper Series No. 5248. East Asia Education Sector Unit, Independent Evaluation Group and the World Bank Institute.