
School-Based Management and Performance of Public Elementary School Heads: Basis for Technical Assistance Plan

Dr. Grace C. Pepito¹ and Dr. Leo Bragat Acibar²

¹Department of Education Region VII - Central Visayas, Corresponding author email id: niamkepepito@yahoo.com

²Department of Education Region VII - Central Visayas, email id: leo.acibar@deped.gov.ph

Date of publication (dd/mm/yyyy): 25/02/2019

Abstract – School performance is based on the six dimensions of school-based management which are school leadership, internal stakeholders’ participation, external stakeholders’ participation, school-based resources and school performance accountability. To measure the delivery of the six dimensions, this study was initiated. The performance of the elementary school heads of the districts of Borbon, Carmen, Catmon, Compostela, Liloan and Sogod were also included. The schools utilized were those elementary schools situated on the lowland areas and within the one-kilometer radius from the district office. Using the descriptive method of research, the study revealed that all the districts were on the level of SBM. On the other hand, all the 44 elementary school heads obtained Very Satisfactory ratings based on their Performance Appraisal system, taking into account their occupational competence, professional and personal characteristics, punctuality and attendance. All these were rated Very Satisfactory, except for punctuality and attendance which were rated Outstanding. Based on the results of the study, the school heads as school leaders had to exert more efforts on the stakeholders’ participation, school improvement process, and school performance accountability. They have to increase their occupational and professional competencies. To improve their management skills and performance, a technical Assistance Plan was developed.

Keywords – School-Based Management, School Leadership, External Stakeholders’ Participation, School Improvement Process, School Performance Accountability.

I. INTRODUCTION

Effective principals are strong educators, anchoring their work on central issues of learning and teaching and continuous school improvement. According to Mike Schmoker (2000), the combination of three concepts constitutes the foundation for positive improvement results: meaningful teamwork; clear, measurable goal; and the regular collection and analysis of performance data. School Heads must lead their school through the goal-setting process in which student achievement data is analyzed, improvement areas are identified, and actions for change are initiated. This process involves working collaboratively with staff and school community to identify discrepancies between current and desired outcomes, to set and prioritize goals to help close the gap, to develop improvement and monitoring strategies aimed at accomplishing the goals, and to communicate goals and change efforts to the entire school community. Principals must also ensure that staff development needs are identified in alignment with school improvement priorities and that these needs are addressed with appropriate professional learning opportunities.

To achieve the Education for All objectives by 2015, the Department of Education is pursuing policy reforms under the Basic Education Sector Reform Agenda. Key Reform Thrust 1 of BESRA is School-Based Management. SBM underscores the empowerment of key stakeholders in school communities to enable them to actively participate in the continuous improvement of schools towards the attainment of higher pupil/student learning outcomes. School-based management decentralizes control from the central district office to individual schools

as a way to give school constituents-principals, teachers, parents and community members-more control over what happens in schools. Often SBM is adopted for the purpose of school improvement. By empowering groups who are closest to the students, school decisions, it is thought, will be better tailored to the particular needs of students, and school performance will improve. (Manual on SBM Practices).

As observed in some schools, there are school heads and teachers who are good at linkages to other stakeholders. Yet, there are also some school heads who are hesitant to tap external stakeholders because they are afraid that when these stakeholders are tapped, they will over rule the school and impede decision-making of the school heads and teachers. They seem to take authority over the schools. School heads and principals become lenient in their policies because they have gratitude over the stakeholders. Thus, creating conflict in the school organization. Conflict becomes a gap in the school organization.

In some cases, there are also schools which are scarcely visited by stakeholders. School heads also do not have the eagerness to tap them. They are afraid if they could not be given the priority and opportunity to raise their plans for the improvement of their schools. Other school heads found some stakeholders unreachable. There are cases that when stakeholders are tapped, they would not prioritize the schools because they do not understand their roles and responsibilities in making themselves partners of the school. Less visitation of schools, fear and unavailability to convince stakeholders are also considered gaps.

II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

To bring the study in proper perspective, related literature and conducted in the past years were reviewed. One great need in education today is to view the schools in a much wider perspective. Such a movement cannot simply be a movement in “life adjustment”, “relevancy”, accountability or basic education because this only prolongs ideas and institutions that are in need of change. To be effective, reconstructionists must be more radical that seeks, through a variety of methods, to change existing social institutions, including the school, in ways that make them more responsive to human needs (Ozonon and Craver, 2008).

Rules and Regulations of Republic Act No. 9155 which is the governance of Basic Education Act of 2001, gives emphasis in the authority, accountability and responsibility of the school head which is consistent with the law, national educational policies, plans, and standards. Setting the mission, vision, goals and objectives of the school; creating an environment within the school which is conducive to teaching and learning; implementing, monitoring and assessing the school curriculum and being accountable for higher outcomes; developing the school education program and school improvement plan; offering educational programs, projects and services which provide equitable opportunities for all learners in the community; introducing new and innovative modes of instruction to achieve higher learning outcomes; administering and managing all personnel, physical and fiscal resources of the school; recommending the staffing complement of the school based on nits needs; encouraging and enhancing staff development; establishing school and community networks and encouraging the active participation of teacher organizations, non-academic personnel of public schools and parents teachers’ community association; accepting donations, gifts, bequests and grants in accordance with existing laws and policy of the Department for the purpose of upgrading teachers/learning facilitators’ competencies, improving and expanding school facilities and providing instructional materials and equipment. Such donations or grants must be reported to the division superintendents’; and performing such other functions as may be assigned by the Secretary, Regional Director and Schools Division Superintendent where they belong.

Management is the totality of process necessary to challenge people to aim for a higher purpose, to involve them significantly in planning and decision-making and to help them develop effective working relationships among themselves that are satisfying and productive in accomplishing the aims of the system of which they are part, (Fullan, 2005).

School budgeting is an executive and legislative function. The executive entity superintendent, and district staff, school principal and/or assistant proposes, and the legislative entity board of education or School board enacts. On formal adoption by the school board, the budget becomes a legal document that serves as the basis for annual expenditures, accounting and auditing. According to school finance experts, budgeting involves five major steps: preparation, submission, adoption, execution and evaluation. The third step, adoption, involves the school board, which appropriates specific amounts for specific categories. The principal's budgeting roles can be classified into four major activities: budget planning, assisting the superintendent in identifying budget priorities and focusing on school needs at the planning stage; budget analysis, dealing with the goals, objectives, and evaluative criteria, suggestions for curriculum materials and instructional equipment, and communication concerns of the students, parents, teachers, and community about specific expenditures or special purposes; budget requesting, involving a review of requests by different groups such as teachers or parents, establishing program priorities, submitting a total budget, and negotiating specific items; and budget controls, dealing with inventory expenses, receipts and disbursements, monthly reporting, and balancing the books at the building level. The fourth activity deals with the regular school operation, which involves ongoing paperwork and record keeping, (Merrill, 2006).

Fullan and Sarason (2005) added a seventh dimension of school management the principal as the change agent and facilitator, while Deal and Peterson (2005) referred to an eight characteristic, based on cooperative leadership, that is building collegiality, a sense of school identity, and a democratic and inspiring school culture. In general, there seems to be an agreement that principals must lead from the center, that is, be more democratic, delegate responsibilities, share decision-making powers, and develop collaborative efforts that bond students, teachers, and parents. In an era of reform and restructuring of schools, with increased legal consideration and government regulations, the principal's duties and tasks have increased to an overload level. Principals are almost forced to share responsibilities with and empower others in order to manage schools on a day to-day basis. But if they give away power selectively to individuals and groups, they can retain and enhance their span of control and subsequent influence, (Sergiovanni, 2005). Although there is a need for the principal to be a leader in the areas of curriculum and instruction, it sometimes disagrees on what specific roles and behaviors should be exhibited and how much time should be devoted to these twin areas of leadership. When principals are surveyed, they often report that the curriculum and instruction aspects on the job are top-priority work areas and that they need to spend more time on the job related to these areas of development, (Spillane and Diamond, 2007).

Dealing with the daily operation of the school and attending meetings tend to take up most of their time. Although the major principal associations (NAEP and NASSP) overwhelmingly envision the principal as a curriculum instructional leader, and this theme continually appears in their respective journals (which principals read), the realities of the job do not permit emphasis in these twin leadership areas, (Corwin Press, 2015).

Another instrument to assess the climate of the school is the Organizational Health Inventory (OHI) developed by Wayne Hoy and John Tarter which describes the health of the interpersonal relations in schools among students, teachers, administrators, and community members.

Influential principals are persuasive with superiors, get additional consideration, and proceed relatively unimpeded by the hierarchy. Resource support is the extent to which classroom supplies and instructional materials are readily available; in fact, even extra materials are supplied if requested. The teacher level is concerned with the teaching and learning process. Teacher affiliation is a sense of friendliness and strong affiliation with the school. Teachers feel good about each other, their job and their students. They are committed to both their students and their colleagues and accomplish their jobs with enthusiasm. Academic emphasis is the extent to which the school is driven by a quest for academic excellence. High but achievable academic goals are set for students, the learning environment is orderly and serious, teachers believe in their students' ability to achieve, and students work hard and respect those who do well academically, (Lunenburg and Ornstein, 2008).

Schools can really make a difference in the achievement levels of students, but a school is usually only as good or bad, as creative or sterile, as the person who serves as the head of that school. Research on effective schools highlights the role of the principal in establishing goals and objectives for the school. Principals of effective schools are strong instructional leaders who know how to manage time and money effectively. They concentrate on priority goals. They set as their main goal the acquisition of basic skills. Effective principals have high expectations for all students and they will enlist the support of others in meeting common goals. (Ubben, Hughes and Norris 2006).

In many successful schools, there is recognition that the social aspects of change are at least as important as the technical emphasis on prioritization and strategic planning. It is through such an approach to school development that recognizes the social complexity of change that some schools are managing to achieve quality in times of change, (Dimmock and Walter 2005).

The principle of collegiality requires all the stakeholders to work together as a team. The school head is the force that encourages and binds together all the teachers. Parents, pupils, local leaders and other community members in the realization of the school mission, vision, goals and objectives (School-Based Management Manual, 2009).

School-Based Management is the decentralization of decision-making authority to schools. At the school level, school heads, teachers and pupils work together with the community leaders and local government officials and other stakeholders to improve school performance. Decentralization, in the context of SBM, is the transfer of responsibility for planning school improvement, raising, allocating and managing resources from the central, regional and division levels down to the school sites (DepED Order NO. 230, series 1999).

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. The Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001 (RA 9155) emphasizes decentralization of school governance. The Basic Education Sector Reform Agenda (BESRA) provides a package of policy reforms focused on Key Reform Thrusts (KRTs). KRT 1 deals on continuous school improvement through active involvement of stakeholders. It is anchored on the principle that those who are directly involved in and affected by school operations are in the best position to plan, manage and improve the school. The Schools

First Initiative (SFI) of 2004 empowers educational leaders and stakeholders to focus on school improvement and total well-being of school children.

III. SCOPE AND LIMITATION

The study utilized the quantitative in approach using the descriptive method of research. A quantitative study analyzed the mathematical presentations and the results were expressed in statistical notation. The researcher analyzed the data through statistical significance where percentage and frequency was used. It portrayed an unbiased result because it allowed the large population to be generalized. The study was conducted in the Fifth Congressional District in Cebu, school Year 2015-2016. The Fifth Congressional Districts were composed of ten Districts namely Liloan, Compostela, Carmen, Catmon, Sogod, Borbon and Camotes Island Districts namely: San Francisco, Poro, Tudela and Pilar. They are situated in the northern part of Cebu province. Starting off from the heart of the city, Liloan is 25kilometers away. Compostela is 26-kilometers away. Carmen is 28-kilometers away. Catmon is 29-kilometers away. Sogod is 30-kilometers away and Borbon is 31- kilometers away.

Only six Districts were included. All of which are situated in the mainland namely; Liloan, Compostela, Carmen, Catmon, Sogod and Borbon. Camotes Island Districts were not included. Schools are situated far from the District offices and are in the mountains. Schools have few teachers and pupils.

IV. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Sampling

The respondents of the study included 45 public elementary school heads universally taken of the fifth congressional district or municipalities and 427 teachers of the 305 (percent) of the teacher population of Central schools and schools within one-kilometer radius from district offices. However, primary schools and Multi-grade schools were also considered as long as they are in the lowlands and within one-kilometer radius from the district offices. Small schools with complete elementary and with only one section per grade level were given 100% (percent) of the tool.

The instrument as also administered to seven public elementary schools and six public secondary schools in the District of Liloan who were not respondents of the study. From all indications, the questionnaire checklists were clear, appropriate and understandable.

Research Procedure

The research was done purposely in a self-administered manner. A written permission was requested by the researcher from the University Dean Dr. Nerissa S. Lopez and the Schools' Division Superintendent of Cebu Province Dr. Rhea Mar A. Angtud to conduct the study, as well as to acquire data from the Assistant Schools Division Superintendent of Cebu Province. Upon approval of the request, the researcher personally approaches the persons in authority to gather data from them. The researcher proceeded for the next process.

The data was gathered to answer sub-problems one and two which the frequency distribution with the weighted mean computation was used. The weights were used to the frequencies of the answer of the respondents over the number of cases and distinguished the points according to the parameter limits as basis for the interpretation.

Permission to acquire the Performance Appraisal System of School Administrators and the School-Based Management level of the public elementary school principals for the School Year 2015-2016 was secured from the Department of Education, Division Office of Cebu Province. The questionnaire-checklist was gathered by the researcher personally from the Assistant Schools Division Superintendent. Since performance Appraisal System for School Administrators was a standard tool with parameter limits, it was not changed and adjusted.

Ethical Issues.

The right to conduct the study was strictly adhered through the approval of the Schools Division Superintendent, Public Schools District Supervisors, Principals and Teachers. There were separate letters provided to the respondents denoting their privacy, safety and safeguarding their personality. Issues of confidentiality were also discussed during the orientation in separate venues, thus, they were treated with respect.

Plan for Data Analysis.

The weighted mean and ranking were used to determine the extent of performance and the levels of School-Based Management as appraised, evaluated and assessed by the Division Evaluators, public elementary school heads and teachers. Item average was obtained after adding the responses of the two respondents (school heads and teachers) and divide the same. The response categories would then be expressed and interpreted based on the parameter limits.

Simple percentage was used in the Performance Appraisal System of School Administrators. After all indicators were rated, they were all added and divided by the total number of indicators. Each criterion was rated obtaining the assigned percentage and summed up. The total number acquired after adding the equivalents of the percentages became the actual rating of the performance of the school heads. Factor averages became the actual rating of the performance of the whole District.

V. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1. School-Based Management of the Fifth Congressional District.

	Districts	Dimensions											Item	Average
1	2.17	D	2.00	D	1.75	D	2.01	D	2.07	D	2.23	D	2.04	D
2	2.30	D	2.06	D	2.04	D	1.99	D	2.19	D	2.12	D	2.12	D
3	2.18	D	2.09	D	1.77	D	2.00	D	2.07	D	2.13	D	2.04	D
4	2.36	M	2.31	D	2.00	D	2.01	D	2.31	M	2.42	M	2.24	D
5	2.19	D	1.81	D	1.78	D	1.99	D	1.98	D	1.98	D	1.96	D
6	2.26	D	1.91	D	1.75	D	2.10	D	2.07	D	2.02	D	2.02	D
FA	2.24	D	2.18	D	1.89	D	2.04	D	2.16	D	2.16	D	2.11	D

Legend: 1-School Leadership; 2-Internal Stakeholders; 3-External Stakeholders; 4-School Improvement Process; 5-School-based Resources; 6-School Performance Accountability; D-Developing (1.34-2.33); 3-M- Maturing (34-3.00)

The table showed the Districts assigned in numbers at the left portion and the six dimensions also assigned in numbers with corresponding mean and level.

School Leadership. District 4 obtained the highest mean denoting the Maturing level. This showed that the specific District had exponentially gained the necessary indicators portrayed in the schools by respective school heads. It also proved that the District had gone par excellence in undertaking School Leadership. School heads

head been trained on basic competencies on Instructional leadership and on SBM and LSB responsibilities. They carried out their responsibilities well as articulated during the trainings. This further showed that the District had managed the schools efficiently and effectively.

District 1 obtained the lowest mean denoting Developing level. This emphasized that the indicators were performed but not par excellence. The District needed constant training and assessment in order to manifest higher level outcomes.

Internal Stakeholders' Participation. District 2 obtained the highest mean denoting Developing level. Though not far from other Districts but underscored that the District performed better than the others. It carefully defined specific roles of pupils and teachers defined in SBM and articulated in Magna Carta of the Philippines to make teachers credible enough in undertaking different functions attached to their position. Parents were given responsibilities with the assumption that they would greatly perform their duties as partners of the school in developing their children to become holistic. More efforts would be required for the District to assess school heads in the pedagogies of teaching employed in classes to effectively enunciate better progress of learners in general.

District E obtained the lowest mean denoting Developing level. The District had to make some adjustments in making teaching-learning process effect in schools with the cooperation of the vital partners who were the parents specifically. Parents, pupils and teacher be oriented on SBM and should be made to understand the underlying indicators to acquire better outcomes.

External Stakeholders' Participation. District 2 obtained the highest mean denoting Developing level. It showed that the District had performed all indicators but far from excellence. External stakeholders did not sustain until the end of the school year. It also manifested inconsistent support to schools. School heads just relied on the help of the Division office and support from the Central office in fund allocations to school buildings, so do with its repair and maintenance. Less effort was instigated by schools in tapping stakeholders that could help identify crucial needs in schools, thus, support generation was vital.

Districts A and F had the same mean denoting Developing level. It further displayed that school heads had not fully identified potent stakeholders that would laud and appreciate SBM. There were many external stakeholders waiting to be tapped and recognized. School heads were hesitant to approach them and include them in meetings and orientations. It also manifested that the Districts had just settled for less improvement. Districts would create better arena for external stakeholders to be in place and encourage them to participate in schools and engage them in assessing school needs.

School Improvement Process. District 6 showed the highest mean denoting Developing level. It expressed that indicators were followed but not strictly implemented. School Governing Council was not properly oriented in the SBM practices, that is why, support was less gained from them. The District should provide avenue for school heads and School Governing Council to meet both ends in order to raise the standards set in the SBM tool, thus, an avenue towards school improvement.

District 2 and 5 had the same mean denoting Developing level. There were indicators being met but not totally practiced as perceived in the results obtained from the respondents. Many indicators were missed for full implementation, that is why, it still regarded as needs to offshoot and could perhaps create better outcomes if religiously followed, practiced and implemented.

School-Based Resources. District 4 obtained the highest mean signifying Developing level. This showed that stakeholders were better informed of MOOE allocation. School-based procurements were undertaken. Yet, some school heads failed to submit liquidation on time and some items procured were disallowed by Commission on Audit. The District should monitor MOOE expenditures to hasten liquidation and to refrain school heads from buying items from non-credible stores.

Districts 2 and 5 had obtained the same mean denoting Developing level. This implied that school heads in the specific Districts had established performance but still far from excellence. This also notified that there were indicators ignored. Less practice was instilled, thus, obtained low mean. The Districts should employ strategies and mechanisms that could help enhance the school improvement process.

School Performance Accountability. District 4 gained the highest mean denoting Maturing level. It showed that the school heads in the District were performing well and made the stakeholders part of the monitoring and evaluation. School performance was manifested in the learning outcomes displayed by the pupils. The District had gainfully accounted all necessary outcomes and made them known to stakeholders. There were two dimensions which denoted “Maturing” level but were dragged down to Developing because of poor performances in the four dimensions.

District 5 obtained the lowest mean denoting Developing level. It showed that Districts had low performances with regard to pupil accountability. Monitoring and evaluation were just taken for granted and were not utilized as means or vehicle for improvement if analyzed carefully.

All the Districts obtained item averages denoting Developing level. However, District 2 gained the highest item average, while District 5 obtained the lowest item average. It showed that all Dimensions were in the Developing level also. Districts still needed to upgrade its level of performance and should make meticulous observations on best practices to be employed and practiced for the next round of assessment. Assessment should be done regularly to know whether schools had improved and or maintained the same level. Previous results served as basis for benchmarking.

Table 2. Summary of the performance appraisal system of School administrators of the fifth Congressional district.

Districts	Dimensions											Item	Average	
1	2.17	D	2.00	D	1.75	D	2.01	D	2.07	D	2.23	D	2.04	D
2	2.30	D	2.06	D	2.04	D	1.99	D	2.19	D	2.12	D	2.12	D
3	2.18	D	2.09	D	1.77	D	2.00	D	2.07	D	2.13	D	2.04	D
4	2.36	M	2.31	D	2.00	D	2.01	D	2.31	M	2.42	M	2.24	D
5	2.19	D	1.81	D	1.78	D	1.99	D	1.98	D	1.98	D	1.96	D
6	2.26	D	1.91	D	1.75	D	2.10	D	2.07	D	2.02	D	2.02	D
FA	2.24	D	2.18	D	1.89	D	2.04	D	2.16	D	2.16	D	2.11	D

Legend: A-Instructional Supervision; B-Development/Implementation of Educational Programs; C- Administrative Management; D- Research; E- Performance Assessment; FR-Final Rating; DR- Descriptive Rating Parameter: 2 –P – Poor (1.00-2.59); 4- U-Unsatisfactory (2.60-4.59); 6- S Satisfactory (4.60-6.59); 8-VS-Very Satisfactory (6.60-8.59); 10- O- Outstanding (8.60-10.00).

The table showed the consolidated result of the Fifth Congressional District in the performance of school heads based on PASSA rating. The districts were assigned in numbers and the occupational competences were assigned

in letters with the corresponding percentage on each criterion. Occupational Competence. It covered instructional supervision, development/implementation of educational programs, administrative management, research and performance assessment. Instructional Supervision. This manifested the performances of the school heads in the Districts in the preparation and implementation of school year instructional plan.

District 5 had the highest rating ascribed Outstanding. It showed that all the school heads in the assigned district had its approved plan and fully implemented the plan. School heads had monthly class observations as part of the plan. Clinical observations were evident. It showed better improvement as manifested in the curriculum development.

District 2 had the lowest rating ascribed Very Satisfactory. This suggested that school heads in the had its long way to improve their performances. Though some districts carried the same rating, but this particular district was far behind them. Thus, an indication that the District should instigate different activities to further develop the school, teachers and pupils in general. Development/ Implementation of Educational Programs. This includes pupil/student development, curriculum development and staff development.

District 2 had the highest rating ascribed Outstanding. It showed that school heads in the particular district had greatly performed different indicators. They had shown increase on mean percentage score obtained through achievement rate and or periodic exams by two percent over the previous years' performance. They had decreased dropout rate if not by two percent, at least minimized. They had increased the participation rate, retention rate and survival rate. They had religiously implemented health and nutrition program through supplementary feeding as allocated by the Division office on their School Based Feeding Program. They had undertaken special programs and projects which were participated by the learners and teachers.

District 1 had the lowest rating ascribed Very Satisfactory. The District had varying performances of school heads in obtaining such rating. Some school heads had decreased dropout rate but other schools had increased dropout rate which meant that the District had different interventions as portrayed by the school heads in their obtained ratings. Some school heads had increased their participation rate and retention rate but others seemingly natural in them to have decreased its retention and participation rate. The District should review on the interventions prevalent in schools and adjust some strategies to gain the overall impact of the District.

Administrative Management. This covered the resource management which included management of human resources, management of physical resources and fiscal management. Data management, conflict management and linkage management were also considered in the ratings of the school heads in the District.

District 3 had the highest rating ascribed Outstanding. It showed that there were four school heads who had excellently performed the different indicators in the administrative management. Yet there were two school heads who performed less but still carried the highest rating. Furthermore, even the district had obtained the highest rating but the District had to extract the schools who performed less so that technical assistance could be given and school heads would be better helped.

District 2 had the lowest rating ascribed Very Satisfactory. It showed that while four schools the ascribed Very Satisfactory rating, two schools obtained Satisfactory rating. The District had to extend help to Schools A and E to make them reach the level of their peers. They had to be visited and assessed from time to time to create a meaningful learning while help was extended to them. Research. This covers all the results of the data gathered

in schools including performance indicators, periodic tests and the result of the PASSA ratings, National Based Competencies Result Standard and many others.

All districts obtained Poor rating. There was not even one school head made research for the schools' improvement. This had to be taken considerations and should not be neglected. Certain issues and problems in schools could be addressed when research was part of their endeavor to arrive at a better performance. Performance Assessment. This covers the achievement rate of the whole district as obtained after the periodical tests or after achievement tests conducted by the higher level. In-service trainings and semestral ratings of teachers were also considered.

Districts 2 and 6 had the highest rating ascribed Very Satisfactory. This showed that the two districts obtained high proficiency level over the tests conducted and administered to learners. This expressed that the competencies taught by the teachers were mastered by the pupils. However, the Districts should incorporate all least learned competencies and most learned competencies in order to highlight the items needed for improvement and those needed for sustainability.

District 5 had the lowest rating ascribed Unsatisfactory. This showed that the District had very low performance in achievement rate. The District should make this the first priority in arriving at a solution. Since the District is big, all school heads must review all the competencies and teachers should be trained on the mastery of the subject areas. Remedial classes should be undertaken as part of the interventions to better off the education in the said District. Professional and Personal Characteristics. This covered the attributes of a good leader while attaining the performances desired from the norms of PASSA.

Districts 1, 4, 5 and 6 had the highest rating ascribed Outstanding. The school heads in the said districts displayed exponentially all ten good characteristics that determined their interpersonal and intrapersonal skills. They worked with flexibility and with ease. They possessed the needed characteristics in the observance of their work performances. The challenge was on how to sustain the said rating.

Districts 2 and 3 had the lowest rating ascribed Outstanding. It showed that the Districts performance on the attributes of school heads good characteristics were just minute point obtained from the highest. Furthermore, there were still little improvements on the school heads characteristics to be cultivated. Punctuality and attendance. This covers all activities that needed personal appearances of school heads in certain districts including its attendance in schools.

District 1 had the highest rating ascribed Outstanding. This showed that school heads in the particular district had manifested punctuality and attendance at all times. They disclosed that it was important to be always prompt and punctual at all times. They should be emulated by the teachers and pupils in schools. The challenge was on the sustainability of the said criteria knowing that in a year, there would two hundred one day in contact with schools, communities, seminars and conferences.

Districts 3, 4 and 5 had the lowest rating ascribed Very Satisfactory. They needed to employ habits of coming early to schools and in meeting, conferences, seminars and the like. School heads in the specific districts should advocate time-consciousness.

The overall PASSA rating of the Fifth Congressional District ascribed Very Satisfactory. All Districts had the same rating. They just differ on the varying indicators that make other Districts perform more and perform less in

some aspects. Moreover, the Districts shall undertake improvements in addressing these challenges and gaps. They have to develop supervisory plan over schools to enhance better performance in some aspects which were performed less.

Occupational Competence

School heads of the six districts situated in the fifth congressional district were unanimously preparing their school year instructional supervisory plan for their measurement in creating adequate results for the whole year. They were able to implement their instructional supervisory plan correspondingly. However, not all Key Result Areas stipulated in the plan were totally followed and accomplished. That was why they differ in their obtained ratings with regard to implementation.

Instructional Supervision

School heads had supervised their teachers most especially in the delivery of instruction. They had constant monitoring through observations where they mentored and coached their teachers to improve teaching strategies to make classrooms wholesome and conducive to learning. However, due to the many demands of tasks endowed by the school principals, sometimes clinical and instructional supervision were neglected.

Development/Implementation of Educational Programs

There had been many reforms initiated by DepED in curtailing pupils/learners from withdrawing classes or schools. There was the KRA of Basic Education Act of 2001 which was the EFA (Education for All) goal.

Despite the many efforts, records showed in the performance indicators of the schools drop-out still prevailed. There were many reasons revealed by the principals when taking this problem. They made measures and interventions to win back learners interest in schools. They had the catch up program.

In the effort of gaining higher performance and school performance accountability, records manifested in different test measurements were gathered and interpreted (periodic tests, formative test, summative tests, work performance, etc.). Results showed that some schools in the fifth legislative districts specifically the six districts did not reach the 75% performance level of learners in all subject areas. Though some had higher mean percentage score, when compared to the present achievement, it did not increase in terms of performance. Many efforts were made but then again, the same was regarded to their performance.

In the effort of increasing participation rate of learners in the school, determined that schools established monitoring of their learners, although not all. Learners who enrolled were encouraged and engaged in many activities that require their participation. While others, who were mentally and academically challenged were also given preference except for those who dropped from the rolls.

In advocating learners' nomenclature of learning and where comfort was desired, teachers and principals take extra leap to make learning meaningful and happen in schools where it manifested a life-long learning experience. Teachers were honed to several techniques in order to leave on to them so that they won't transfer to other schools. There had been records of learners enrolled from the lowest grade and some were not able to graduate in the same schools. Some pupils transferred to other schools, to other districts and municipalities, to other provinces and cities. But information was known that the pupils who transferred to other schools and districts finished their studies. Although the Cohort Survival of the schools lessen, but the school was just joyful learning that learners

graduated. Sometimes, school principals and teachers could not help it most especially when the reasons confronted with the families (livelihood, parental problem, transfer of residence and the like).

With regard to the retention of learners, most of the schools had increased their potential in rearing the learners and enhancing their capabilities while honing and capacitating teachers.

With regard to Health and Nutrition program, most of the schools gained Outstanding performance. School-based feeding program was admonished. There was fund allocation intended solely for feeding program. It was perceived that it was fully and successfully implemented knowing that it was also monitored. Learners who wasted and severely wasted were given priorities and much attention. This was a great aid for learners to be motivated to come to school every day most especially those less privileged.

Community involvement includes attention to the nutrition and health needs of young children long before they reach school age. It is observed that these common features ARE also observed in our country.

Curriculum Development

Much had been undertaken with regard to curriculum. There were books provided although not in a 1:1 correspondence. Learners and teachers had been becoming to be technology-driven, some of them made research and made materials available and within their reach. There were recipient schools for DCP (Decentralization Computerization Program) to be used during delivery of instruction to make pupils and teachers abreast of the common technology.

Ruth U. Retulla (2011), cited that learning of students are active rather than passive learning. The people-parents and other community members are heavily involved in the learning of the children and in the management of the school. Teacher and student constructed learning materials are widely used.

Staff Development

The school principals assessed the training needs of teachers based on different forms and norms. Result of the assessment served as guide or gauge for better enhancement. School-based training program and in-service training were crafted and initiated and realized every midyear and summer to better the education and the teaching-learning process.

In providing opportunities for professional and personal enhancement, only few had gained Very Satisfactory rating. Though teachers were encouraged to attend to trainings and seminars, some would then decline most especially when it needed personal funds. Others enrolled in higher and post education but could not be equated among the many others. Ruth U. Retulla (2011), cited there is active student involvement in the governance of the school. There is existing on-going regular and regular in-service training and peer mentoring for teachers. There is on-going monitoring /evaluation /feedback system allowing the school to learn from its own experience.

Administrative Management

These are the functions of public elementary school principals in the resource management, data management, conflict management and linkage management. Under resource management are the management of human resource, management of physical facilities and fiscal management.

Teachers, pupils and parents are the most essential resources in schools. School heads could not be assigned to

specific schools without them. They need to be taken care of most especially when teaching and learning is concerned. School heads are equipped with the necessary things to make the essence of camaraderie be manifested in schools and that harmonious and peaceful atmosphere occur.

Along with the management of physical facilities, school principals had the monthly allocation of school MOOE (Maintenance and Other Operating Expenses) to facilitate the repair if needed. Expenditures should be properly aligned to SOB (School Operating Budget), SIP (School Improvement Plan) and AIP (Annual Implementation Plan).

External stakeholders could also be of great help in making schools become effective source of emergent literacy if school buildings and facilities were adequate and moreover a good avenue for learning and not dilapidated.

Research

In all of the school heads and schools in districts/ municipalities of the fifth congressional district, not one of them had made any research. There might be many indicators of how to obtain the research studies, but then records were just kept for reporting purposes.

Performance Assessment

This involved people in the community organizations, teacher organizations, NGO's and persons in the Barangay and municipal level to be involved in evaluating performance of the school principals. In this regard, many school heads had made their effort known through meetings and conferences. However, there is a need for school heads to increase their network towards them.

Professional and Personal Characteristics

These are the characteristics displayed and portrayed by the school heads in dealing with co-workers, peers, subordinates, learners and stakeholders. Once these characteristics were delineated, the better the outcomes of strong partnership and better understanding would be geared towards school improvement in general. Interpersonal and intrapersonal skills should be displayed to catch many clientele for better improve schools. This could bring synergy of efforts to be played by both school heads and all stakeholders of the school. All school heads displayed good attributes to the people around and that surrounds them.

Effects of School-Based Management Status to School Heads' Performance

School Leadership can be incorporated with the Occupational Competence derived by the school heads in attaining their target, goals, mission and vision. These include their capacities and their plans in carrying out their work.

Internal Stakeholders' Participation can be incorporated with the development/ implementation of school programs which greatly influenced management of human resources where pupils, teachers are parents are essential in carrying out plans of improved teaching learning process.

External Stakeholders' Participation could be incorporated with linkage management under Administrative management. Linkage and networking to outside forces could greatly affect better performance of the schools most especially when they had to be included in planning, in carrying out their responsibilities.

External stakeholders of the elementary schools could be very supportive to the schools in terms of money, time and support. This should be instigated so that stakeholders could participate actively in the planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the school programs and projects.

School Improvement Process in tandem with the 70% of PASSA (Performance Appraisal System for School Administrators). This includes all the needed resources to be utilized to better equip teachers, learners, parents and other stakeholders to achieve better and perform at its best.

School- Based Resources can be incorporated with Administrative management wherein several management reforms could be instituted to make schools become an arena of honesty, trust and confidence which would result to worthwhile endeavor or performance.

School Performance Accountability could be incorporated with all criteria in Instructional Supervision, Development/ Implementation of Educational Programs, Administrative Management and the like. ALL of the criteria benefited the learners and teachers as well as the school principals when these tasks had been carefully and meaningfully fulfilled. Adept with all the plans and procedures, the challenge takes place on how the public elementary school principals of the six districts/municipalities of the fifth legislative district carry out their tasks in obtaining higher performance in which they were accountable for.

Professional and Personal Characteristics should be incorporated in all School-based management dimensions, all the school principals endeavor in the pursuit of increased performance and productivity needed their interpersonal and intrapersonal skills.

VI. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PLAN

Rationale

Success and survival of a certain educational program depends mainly on planning and technical assistance given by the planners on curriculum aspects. Since the results of School-Based Management was developing in the six districts of the Fifth Congressional District of Cebu and the performance level of the school heads was Very Satisfactory, there is a need to further improve their management and leadership skills through a technical assistance plan.

Objectives

After the two-day seminar of revealing the overall dimensions employed by district, the school heads of the Fifth Congressional District will be able to:

1. Identify the different dimensions on areas that should be developed by the school heads to identify and answer the challenges, issues, gaps and priorities;
2. Develop planning standards or system to answer the indicated priorities,
3. Plan strategies and intervention programs to answer the challenges, issues, gaps or priorities,
4. Monitor and evaluate the assistance extended after a definite period of time; an
5. Report results as basis for upgrading.

Implementing Strategies

1. Ask approval from the Schools Division Superintendent of Cebu Province to conduct a two-day seminar on May 24-25, 2018, which will be held at the District of Liloan.
2. Create steering committee to facilitate the two-day seminar such as:
 3. Discuss with the participants after the Opening Ceremony the results of the study.
 - 3.1. Planning committee
 - 3.2. Documentation Committee
 - 3.3. Food and Snacks Committee
 - 4.4. Evaluation Committee
 4. Introduce the Technical Assistance Plan and its mechanics of implementation,
 5. Open Forum
 6. Closing Ceremony

VII. CONCLUSION

The School-Based Management practices is an aspect in improving the school system. It is of great help in attaining mission, vision, goals and DepED's thrust. It serves as assessment of the functions, duties and responsibilities of the school heads as stipulated in the Republic Act 9155. It also measures the capacity of school heads in addressing different concerns, issues, gaps and priorities the school is undertaking. It identifies aspects that needs to be given importance to augment better performance.

Different indicators stipulated in the tool performed and practiced by the school heads are fundamental aspects in school-based management practices to alleviate the status of the elementary schools in the aspects of the different dimensions such as the participation of stakeholders, school improvement process, school-based resources and school performance accountability.

It signifies that School-based management is not fully implemented to all schools. There are certain indicators that are left unpracticed. Since this is only an assessment, it is considered not mandatory to all schools.

It is best to be implemented in all schools regardless of whether it is an assessment. It really affects the school heads' performance. Once School based management is in place, school heads always carry with them the excellence that they desire.

VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are advanced to further improve the study:

1. It is highly suggested and recommended that technical assistance plan be thoroughly implemented in different schools.
2. Policies imposed in the public schools must be monitored consistently to make the educational system holistic.
3. The following topics for future research are suggested:

- 3.1 Attend Action Research Seminars
- 3.2 Roles and Responsibilities of External Stakeholders in School Improvement
- 3.3 Transparency and Accountability Mechanisms and Responsibilities of School Heads.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Above all, the deepest thanksgiving is to the Almighty God, who had shared His predilection to sustain from the beginning until the end. Foremost, the author extends the sincerest gratitude to Dr. Paterno Belarmino- Adviser of Mount Olives Christian School Academy and Professor, University of the Visayas, for the profound support, tremendous patience, motivation and enormous knowledge in making reach this far.

Credit to the knowledgeable panelists who had shared their forte and proficiency in making a good dissertation: Chairman, Dr. Nerissa S. Lopez, Members: Dr. Mathea M. Baguia, Dr. Philadelfa E. Vestal and Dr. Zosima A. Panares for their abounding love, intense support and generous insights and prolific comments and suggestions.

Immense gratitude to Dr. Eladio C. Dioko, former Dean of Graduate Schools, University of the Visayas who helped craft title of the study. Grateful appreciation to Dr. Arden Monisit, former Schools Division Superintendent of Cebu Province Division, Dr. Rhea Mar A. Angtud, Cebu Province Schools Division Superintendent, Mr. Roseller N. Gelig, Dr. Lea Apao and Dr. Ester A. Futralan, Assistant Schools Division Superintendents, Dr. Julieta Jeruta, Regional Director, Department of Education, for their substantial support in granting my study leave and allowing me to field out questionnaires for my study. Earnest appreciation to Dr. Gerardo Mantos, Dr. Pamela Rodemio, Dr. Mary Ann P. Flores and Mr. Isaiash T. Wagas for their spirited support.

Dr. Leo Bragat Acibar - Education Specialist-Research of DepED Region VII for the full technical assistance on IMRAD Format. Heartfelt gratitude to the Public Schools District Supervisors, School Heads and teachers of the Fifth Congressional District for their meritorious support in allowing me to conduct my study and obtained responses vivaciously. Special thanks to the School Administration of Mt. Olives School of the Philippines, Inc. headed Rev.

Dr. Gerry B. Cabajes and her behalf Dr. Lynn Cabajes for allowing me to use their school facilities while meeting with my adviser. Sincerest thanks also for the laudable support of her husband Nilo Q. Pepito and son Nethanel Niamke C. Pepito, and father Romeo D. Capangpangan and her sister Glace C. Mercader.

REFERENCES

- [1] Apa-ap, M. P. (2015). Public Elementary School Principals. Cebu: University of the Visayas.
- [2] Dimmrock C., Walter A. (2005). Educational Leadership: Culture and Diversity. SAGE Publications Ltd.
- [3] Dimzon, B. D. (2012). Administrative and Supervisory Functions of the Department Heads of Western Visayas College of Science and Technology External Campuses: Proposed Development Plan, Cebu: University of the Visayas.
- [4] Fullan, M. (2005). Leadership and Sustainability. Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press.
- [5] Gudelasao, D. G. (2011). The Collaborative Assessment of the School-Based Management Practices of the Cebu City Public Schools: A Provus Descripancy Model. Cebu: Cebu Normal University.
- [6] Hoy, W. K. (2006). Educational Administration Theory, Research and Practice. Mc-Graw Hill Higher Education.
- [7] Labos, J. (2012). Perceived Instructional Leadership Management Practices of Public School Principals in Iloilo City Division: Proposed professional Development Program. Cebu: University.
- [8] Legaste, H. T. (2012). Personal Characteristics, Adversity Quotient, Leadership and School-Based Management Practices of School Administrators, Three Districts of Esperanza Sultan Kudarat. Cebu: University of the Visayas.
- [9] Lunenberg, F. (2008). Educational Administration (International Edition); Educational Concepts and Practices Fifth Edition.
- [10] Mantos, G. (2013). The Status of SBM Implementation in the Division of Cebu Province by Secondary School Heads SY 2012-2013: Basis for Action Plan. Cebu: University of the Visayas.
- [11] Schmoker M. (2000). Leading the Essentials for School and District Improvement. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- [12] Merrill. (2006). Data-Driven Decision Making for Effective School Leadership, OH.

- [13] Ozonon H., Craver S. (2008). Philosophical Foundations of Education, Virginia Commonwealth University.
- [14] Pasaol, R. M. (2012). The Status Level and Implementation of the School-Based Management Program in Danao City Division: Proposed Development Program. Cebu: University of the Visayas.
- [15] Retulla, R. U. (2011). The Status of the School-Based Management Program Implementation in the Elementary Schools of Hilongos North and South Districts, Division of Leyte School Year 2009-2010: Basis for Improvement. Cebu: University of the Visayas.
- [16] Sergiovanni. (2006). Rethinking Leadership. Thousand Oaks, California.
- [17] Sol, O. M. (2011). Administrative Performance and Fiscal Management Competencies of the Administrators of Sogod District: A Paradigm for Administrative Development. Cebu: University of the Visayas.
- [18] Solis, M. C. (2010). The Administrative and Supervisory Functions of Public Secondary School Administrators in Leyte Division as Perceived by Themselves and their Teachers: Basis for Development Program. Cebu: University of the Visayas.
- [19] Spillane J., Diamond J. School Leadership on Arrangement from Distributed Perspective: A 2016 prospective
- [20] Sotto, S. F. (2010). The Leadership Approaches of the Administrators of Salazar Colleges of Science and Institute of Technology. Cebu: University of the Visayas.
- [21] Ubben, G. C. (2011). The Principal Creative Leadership for Excellence in Schools Seventh Edition.
- [22] Walker, A. (2005). Educational Leadership "Culture and Diversity".

AUTHORS PROFILE'



DR. GRACE C. PEPITO – niamkepepito@yahoo.com. The author was born on May 20, 1973 at Liloan, Cebu, Philippines. She finished her Bachelor in Elementary Education at Cebu Normal University and graduated Master's Degree in Education at the University of the Visayas and finished the Doctor of Education major in Educational Leadership and Management at the University of the Visayas. Also, Public Schools District Supervisor of Cebu Province Division detailed as Education Program Supervisor in Regional Field Technical Assistance Division in Region City.



DR. LEO BRAGAT ACIBAR – leo.acibar@deped.gov.ph. He finished his Doctor in Education (Ed.D) Major Educational Leadership and Management (March 2012) and Doctor in Management (D.M.) in Major in Human Resource Development and Management (October 2005) at University of the Visayas and currently works as Education Program Specialist (EPS)-Research of Department of Education Region VII – Central Visayas, Sudlon, Lahug, Cebu City. Regional Trainer on Action/Basic Research for Teachers and Non-Teaching Personnel DepEDRO7 and extend support of Technical Assistance (TA) and a Part-Time University Professor teaching Theory Development in Education, and Research Courses of both Doctoral and Masteral Programs of University of the Visayas, Cebu City, Philippi.