Shared Responsibility of School Community Towards Performance in the District of Santa Cruz

Violalyn Edra Gallardo

violalyn.gallardo@deped.gov.ph
Elementary Teacher, Silangan Elementary School., Santa Cruz 4009 Laguna, Philippines

Ma. Victoria A. Cabigan

mavictoriacabigan@lspu.edu.ph
College Professor, Laguna State Polytechnic University, Santa Cruz 4009 Laguna, Philippines

Abstract

The study was conducted to determine the effect of shared responsibility of school community towards performance in the District of Santa Cruz.

Specifically, this research sought to provide relevant information based on the following research questions (1) What is the level of shared responsibilities with regards to (1.1) Stakeholders as to (1.1.1) Financial Support (1.1.2) Services, (1.2) School Personnel as to (1.2.1) Open Communication, (1.2.2) Expectation, (1.2.3) Decision Making, (1.3) Parents as to (1.3.1) Manpower, (1.4) Alumni, (1.4.1) Commitment, (1.4.2) and Achievement, (2) What is the level of School Performance in terms of (2.1) Cohort Survival, (2.2) Promotion, (2.3) Retention, (2.4) Repetition, (2.5) Completion, (2.6) Graduation, and (2.7) Transition, (3) Do the Shared Responsibilities of the Stakeholders have significant effect to the School Performance? (4) Do the Shared Responsibilities of the School Personnel have significant effect to the School Performance? (5) Do the Shared Responsibilities of the Parents have significant effect to the School Performance? (6) Do the Shared Responsibilities of the Alumni have significant effect to the School Performance?

The descriptive design was utilized to analyze the data systematically. A survey and a research-made questionnaire in the form of a 5-point Likert scale were used. Mean and standard deviation were used for the descriptive questions, while the Two-Sample T-test was used for the inferential questions.

The salient points of the study presented found that the level of shared responsibilities with regards to stakeholders as to financial support and services, school personnel as to open communication, expectation and decision making, parents as to manpower, and alumni as to commitment and achievements were very high respectively. This means that the shared responsibilities of the school community are efficient and evident.

School Performance based on the given data of the three schools in terms of cohort survival, promotion, retention, repetition, completion, graduation and transition, the schools perform better in the three consecutive years. This conclude that the helped of stakeholders, school personnel parents and alumni are relevant. The collaborative effort of the group result to improve the school goal.

Therefore, the hypothesis is partially rejected, stating that there is significant effect in the level of shared responsibilities of the stakeholders in terms of financial support and services. The hypothesis is also partially rejected, stating that there is significant effect in the level of shared responsibilities of the school personnel in terms of open communication, expectation and decision making. The shared responsibilities of the parents in terms of manpower shows significant effect as evaluated by respondents. And lastly, the shared responsibilities of the alumni in terms of commitment and achievements shows significant effect as well.

This recommends that the school community may continue to support those schools to help them perform at their highest levels. Schools may keep on organizing community forums to encourage the school community about the significant relationship between school performance and the future of the learners. To accomplish the highest level of school performance, school personnel may continue to have open communication, goal-oriented decisions, and better services. Parents and alumni may continue to provide resources, commitment, and support for more projects and achievement that seek to enhance school performance and the academic achievement of learners. And lastly, in order to continue working toward achieving the highest performance level possible for the school, future researchers may conduct a study about school performance and shared responsibilities.

Keywords: Stakeholders, Financial Support, Services, School Personnel, Open Communication, Expectation, Decision Making, Parents, Manpower, Alumni, Commitment, Achievements, Cohort Survival, Promotion, Retention, Repetition, Completion, Graduation, Transition

1. Main Text

Introduction

Former DepEd Secretary Briones said that "Education has become, and it is obvious now that it is a shared responsibility. We call for the involvement of all sectors of society, in addition of course to the Ministries of Education who are leading these efforts. It is a shared responsibility because of the added threat — the health threat in our countries."

School improvement plans and goals can be one of your most powerful leadership tools. Shared responsibility is one of the most vital aspects that a school should have. It is a commitment among school community stakeholders. School community involvement is important to establish a shared knowledge and dedication to their own tasks and duties in order to support implementation.

Parents, teachers, and the school community all share responsibility for young children's education. Many nations' educational policies emphasize parents' roles and responsibilities as vital participants in creating more inclusive systems, where decision-making and responsibility must be shared, in order to effectively implement inclusive education.

In crafting the School Improvement Plan, stakeholders are members of the working committee who look into their involvement in making the school conducive to learning. They are also accountable for ensuring that the learning goals are accomplished by actively participating in educational activities, initiatives, and programs. That's why school community involvement is really important in every school.

In line with this, the study determined is to know the shared responsibility of the school community towards school performance in the District of Santa Cruz.

Background of the Study

Pursuant to Republic Act (RA) 9155 or the "Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001" and RA 10533 or the "Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013", the Department of Education (DepEd) implements programs, projects, and major activities to ensure access to and improve the quality of basic education, an end toward which all operating units at all governance levels have attendant roles, tasks, and responsibilities for which they are principally accountable.

Relative to this, the Department of Education develops the Basic Education Development Plan (BEDP) 2030 which responds to issues and challenges in basic education as well as the global and national education commitments. The BEDP 2030 aims to continue the goal of the Department that all Filipinos can realize their full potential and contribute meaningfully to a cohesive nation through the protection and promotion of the right to education. It is a long- term plan for basic education anchored on the Sulong Edukalidad Framework, the Philippine Development Plan, Ambisyon Natin 2040 and the commitments in the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) 2030, and provides a strategic roadmap for the Department to follow to improve the delivery and quality of basic education and the experience of learners in the basic education learning environment.

In support to this, DepEd developed this policy framework on Basic Education Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (BEMEF) to track and measure the achievement of BEDP 2030. In addition, BEMEF is integrally linked to the planning and budget strategy of the Department. In particular, BEMEF explicitly identifies and articulates the indicators and targets for measuring performance in the development of plans and policies of all DepEd operating units at all governance levels. It intends to complement the planning and budget strategy by setting up the framework for agency-wide monitoring and evaluation (M&E).

In line with this, school community stakeholders play a vital role in the achieving a good performance in every schools. Performance indicators also help schools analyze their performance so they can make important changes to their execution to meet their strategic objectives. In this study the researcher wants to provide ideas or insights on how to improve school performance. And allow them to work even further so they can accomplish their specific goal or objectives.

Theoretical Framework

Collective Responsibility Theory is the idea of collective responsibility, like that of personal responsibility and shared responsibility, which refers in most contexts to both the causal responsibility of moral agents for harm in the world and the blameworthiness that we ascribe to them for having caused such harm. As a result, it nearly invariably refers to moral responsibility rather than solely causal responsibility, like its two more individualistic equivalents. However, unlike its two more completely individualistic alternatives, it does not identify the basis of moral responsibility in the free will of individual moral actors, nor does it associate causal responsibility or blameworthiness with distinct persons. Instead, it links collectives to blameworthiness and causal responsibility, and it places the onus of moral responsibility on these collectives' collective activities. (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy 2017.

According to the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, moral responsibility (2017) is making judgments about whether a person is morally responsible for her behavior and holding others and ourselves responsible for actions and the consequences of actions is a fundamental and familiar part of our moral practices and our interpersonal relationships.

Furthermore, the conclusion that a person is morally responsible for her actions entails—at least roughly—attributing certain powers and capacities to the individual involved and seeing the behavior as having arisen (in the right way) from the person's possession and use of these powers and capacities. The possession of these abilities qualifies an agent as morally responsible in a broad sense, that is, as one who may be morally accountable for specific exercises of the agency.

Appreciative Inquiry Theory (2022) is a positive approach to leadership development and organizational change. The method is used to boost innovation among organizations. A company might apply appreciative inquiry to best practices, strategic planning, organizational culture, and to increase the momentum of initiatives. This approach has also been applied at the societal level for discussion on topics of global importance. For example, non-profit and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) might design initiatives across global regions and industry sectors after analysis using appreciative inquiry.

As cited by Greenwood et.al (2021), Organization theory is concerned with the relationship between organizations and their environment, the effects of those relationships on organizational functioning, and how organizations affect the distribution of privilege in society. A central concept is an organizational design. Organizational design is important because the ability of societies to respond to various problems depends on the availability of organizations with different capabilities. Organization theorists are thus interested in the range of organizational designs; their governance, capabilities, processes, and consequences, and how new organizational designs arise and become established. Recently, organization theorists have been applying their insights to grand challenges and making an impact on practice.

It is relevant to the current study since these focus on the discussion of the responsibility of individuals in achieving certain goals and objectives of the schools. To ensure that learners' potential and self-confidence grow to their full potential, stakeholders have a significant role to guide and enable them as well as to provide a stimulating environment. Get stakeholders involved in the decision-making process by empowering them. Involved stakeholders can help you make decisions and give you the support you need for long-term sustainability. All stakeholders must connect in a meaningful way through collaboration in order to build effective educational systems and learning environments. School community place a lot of importance on the educational benefits of school community support.

Statement of the Problem

This study aims to find out the effect of the shared responsibility of school community towards school performance in the District of Santa Cruz. Specifically, this sought to answer the following.
1. What is the level of shared responsibilities with regards to:
    1.1. Stakeholders as to
        1.1.1. Financial Support
        1.1.2. Services
1.2. School Personnel as to
    1.2.1. Open Communication
    1.2.2. Expectation
    1.2.3. Decision Making
1.3. Parents as to
    1.3.1. Manpower
    1.4. Alumni
        1.4.1. Commitment
        1.4.2. Achievement
2. What is the level of School Performance in terms of:
    2.1. Cohort Survival
    2.2. Promotion
    2.3. Retention
    2.4. Repetition
    2.5. Completion
    2.6. Graduation
    2.7. Transition
3. Do the shared responsibilities of the stakeholders have significant effect to the School Performance?
4. Do the shared responsibilities of the school personnel have significant effect to the School Performance?
5. Do the shared responsibilities of the parents have significant effect to the School Performance?
6. Do the shared responsibilities of the alumni have significant effect to the School Performance?

Research Methodology

This research explores the effect of shared responsibility to the school performance. However, specifically, it addressed the significant effect of school performance.

Research Design

The researcher will use the descriptive method of research to analyze the data systematically. The descriptive research method will help the researcher plan and carry out descriptive details about the shared responsibility and school improvement plan.

According to McCombes (2019), Descriptive research aims to accurately and systematically describe a population, situation or phenomenon and it includes a purpose and a question. It is the most basic research design; it answers basic questions about what is happening in a defined population.

Population and Sampling Technique

In this research, the study's respondents are the school stakeholders, teachers, parents and the community. Purposive sampling was done in the selection of the respondents. Purposive sampling, also known as judgmental, selective, or subjective sampling, is non-probability sampling. Researchers choose population members to participate in the surveys, relying on their judgment. (Alchemer, 2021)

Research Procedure

The research will begin in the first semester of 2022-2023. The pre-oral defense will hold to approve the title, paradigm, and problem statement. The procedure for conducting the research will prepare the necessary requirements.

The self-made questionnaire will be checked and validated by the experts. A written request for permission to conduct this study will be signed and noted by the research adviser and the Dean of the College of Teacher Education.

The proponent will create a self-made questionnaire. Before distributing the validated questionnaire, the respondents will be informed that they will participate in the study as research respondents. The researcher will discuss the study with the respondents and request their participation prior to validating the questionnaire. After the validation, the researcher will ask permission from the Schools Division Superintendent to conduct her research through a google form. Respondents will give enough time to answer the questionnaire. Finally, the researcher will interpret the data collected to determine the effects of the shared responsibility of the school community in creating the school improvement plan.

Research Instrument

This study will utilize the self-made questionnaire. It will be validated by the experts. According to Nemoto et. al (2017), a Likert scale is a psychometric scale with multiple categories from which respondents choose to indicate their opinions, attitudes, or feelings about a particular issue. This study's Likert type of questionnaires was categorized from one to five (1-5) strongly agree to disagree strongly. The first part of the questionnaire will ask the level of shared responsibility with regards to stakeholders as to financial support and services, school personnel as to open communication, expectation and decision making, parents as to manpower, and alumni as to commitment and achievements. The second part of the questionnaire will ask school performance indicators of the respective schools in the District of Santa Cruz. The instrument was validated by Mrs. Analiza T. Madelar, Mrs. Riza P. Ayala, Mrs. Marizel Esperanza and Mrs. Maricel Chan, Master Teachers of Santa Cruz, District. The researcher also utilized the Likert Scale for the questionnaires as follows:

Scale	Verbal Interpretation
5	Very High
4	High
3	Average
2	Low
1	Very Low

Statistical Treatment of Data

Statistical treatment of data of the present study is shown in the table below.

Statement of the Problem	Statistical Tool
1. To determine the level of shared responsibilities	Mean and Standard Deviation
2. To determine the level of School Performance	Average Percentage based on the given data by the schools
3. To ascertain whether there is a significant effect between the shared responsibility of the Stakeholders and school performance	Regression Analysis
4. To ascertain whether there is a significant effect between the shared responsibility of the School Personnel and school performance	Regression Analysis
5. To ascertain whether there is a significant effect between the shared responsibility of parents and school performance	Regression Analysis
6. To ascertain whether there is a significant effect between the shared responsibility of alumni and school performance	Regression Analysis

Results and Discussion

Level of Shared Responsibility

In this study, the level of shared responsibility of school community includes stakeholders as to financial support and services. School personnel as to open communication, expectation and decision making, parents as to manpower and alumni as to commitment and achievements and was determined by mean and standard deviation.

Table 1. Level of Shared Responsibilities with regard to Stakeholders as to Financial Support

Statements The financial support.	Mean	Standard Deviation	Remarks
1. is evident.	4.70	0.58	Strongly Agree
2. is important in school needs.	4.75	0.53	Strongly Agree
3. can help in improving the school.	4.71	0.55	Strongly Agree
4. is appropriately utilized for the school's needs.	4.75	0.52	Strongly Agree
5. is appropriately managed for the school's needs.	4.76	0.53	Strongly Agree

Overall Mean = 4.73
Standard Deviation= 0.54
Verbal Interpretation= Very High

Table 1 shows the level of shared responsibility of the school community with regard to stakeholders as to financial support. The respondents *strongly agree* that the financial support of the stakeholders was appropriately managed for the school's needs (M= 4.76, SD= 0.53). They *strongly agree* that the financial support given by the stakeholder is important to provide for the school's needs (M= 4.75, SD= 0.53). On the other hand, the financial support is evident (M= 4.70, SD= 0.58)

The overall mean of 4.73 indicates that the level of stakeholders'' financial support is *very high*. This means that stakeholders shared responsibility in school helped to improve schools for children's education and concern.

As cited in Lee et. al (2017) As they go into greater detail below, financial stakeholders are becoming more and more interested in being involved in the strategic planning processes of businesses as they are subject to rising scrutiny and pressure about the social benefits of their actions. Freeman, et.al (2017) Stakeholders engagement describes all practices an organization undertakes to identify relevant stakeholders and manage their needs, establish different interaction approaches and create learning processes from and with stakeholders through education and training.

Table 2. Level of Shared Responsibilities with regard to Stakeholders as to Services

Statements	Mean	Standard Deviation	Remarks
The Services…			
1. is evident.	4.82	0.48	Strongly Agree
2. is essential in school needs.	4.69	0.55	Strongly Agree
3. can help in improving the school.	4.70	0.54	Strongly Agree
4. is ensured through the collaboration and effort of the school and stakeholders.	4.76	0.51	Strongly Agree
5. is consistent.	4.82	0.49	Strongly Agree

Overall Mean = 4.76
Standard Deviation= 0.52
Verbal Interpretation= Very High

Table 2 shows the level of shared responsibility of the school community with regard to stakeholders as to services. Respondents *strongly agree* that the services of the stakeholders were evident (M= 4.82, SD= 0.49). They *strongly agree* that the services were ensured through the collaboration and effort of the school and stakeholders (M= 4.76, SD= 0.51). On the other hand, the services were essential in the school needs (M= 4.69, SD= 0.55).

The overall mean of 4.76 indicates that the level of stakeholders' services is *very high*. This means that the services offered by the stakeholders were relevant in improving the school.

Based on the research of Shah (2019), institutions can improve the quality of service they offer if they listen to and incorporate feedback given by stakeholders. According to Gbadamosi et. al (2019), service quality in higher education is determined by the extent to which stakeholders' needs and expectations are satisfied.

Table 3. Level of Shared Responsibilities with regard to School Personnel as to Open Communication

Statements	Mean	Standard Deviation	Remarks
The open communication….			
1. is evident.	4.81	0.49	Strongly Agree
2. is important in the school's performance.	4.75	0.48	Strongly Agree
3. can help in improving the school's performance.	4.73	0.49	Strongly Agree
4. is effective.	4.77	0.47	Strongly Agree
5. is consistent.	4.79	0.50	Strongly Agree

Overall Mean = 4.77
Standard Deviation= 0.48
Verbal Interpretation= Very High

Table 3 shows the level of shared responsibility of the school community with regard to school personnel as to open communication. Respondents *strongly agree* that open communication with school personnel was evident (M= 4.81, SD= 0.49). They *strongly agree* that open communication was consistent (M= 4.79, SD= 0.50). On the other hand, open communication can help in improving a school's performance. (M= 4.73, SD= 0.49)

The overall mean of 4.77 indicates that the level of school personnel's open communication is *very high*. This means that open communication of the school personnel encourages stakeholders to increase engagement and participation levels in achieving a good performance.

To support the result of the study Safir (2017) states that honest conversations between administrators and staff are the prerequisite for growth. Growth occurs through reflection, and effective communication can reveal diversions from the goal in a teacher's practice. And also, (Llopis, 2017) states that in-person communication is more transparent because people can read indirect communication, and this leads to fewer misunderstandings.

Table 4. Level of Shared Responsibilities with regard to School Personnel as to Expectation

Statements	Mean	Standard Deviation	Remarks
The Expectation….			
1. is high.	4.81	0.48	Strongly Agree

2. is attainable.	4.76	0.51	Strongly Agree
3. helps increase the school's performance.	4.79	0.50	Strongly Agree
4. is aligned with the goals or objectives of the school.	4.80	0.49	Strongly Agree
5. ensures the development of the school plan.	4.81	0.48	Strongly Agree

Overall Mean = 4.80
Standard Deviation= 0.49
Verbal Interpretation= Very High

Table 3 shows the level of shared responsibility of the school community with regard to school personnel as to expectations. Respondents *strongly agree* that expectation with school personnel was high and ensured the development of the school plan (M= 4.81, SD= 0.48). They *strongly agree* that expectations were aligned with the goals and objectives of the school (M= 4.80, SD= 0.49). On the other hand, expectations were attainable based on the increasing school's performance. (M= 4.76, SD= 0.51)

The overall mean of 4.80 indicates that the level of school personnel's expectations is *very high*. This implies that expectations encourage the school community to work hard to achieve certain goals such as high school performance.

As stated by Semke, et. al (2017), what we learn about expectations, from family and community, can help develop a deeper understanding of what students need to be successful members of rural communities. Family and community understanding of education shape how students succeed in school. Supported by (Delavande, 2017) Setting expectations is a common human practice which affects many domains, such as education, economics, health, income, etc.

Table 5. Level of Shared Responsibilities with regard to School Personnel as to Decision Making

Statements	Mean	Standard Deviation	Remarks
The decision making…			
1. is coherent.	4.77	0.54	Strongly Agree
2. is clear.	4.78	0.52	Strongly Agree
3. is aligned with the needs of the school for the improvement of its performance.	4.78	0.50	Strongly Agree
4. is made with the influence of the school personnel.	4.77	0.51	Strongly Agree
5. is created with all available information specifically the pros and cons of the plan and project.	4.78	0.53	Strongly Agree

Overall Mean = 4.78
Standard Deviation= 0.52
Verbal Interpretation= Very High

Table 5 shows the level of shared responsibility of the school community with regard to school personnel as to decision-making. Respondents *strongly agree* that decision-making with school personnel was created with all available information specifically the pros and cons of the plan and projects (M= 4.78, SD= 0.53). They *strongly agree* that decision-making was aligned with the needs of the school for the improvement of its performance (M= 4.78, SD= 0.50). On the other hand, decision-making was made with the influence of the school personnel (M= 4.77, SD= 0.51)

The overall mean of 4.78 indicates that the level of school personnel's decision-making is *very high*. This indicates that decision-making can affect individual and school actions toward school performance.

According to Xia et al. (2019) investigated the nature of decision making was shown to be tightly coupled in areas such as performance standards, curriculum, and professional development, a loose coupling was identified in the area of budget and financial oversight. In addition to that, identified that while budget remains a central facet of the school operational decision-making process, loose coupling has allowed much of the financial decision making to be shifted to the principal level in the sample population. Supported by (Klocko et al, 2019), a critical aspect of a superintendent's role is to exhibit flexibility in decision making based upon current contexts, such as dwindling financial resources.

Table 6. Level of Shared Responsibilities with regard to Parents as to Manpower

Statements	Mean	Standard Deviation	Remarks
The manpower….			
1. is evident.	4.77	0.54	Strongly Agree

2.	is essential in school needs.	4.72	0.56	Strongly Agree
3.	can help in improving the school's performance.	4.75	0.54	Strongly Agree
4.	is ensured through the collaboration and effort of the school and school community.	4.73	0.54	Strongly Agree
5.	is consistent.	4.78	0.52	Strongly Agree

Overall Mean = 4.75
Standard Deviation= 0.54
Verbal Interpretation= Very High

Table 6 shows the level of shared responsibility of the school community with regard to parents as to manpower. Respondents strongly agree that manpower with school personnel was consistent (M= 4.78, SD= 0.52). They strongly agree that manpower was evident (M= 4.77, SD= 0.54). On the other hand, manpower was essential in school needs (M= 4.72, SD= 0.56)

The overall mean of 4.75 indicates that the level of parents' manpower is *very high*. These results imply that manpower is relevant in attaining certain goals and objectives of the school.

According to Nirav (2015) school organization has a large component of manpower resources. The school is an organization composed of people of Manpower planning process seeks to ensure that the people with right fit in the required number are placed at the right time in the organization. Stated by

Ashwini (2018), manpower planning is a very important tool and technique of human resource management. It basically aims at maintaining and improving the ability of an organization to attain the goals of an organization by developing and utilizing properly its human resources.

Table 7. Level of Shared Responsibilities with Regard to Alumni as to Commitment

Statements	Mean	Standard	Remarks
The Commitment**….**		**Deviation**	
1. is evident.	4.79	0.50	Strongly Agree
2. is essential in school needs.	4.74	0.52	Strongly Agree
3. is built between school and community.	4.77	0.51	Strongly Agree
4. is classified according to school needs.	4.75	0.52	Strongly Agree
5. It takes a significant amount of time to develop and improve the school's goals.	4.79	0.50	Strongly Agree

Overall Mean = 4.77
Standard Deviation= 0.51
Verbal Interpretation= Very High

Table 7 shows the level of shared responsibility of the school community with regards to alumni as to commitment. Respondents strongly agree that commitment with alumni was evident (M= 4.79, SD= 0.50). They strongly agree that it takes a significant amount of time to develop and improve the school's goals. (M= 4.79, SD= 0.50). On the other hand, commitment is essential in school needs (M= 4.74, SD= 0.52)

The overall mean of 4.77 indicates that the level of alumni's commitment is *very high*. This indicates that the commitment of alumni plays a valuable role in building and helping the school.

As cited by Womac (2018), commitment has been associated with intent to remain within a profession or organization, suggesting that commitment is an important component of career retention. Commitment to one's academic major may also provide information about university retention. Supported by Semke, et al (2017) that the importance of commitment to the development of the school plan is also covered.

Table 8. Level of Shared Responsibilities with Regard to Alumni as to Achievements

	Statements	Mean	Standard	Remarks
	The Achievements		**Deviation**	
1.	shown the efforts of the alumni.	4.77	0.51	Strongly Agree
2.	indicates the importance of the alumni.	4.74	0.55	Strongly Agree
3.	reveal the strong sense of persistence and the performance of the alumni.	4.78	0.52	Strongly Agree
4.	express the solidarity of the alumni and school.	4.79	0.51	Strongly Agree

5. reveal the success of the alumni of the school.	4.81	0.50	Strongly Agree

Overall Mean = 4.78
Standard Deviation= 0.52
Verbal Interpretation= Very High

Table 8 shows the level of shared responsibility of the school community with regards to alumni as to achievements. Respondents strongly agree that achievements reveal the success of the alumni of the school (M= 4.81, SD= 0.50). They strongly agree that achievement expresses the solidarity of the alumni and school (M= 4.79, SD= 0.51). On the other hand, achievements indicate the importance of the alumni (M= 4.74, SD= 0.55)

The overall mean of 4.78 indicates that the level of alumni achievement is *very high*. This implies that the alumni's achievement is powerful in revealing their accomplishments in their respective schools and they play a vital role in achieving the goals and objectives of the schools.

Amayki (2017) stated that stakeholders have expectations of schools that go beyond the schools meeting just the minimum acceptable standards. The schools should provide education that will shape the character of the students to become good citizens and at the same time equip them with the requisite knowledge to contribute to the economic growth and development of the nation. They are also used to convince stakeholders, especially parents or guardians, that schools are efficient and up to the task. In addition to tests scores being used to judge performance of schools, they also are used to make important decisions about students, for example, for classification, retention, and promotion (Moses et. al., 2017).

School Performance

In this study, School performance includes cohort survival, promotion, retention, repetition, completion, graduation, and the transition was determined by mean and standard deviation.

Table 9. School Performance in terms of Cohort Survival

SCHOOLS	Cohort Survival			Average per School
	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	
School A	95%	93%	93%	94%
School B	101.91%	123.50%	105.87%	110%
School C	86.91%	92.92%	92.72%	91%
Average per SY	94.61%	103.14%	97.20%	

Average Percentage = 98.31%

Table 9 shows the school's performance in terms of cohort survival for three consecutive school years. The percentage of a cohort of students who are enrolled in the first grade of the education cycle in a given school year. Among the three schools, school B attained more than the target gaining 110%, followed by school A gaining 94% and school C. The average percentage of 98.31% for the three-school year means that schools perform *better in* terms of cohort survival. This implies that the cohort survival rate of the three schools holds power and efficiency. It indicates that they have low dropout and high retention.

According to PSA, Cohort Survival the percentage of enrollees at the beginning grade or year in a given school year who reached the final grade or year of the elementary/secondary level. In addition to that, ACPS (2019) the cohort survival rate is the ratio of the number of students enrolling in a grade this year to the number of students that were in the earlier grade the previous year. For example, the 2013 cohort survival rate for kindergarten to first grade is the number of 2013 first grade students divided by the number of kindergarten students in 2012. The number is commonly expressed as a percentage.

Table 10. School Performance in terms of Promotion

SCHOOLS	Promotion			Average per School
	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	
School A	100%	100%	100%	100%
School B	100%	100%	100%	100%
School C	94.44%	100%	100%	98%
Average per SY	98.15%	100.00%	100.00%	

Average Percentage= 99.38%

Table   10 shows the school's performance in terms of promotion for three consecutive school years. The percentage of the students who are promoted to the next grade/year level. Among the three schools, schools A and B attained more than the

target gaining 100%, followed by 98 % of school C. The average percentage of 99.38% for the three-school year means that schools perform *better in* terms of promotion. This implies that the promotion rate of the three schools holds power and efficiency. It indicates that they have low dropout and high retention. This indicates that the school's initiatives were successful and that the students' learning environment was favorable.

The study's findings are supported by (Leibur, et. al, 2021) Teacher professional qualification is very essential in education of learners. This improves teachers' professionalism which is a necessity in class delivery which enhances learners' promotion rates to the next class. Hence, learners' promotion rates are aspects of internal efficiency in learning institutions. Supported by Alharbi (2018) promotion rates is an aspect of the internal efficiency of education, which shows the percentage at which the ECE children's cohort is transited to grade one in public primary schools. This is likely to affect the education of many children, which makes school administration be confronted with problem of finding out ways and to what degree promotion rates affect children and the schools.

Table 11. School Performance in terms of Retention

SCHOOLS	Retention			Average per School
	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	
School A	94%	102%	98%	98%
School B	104%	104.39%	108%	105%
School C	101.65%	99.90%	98.61%	100%
Average per SY	99.88%	102.10%	101.54%	

Average Percentage= 101.17%

Table 11 shows the school's performance in terms of retention rate for three consecutive school years. The percentage of students who re-enroll from one year to the next. Among the three schools, school B attained more than the target gaining 105% followed by 100 % of school C and 98% of school A. The average percentage of 101.17% for the three-school year means that schools perform *better in* terms of retention. Given the high percentage of students who enrolled in a given school year and returned the next year, this indicates that the three schools were performing well.

The results were supported by (Huddleston, 2017) Even if students do in fact receive more developmentally appropriate content after being retained, the experience might be related to social stigmatization and lower expectations, which may have negative effects on student success. (Goos et al., 2021) Recent meta-analytic evidence of rigorous studies indicates that, on average, grade retention is associated with neither an academic benefit nor harm for students.

Table 12. School Performance in terms of Repetition

SCHOOLS	Repetition			Average per School
	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	
School A	1%	0%	0%	0.33%
School B	0%	0%	0%	0%
School C	5.93%	3.26%	0.77%	3.32%
Average per SY	2.31%	1.09%	0.26%	

Average Percentage= 1.22%

Table 12 shows the school's performance in terms of repetition for three consecutive school years. The percentage of students who start in a particular grade level and continue in that grade the following school year. Among the three schools, school B has a low percentage of repletion with 0% followed by 0.33 % of school A and 3.32% of school C. The average percentage of 1.22% for the three-school year means that schools repetition rates were low meaning the schools perform *better* since they have low proportion of repeaters. The low percentage of students who did not repeat a grade indicates that the schools' intervention programs were efficient and that they place a significant emphasis on every student's educational growth.

Crouch et.al (2017) suggest that the inflation in early primary grades may be related to issues around provision of pre-primary education or early childhood development and education. In addition to that, Brunette et. al (2017) the findings suggest that expanding access to pre-primary education may reduce early primary repetition and improve the efficiency of the basic education cycle overall.

Table 13. Performance in terms of Completion

SCHOOLS	Completion			Average per School
	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	
School A	93%	93%	93%	93%

School B	114%	115.18%	118.17%	116%
School C	85.09%	92.92%	100%	93%
Average per SY	97.36%	100.37%	103.72%	

Average Percentage= 100.48%

Table 13 shows the school's performance in terms of completion for three consecutive school years. The percentage of students who enter an educational institution in the first grade or year who finish the level in the specified number of years of study. Among the three schools, school B attained more than the target gaining 116%, followed by school A and C gaining 93%. The average percentage of 100.48% for the three-school year means that schools perform *better in* terms of completion. This indicates that the success of a particular project or activity inside a school is defined by its completion rate. The school interventions were effective enough to help students finish their level of education.

Foreman-Murray, S., et. al (2022) evidence from the literature indicates a significant positive relation between school-engagement and completion of high school and mixed indications for the connection between restrictive educational placement and school completion. Strom et. al., (2017), teachers are resources for students, in that they have the ability to encourage student achievement. obtained similar results in that parental expectations were linked to student achievement along with parental participation in school activities, parent-teacher conferences, and helping the student with homework.

Table 14. School Performance in terms of Graduation

SCHOOLS	Graduation			Average per School
	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	
School A	100%	100%	100%	100%
School B	100%	100%	100%	100%
School C	97.91%	100%	100%	99%
Average per SY	99.30%	100.00%	100.00%	

Average Percentage= 99.77%

Table 14 shows the school's performance in terms of graduation for three consecutive school years. The percentage of students who advance to the following grade or year. Among the three schools, schools A and B attained 100%, followed by school C gaining 99%. The average percentage of 99.77% for the three-school year means that schools perform *better in* terms of graduation. This implies that the school's programs were efficient as well as the learning environment for the students was encouraging.

The results of the study were supported by Jimmerson, 2022, although other risk factors play a role in student dropouts, grade retention was one of the strongest predictors. Foreman-Murray, S., et. al (2022) evidence from the literature indicates a significant positive relation between school-engagement and completion of high school and mixed indications for the connection between restrictive educational placement and school completion.

Table 15. Level of School Performance in terms of Transition

SCHOOLS	Transition			Average per School
	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	
School A	106%	100%	100%	102%
School B	90.27%	127.43%	104.82%	108%
School C	109.86%	103.68%	100%	105%
Average per SY	102.04%	110.37%	101.61%	

Average Percentage= 104.67%

Table 15 shows the school's performance in terms of transition for three consecutive school years. The percentage of students who move to the next high level of education. Among the three schools, school B attained more than the target gaining 108%, followed by school C gaining 105% and school C gaining 102%. The average percentage of 104.67% for the three-school year means that schools perform *better in* terms of transition. This indicates that schools assess students' readiness to advance to the next higher level of education and make efforts towards that goal.

Mechthild R. et. al. (2022) positive experiences and unique views on the transition and the first year of secondary school could contribute to a more optimistic and inclusive transition planning. This model emphasizes that effective transition programs

will involve families as well as children and foster strong family–school–community partnerships (Caspe et al., 2018), with the potential to create strong relationships that continue to grow and develop as the child progresses through school.

Table 16. Summary of the table for the School Performance

School	Cohort Survival (%POI)			Promotion (%POI)			Retention (%POI)			Repetition (%POI)		
	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022
A	0.32	0.31	0.31	0.33	0.33	0.33	0.31	0.34	0.33	0	0	0
B	0.34	0.41	0.35	0.33	0.33	0.33	0.35	0.35	0.36	0	0	0
C	0.29	0.31	0.31	0.31	0.33	0.33	0.34	0.33	0.33	0.02	0.01	0

School	Completion (%POI)			Graduation (%POI)			Transition (%POI)			Results	Categories
	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022		
A	0.31	0.31	0.31	0.33	0.33	0.33	0.35	0.33	0.33	**1.96**	Better
B	0.38	0.38	0.39	0.33	0.33	0.33	0.3	0.42	0.35	**2.03**	Better
C	0.28	0.31	0.33	0.33	0.33	0.33	0.37	0.35	0.33	**1.94**	Better

Legend:

Categories	*Interval Scores*
Good	*0.50-1.49*
Better	*1.50-2.49*
Best	*2.50-3.00*

Result from table 16 revealed the summary of school performance in terms of cohort survival, promotion, retention, repetition, completion, graduation, and transition. *Better* performances of the school were observed given the data in each category. School B attain the score of 2.03, followed by school A with the score of 1.96, and school C with the score of 1.94. This conclude that school perform better with the helped of stakeholders, school personnel parents and alumni. The collaborative effort of the group result to improve the school goal.

The result is supported by National Academy (2019) Indicators is very important. It reflects the contribution of a given school (school s) to growth in student achievement after controlling for all student-level factors, pretest and student characteristics. Equivalently, it captures all of the achievement. As defined, the total performance indicator gives an unambiguous ranking of schools, but the exact range and magnitude of the indicator are somewhat arbitrary.

Table 17. Significant Effect of Shared Responsibilities of the Stakeholders to the School's Performance

School Performance	Shared Responsibilities- Stakeholders					
	Financial Support			Services		
	t-value	p-value	Analysis	t-value	p-value	Analysis
Cohort survival	-12.586	0.049	Significant	12.679	0.004	Significant
Promotion	0.866	0.546	Not Significant	32.764	0.016	Significant
Retention	4.704	0.133	Not Significant	12.478	0.035	Significant
Repetition	-1.848	0.316	Not Significant	5.718	0.011	Significant
Completion	11.564	0.037	Significant	7.198	0.021	Significant
Graduation	1.732	0.333	Not Significant	16.198	0.028	Significant
Transition	-1.305	0.416	Not Significant	14.198	0.008	Significant

As shown in Table 17, the shared responsibilities of stakeholders in terms of financial support has a significant effect in school performance in terms of cohort survival with (t-value= -12.586, p-value= 0.049) and completion with (t-value= 11.564, p-value= 0.037). The p value is less that the alpha value of 0.05. While no significant effect in promotion (t-value= 0.822, p-value= 0.866), retention (t-value= 4.704, p-value= 0.133), repetition (t-value= -1.848, p-value= 0.316). graduation (t-value= 1.732, p-value= 0.333), transition (t-value= -1.305, p-value= 0.416). The p value is greater than the alpha value of 0.05.

Shared responsibility of stakeholder in terms of services has significant effect in school performance in terms of cohort with (t-value= 12.679, p= 0.004) promotion (t-value= 32.764, p-value= 0.016), retention (t-value= 12.478, p-value= 0.035), repetition (t-value= 5.718, p-value= 0.011), completion (t-value= 7.198, p-value= 0.021), graduation (t-value= 16.198, p-value= 0.028), transition (t-value= 14.198, p-value= 0.008), All p value is less than the alpha value of 0.05. This means that the services of the stakeholder helped to improve the school performance and meet the goal and objectives.

It is supported by Bronn, et. al. (2019) argue that mental models, which are individual or shared views of how things work, distinguish stakeholders from one another. As stated also by Freeman, et.al (2017) Stakeholder engagement describes all practices an organization undertakes to identify relevant stakeholders and manage their needs, establish different interaction approaches and create learning processes from and with stakeholders through education and training.

Table 18. Significant Effect of Shared Responsibilities of the School Personnel to the School's Performance

School Performance	Shared Responsibilities- School Personnel								
	Open Communication			Expectation			Decision Making		
	t-value	p-value	Analysis	t-value	p-value	Analysis	t-value	p-value	Analysis
Cohort	-2.809	0.218	Not Significant	-19.406	0.033	Significant	0.941	0.519	Not Significant
Promotion	0.51	0.700	Not Significant	-0.799	0.571	Not Significant	8.89	0.037	Significant
Retention	6.007	0.005	Significant	-5.959	0.106	Not Significant	18.914	0.021	Significant
Repetition	-9.938	0.020	Significant	1.555	0.364	Not Significant	-12.258	0.026	Significant
Completion	14.027	0.042	Significant	-1.716	0.336	Not Significant	0.632	0.641	Not Significant
Graduation	13.618	0.032	Significant	-2.149	0.277	Not Significant	11.892	0.030	Significant
Transition	-2.682	0.227	Not Significant	2.621	0.232	Not Significant	4.452	0.027	Significant

As shown in Table 18, the shared responsibilities of school personnel in terms of open communication has a significant effect in school performance in terms of retention with (t- value= 6.007, p-value= 0.005), repetition with (t-value= -9.938, p-value= 0.020), completion with (t-value= 14.27, p-value= 0.042) and graduation with (t-value= 13.618, p-value= 0.032). The p value is less that the alpha value of 0.05. While no significant effect in cohort survival (t-value= -2.809, p-value= 0.218), promotion (t-value= 0.51, p-value= 0.700), and transition (t-value= -2.682, p-value= 0.227). The p value is greater than the alpha value of 0.05.

Shared responsibility of school personnel in terms of expectation has significant effect in school performance in terms of cohort survival with (t-value= -19.406, p-value= 0.033). The p value is less than the alpha value of 0.05. While no significant effect in promotion (t-value= -0.799, p-value=0.571), retention (t-value= -5.959, p-value= 0.571), repetition (t-value= 1.555, p-value= 0.364), completion (t-value= -1.716, p-value= 0.277), graduation (t-value= -2.149, p-value= 0.277), and transition (t-value= 2.621, p-value= 0.232). The p value is greater than the alpha value of 0.05.

Shared responsibility of school personnel in terms of decision making has significant effect in school performance in terms of promotion with (t-value= 8.89, p-value= 0.037), retention with (t-value= 18.914, p-value= 0.021), repetition with (t-value= 12.258, p-value= 0.026), graduation with (t-value= 11.892, p-value= 0.30), and transition with (t-value= 4.452, p-value= 0.027). The p value is less than the alpha value of 0.05. While no significant effect in cohort survival with (t-value= 0.941, p-value= 0.519), and completion with (t-value= 0.632, p-value= 0.641). The p value is greater than the alpha value of 0.05. This means that the services of the stakeholder helped to improve the school performance and meet the goal and objectives.

The results is supported by Jaakson (2018) conducted work along a similar vein, looking at how stakeholder engagement differs by stakeholder type, by exploring the role stakeholders play in formulating organizational value statements. And according to Desai (2018) Stakeholder collaboration typically refers to joint activities with external stakeholders, and it can be depicted as a means for organizations to pursue goals that would otherwise be difficult to achieve internally.

Table 19. Significant Effect of Shared Responsibilities of the Parents to the School's Performance

School Performance	Shared Responsibilities- Parents		
	Manpower		
	t-value	p-value	Analysis
Cohort	51.884	0.012	Significant
Promotion	0.117	0.926	Not Significant
Retention	8.208	0.019	Significant
Repetition	-0.362	0.779	Not Significant
Completion	8.958	0.014	Significant

| Graduation | 15.82 | 0.003 | Significant |
| Transition | 12.151 | 0.027 | Significant |

As shown in Table 19, the shared responsibilities of parents in terms of manpower has a significant effect in school performance in terms of cohort survival with (t-value= 51.884, p-value= 0.012), retention with (t-value= 8.208, p-value= 0.019), completion with (t-value= 8.958, p-value= 0.014), graduation with (t-value= 15.82, p-value= 0.003), and transition with (t-value= 12.151, p-value= 0.027). The p value is less that the alpha value of 0.05. While no significant effect in promotion (t-value= 0.117, p-value=0.926), and repetition (t-value= -0.362, p-value= 0.779). The p value is greater than the alpha value of 0.05.

As stated also by Freeman, et.al (2017) Stakeholder engagement describes all practices an organization undertakes to identify relevant stakeholders and manage their needs, establish different interaction approaches and create learning processes from and with stakeholders through education and training. In addition to that, Ashwini (2018), stated that manpower entails consideration of several steps with relevant input before the estimation of manpower requirements can be arrived at and involves, the identification of the source of supply to meet the requirements, taking into consideration various constraints. Manpower planning process seeks to ensure that the people with right fit in the required number are placed at the right time in the organization.

Table 20. Significant Effect of Shared Responsibilities of the Alumni to the School's Performance

School Performance	Shared Responsibilities- Alumni					
	Commitment			Achievements		
	t-value	p-value	Analysis	t-value	p-value	Analysis
Cohort	-1.039	0.488	Not Significant	12.053	0.043	Significant
Promotion	7.289	0.021	Significant	0.887	0.538	Not Significant
Retention	-9.457	0.026	Significant	7.718	0.01	Significant
Repetition	-13.457	0.027	Significant	-12.271	0.024	Significant
Completion	42.564	0.003	Significant	2.145	0.278	Not Significant
Graduation	8.577	0.007	Significant	2.494	0.243	Not Significant
Transition	0.577	0.667	Not Significant	-8.743	0.032	Significant

As shown in Table 20, the shared responsibilities of alumni in terms of commitment has a significant effect in school performance in terms of promotion with (t- value= 7.289, p-value= 0.021), retention with (t-value= -9.457, p-value=0.026), repetition with (t-value= -13.457, p-value= 0.027), completion with (t-value= 42.564, p-value= 0.003) and graduation with (t-value= 8.577, p-value= 0.007). The p value is less that the alpha value of 0.05. While no significant effect in cohort survival (t-value= -1.039, p-value=0.488), and transition (t-value= 0.577, p-value= 0.667). The p value is greater than the alpha value of 0.05.

Shared responsibility of school personnel in terms of achievements has significant effect in school performance in terms of cohort survival with (t-value= 12.053, p-value= 0.043), retention with (t-value= 7.718, p-value= 0.01), repetition with (t-value= -12.271, p-value= 0.024), and transition with (t-value= -8.743, p-value= 0.032). The p value is less than the alpha value of 0.05. While no significant effect in promotion with (t-value= 0.887, p-value=0.538), completion with (t-value= 2.145, p-value=0.278), and transition with (t-value= -8.743, p-value=0.032). The p value is greater than the alpha value of 0.05.

According to Desai (2018) Stakeholder collaboration can also embrace how stakeholders come together to identify and develop solutions to wicked issues. Stakeholder inclusion often refers to the presence of stakeholders in organizational activities, such as decision-making, to include stakeholders' perspectives and knowledge in improving value creation. Supported by Semke, et al (2017) that the importance of commitment to the development of the school plan is also covered.

Summary of Findings

The study was conducted to determine the effect of shared responsibility of school community towards performance in the District of Santa Cruz.

Specifically, this research sought to provide relevant information based on the following research questions (1) What is the level of shared responsibilities with regards to (1.1) Stakeholders as to (1.1.1) Financial Support (1.1.2) Services, (1.2) School Personnel as to (1.2.1) Open Communication, (1.2.2) Expectation, (1.2.3) Decision Making, (1.3) Parents as to (1.3.1) Manpower, (1.4) Alumni, (1.4.1) Commitment, (1.4.2) and Achievement, (2) What is the level of School Performance in terms of (2.1) Cohort Survival, (2.2) Promotion, (2.3) Retention, (2.4) Repetition, (2.5) Completion, (2.6) Graduation, and (2.7) Transition, (3) Do the Shared Responsibilities of the Stakeholders have significant effect to the School Performance? (4) Do the Shared Responsibilities of the School Personnel have significant effect to the School Performance? (5) Do the Shared Responsibilities of the Parents have significant effect to the School Performance? (6) Do the Shared Responsibilities of the Alumni have significant effect to the School Performance?

The descriptive design was utilized to analyze the data systematically. A survey and a research-made questionnaire in the form of a 5-point Likert scale were used. Mean and standard deviation were used for the descriptive questions, while the Two-Sample T-test was used for the inferential questions.

The salient points of the study presented found that the level of shared responsibilities with regards to stakeholders as to financial support and services, school personnel as to open communication, expectation and decision making, parents as to manpower, and alumni as to commitment and achievements were very high respectively. This means that the shared responsibilities of the school community are efficient and evident.

School Performance based on the given data of the three schools in terms of cohort survival, promotion, retention, repetition, completion, graduation and transition, the schools perform better in the three consecutive years. This conclude that the helped of stakeholders, school personnel parents and alumni are relevant. The collaborative effort of the group result to improve the school goal.

The shared responsibilities of stakeholders in terms of financial support has a significant effect in school performance in terms of cohort survival and completion. Since the p value is less that the alpha value of 0.05. While no significant effect in promotion, retention, repetition, graduation, and transition. Since the p value is greater than the alpha value of 0.05. The shared responsibility of stakeholder in terms of services has significant effect in school performance in terms of cohort, promotion, retention, repetition, completion, graduation, and transition since p value is less than the alpha value of 0.05. This means that the services of the stakeholder helped to improve the school performance and meet the goal and objectives.

The shared responsibilities of school personnel in terms of open communication has a significant effect in school performance in terms of retention, repetition, completion and graduation. While no significant effect in cohort survival, promotion, and transition. Shared responsibility of school personnel in terms of expectation has significant effect in school performance in terms of cohort survival. While no significant effect in promotion, retention, repetition, completion, graduation, and transition. Shared responsibility of school personnel in terms of decision making has significant effect in school performance in terms of promotion, retention, repetition, graduation, and transition. While no significant effect in cohort survival, and completion. This means that the services of the stakeholder helped to improve the school performance and meet the goal and objectives.

The shared responsibilities of parents in terms of manpower has a significant effect in school performance in terms of cohort survival, retention, completion, graduation, and transition. While no significant effect in promotion, and repetition.

The shared responsibilities of alumni in terms of commitment has a significant effect in school performance in terms of promotion, retention, repetition, completion and graduation. While no significant effect in cohort survival, and transition. Shared responsibility of school personnel in terms of achievements has significant effect in school performance in terms of cohort survival, retention, repetition, and transition. While no significant effect in promotion, completion, and transition.

Conclusion

In accordance with the findings, the conclusions were made:

The respondents evaluated the research anchored through the data that shows the respondents strongly agree which means very high with all the statement provided that illustrates its positive impact on them. The research also reveals significant effect between school community and school performance across all indicators under each parameter.

Therefore, the hypothesis is partially rejected, stating that there is significant effect in the level of shared responsibilities of the stakeholders in terms of financial support and services. The hypothesis is also partially rejected, stating that there is significant effect in the level of shared responsibilities of the school personnel in terms of open communication, expectation and decision making. The shared responsibilities of the parents in terms of manpower shows significant effect as evaluated by respondents. And lastly, the shared responsibilities of the alumni in terms of commitment and achievements shows significant effect as well.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusion of the study, the following recommendations are hereby endorsed.
1. The school community may continue to support those schools to help them perform at their highest levels.
2.. Schools may keep on organizing community forums to encourage the school community about the significant relationship between school performance and the future of the learners.
3. To accomplish the highest level of school performance, school personnel may continue to have open communication, goal-oriented decisions, and better services.
4. Parents and alumni may continue to provide resources, commitment, and support for more projects and achievement that seek to enhance school performance and the academic achievement of learners.

5. In order to continue working toward achieving the highest performance level possible for the school, future researchers may conduct a study about school performance and shared responsibilities.

References

Acton, K.S. (2021). School leaders as change agents: Do principals have the tools they need? Management in Education, 35(1), 43–51. https://doi.org/10.1177/0892020620927415

Ahmad, A. R. & Marinah, A. (2017). Learning organization and organizational commitment in primary school. International Proceedings of Economics Development and Research, 60, 55-59.

Alharbi, H. M. (2018). Internal and External Efficiency of the Saudi Educational System. International Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 5(8).

Alvesson, M., & Sandberg, J. (2020). The problematizing review: A counterpoint to Elsbach and Van Knippenberg's argument for integrative reviews. Journal of Management Studies, 57, 1290–1304

Amakyi M. (2017) COMMUNICATING ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT OF SCHOOLS TO STAKEHOLDERS: THE USE OF WEIGHTED AVERAGE Institute for Educational Planning and Administration, University of Cape Coast, Cape Coast, Ghana.

Ashwini D. (2018) Manpower Planning. Retrieved from: https://www.economics discussion.net/human-resourcemanagement/manpowerplanning/32 257

Băbuț, T. (2021). Brainstorming And Modern Teaching Strategies In Preschool Education. 1 Volume 14, Number 1, 2021 – DOI: 10.24193/adn.14.1.17

Bandy, J. (2017). Challenges and Opportunities of Community Engaged Teaching. Vanderbilt University Center for Teaching. Retrieved [October 22, 2022] from https://cft.vanderbilt.edu/guides-sub-pages/challenges-and-opportunities-of-community-engaged-teaching/.

Bernhardt, V., & Hebert, C. (2017). Response to intervention and continuous school improvement: Using data, vision, and leadership to design, implement, and evaluate a schoolwide prevention system. New York: Routledge.

Bettez, S. (2020) Creating Community Commitments in the Higher Education ClassroomAbout Campus, v25 n1 p14-18 Mar-Apr 2020. Retrieved from:https://eric.ed.gov/?q=commitment+of+community+in+school&id=EJ1253370

Bronn, et.al. (2019). A reflective stakeholder approach: Co-orientation as a basis for communication and learning. Journal of Communication Management, 7, 291-303.

Brunette T., at. al (2017). Repetition of Primary 1 and Pre-primary Education in Uganda. RTI International. Retrieved from: https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED582363.pdf

Čadil, J., Petkovová, L., & Blatná, D. (2017). Human Capital, Economic Structure and Growth.Procedia Economics and Finance, 12, 85–92. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671(14)00323-2

Carvalho, M., Cabral, I., Verdasca, J., & Alves, J. (2021b). What about us? Teachers' participation in schools' strategic action plans. Participatory Educational Research, 8(3), 156–175. https://doi.org/10.17275/ per. 21.59.8.3

Caspe, et. al. (2018). Four important things to know about the transition to school. Family Involvement Network of Educators (FINE) Newsletter, 7(1). https://archive.globalfrp.org/publications-resources/browse-our-publications/four-important-things-research-tells-us-about-the-transition-to-school

CCS¬- Coalition for Community Schools (2020). Financing Community Schools LEVERAGING RESOURCES TO SUPPORT STUDENT SUCCESS. Coalition for Community Schools, Institute for Educational Leadership, Inc. Retrieved from: https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED515222.pdf

Clarke A 2017. The handbook of school management. Cape Town, South Africa: Kate McCallum

Crouch, L et. al. 2017. "Stumbling at the First Step: Efficiency Implications of Poor Performance in the Foundational First Five Years." Prospects, 1–22. Retrieved from https://link.springer.com/journal/11125

Delavande, A. (2017). Probabilistic Expectations in Developing Countries.   Annual Review of Economics, 6(1), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-economics-072413-105148

Desai V. M. (2018). Collaborative stakeholder engagement: An integration between theories of organizational legitimacy and learning. Academy of Management Journal, 61, 220–244.

Dwangu et. al. (2021). Accountability in the Financial Management Practices of School Principals. EJ1317305International Journal of Educational Management, v35 n7 p1504-1524 2021 Retrieved from: https://eric.ed.gov/?q =finaNciaL+IN+SCHOOL&id=

Fernandez, K.E. (2011). Evaluating school improvement plans and their effect on academic performance. Educational Policy, 25(2), 338–367.

Flumerfelt et. al (2017). Continuous Improvement in Schools and Districts: Policy Considerations – ed. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ ED557599.pdf

Foreman-Murray, S. et. al. (2022) A systematic review of the literature related to dropout for students with disabilities, Preventing School Failure: Alternative Education for Children and Youth, 66:3, 228-237, DOI: 10.1080/1045988X.2022.2037494

Freeman   et.al.   (2017).   World   Journal   of   Science   Technology   and   Sustainable Development.https://www.researchgate.net/publication/299406193_A_selected_literature_review_on_the_changing_ro le_of_stakeholders_as_value_creators

Gbadamosi, G. et. al (2019). What you see is what you get: Service quality, students' perceptions and satisfaction at South African universities. South African Journal of Higher Education, 23(5), 877–893. https://doi.org/10.4314/sajhe.v23i5.48806

Glaze, A. (2017). Communication: The essence of leadership. Principal Connections,   18(2),   7-9.   https://www.oct.ca/- /media/PDF/Power_ Of_Communication_EN.pdf

Goos, et. al (2021). Effectiveness of grade retention: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Educational Research Review, 34(November), Article 100401. https://doi. org/10.1016/j.edurev.2021.100401

Huddleston, A. P. (2017). Achievement at whose expense? A literature reviews of test-based grade retention policies in U.S. schools. Education Policy Analysis Archives, 22(18), 1–34. https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v22n18.2014

Jaakson, K. (2018). Engagement of organizational stakeholders in the process of formulating values statements. Atlantic Journal of Communication, 18, 158-176.

Jimerson et. al (2022). Winning the battle and losing the war: Examining the relation between grade retention and dropping out of high school. Psychology in Schools, 39, 441-457. doi:10.1002/pits.10046

Judkins, S. (2019, July 24). Managing challenging conversations. Victoria State Government. Retrieved June 2, 2020, from https://graduateteacherlearningseries.global2.vic.edu.au/2019/07/08/ed7fa2-managingchallenging-conversations/

Klein,   M.   (2022)   The   importance   of   open   communication   in   the   workplace.   Retrieved   from: https://joinblink.com/intelligence/opencommunicationimportance/#:~:text=Open%20communication%20is%20when% 20senior, resolve%20conflicts%2C%20and%20collaborate%20better. March 8, 2022

Klocko, et. al (2019). Leadership tenacity and public-school superintendents. Journal of Leadership Education, 18(1), 1-13. https://doi.org/10.12806/v18/I1/R1

Lee, Jae-Hyuck & Choi, Hae. (2017). Stakeholders' views on reducing financial support in government-led ecotourism areas. Ocean & Coastal Management. 144. 7-15. 10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2017.03.033.

Leibur, et. al (2021). Towards Acquiring Teachers' Professional Qualification Based on Leibur, T., Saks, K., & Chounta, I. A. (2021). Towards Acquiring Teachers' Professional Qualification Based on

Lewis, K. L. (2017). An organizational stakeholder model of change implementation communication. Communication Theory, 17, 176-204.

Lindberg, E. N., Yıldırım, E., Elvan, Ö., Öztürk, D., & Recepoğlu, S. (2019). Parents' Educational Expectations: Does It Matter for Academic Success? SDU International Journal of Educational Studies, 6(2), 150–160. https://doi.org/10.33710/sduijes.596569

Llopis, G. (2012, September 10). Five powerful things happen when a leader is transparent. Forbes. Retrieved June 9, 2020, from https://www.forbes.com/sites/glennllopis/2012/09/10/5-powerful- things-happen-when-a leader-is-transparent/#1bf027804a3a

Mak, B. (2018). Professional Qualifications of Teachers for English for Primary and Secondary Education—A Brief Comparison between Hong Kong and China. Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics, 20(2), 19−29.

Mbugua, F., & Rarieya, J.F.A. (2017). Collaborative strategic planning: Myth or reality? Educational Management Administration and Leadership, 42(1), 99–111. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143213499258

McCombes (2019). Methods of Research: Grolier Publication. USA

Mechthild et. al. (2022) Is transition an (adult) problem? – experiences of autistic students during the transition from primary to secondary school. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-3802.12574

Mestry R 20017. The functions of school governing bodies in managing school finances. South African Journal of Education, 26(1):27–38. Available at http://www.sajournalofeducation.co.za/index.php/saje/article/view/67/63. Accessed 16 March 2019

Meyers, C., & Hitt, D. (2018). Planning for school turnaround in the United States: An analysis of the quality of principal-developed quick wins. School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 29(3), 362–382.

Meyers, C., & VanGronigen, B. (2019). A lack of authentic school improvement plan development: Evidence of principal satisficing behavior. Journal of Educational Administration, 57(3), 261–278. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-09-2018-0154

Miller, H. (2022). The Value of Open Communication in the Workplace Retrieved from: https://leaders.com/articles/company-culture/open-communication/. August 13, 2022

Moses, M.S. et. al, 2017. The testing culture and the persistence of high stakes testing reforms. Education and Culture, 23(1): 55-72.

Musau, L. M., & Abere, M. J. (2018). Teacher Qualification and Students' Academic Performance in Science Mathematics and Technology Subjects in Kenya. International Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies, 7(3), 83−89. https://doi.org/10.5897/IJEAPS2014.0386

National Academy (2019). Improving America's Schools: The Role of Indicator: The National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/5143.

Nirav (2015) What are the Manpower Resources Required in a School System? Retrieved from: https://www.preservearticles.com/education/what-are-the-manpower-resources-required-in-a-school-system/18300

Oghene , Uyeri Ajiri (2016) The Relationship between Manpower Development and Lecturers' Productivity in Colleges of Education in Delta State. Volume 16 Issue 10 Version 1.0 Year 2016

Okunoye, A., et. al. (2018). Stakeholder influence and ERP implementation in higher education. Journal of Information Technology Case and Application Research, 10(3), 72–84. https://doi.org/ 10.1080/15228053.2008.10856139

Onuka, A.O.U (2017) Management Manpower Development in the Context of Globalisation An Evaluation. In International Journal of African African American Studies. Vol. 5(1), 17-28 12.

Onuka, A.O.U and Ajayi, K.O (2017) Effects of Manpower Development on Workers' Job Performance. European Journal of Educational Studies. Vol. 4(3)

Park, S., Hironaka, S., Carver, P., & Nordstrum, L. (2017). Continuous improvement in education. Stanford, CA: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Retrieved from http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/sites/default/files/carnegie-foundation_continuousimprovement_2013.05.pdf

Petrin, R. A., Schaft, K. A., & Meece, J. L. (2017). Educational sorting and residential aspirations among rural high school students: What are the contributions of schools and educators to rural brain drain? American Educational Research Journal, 294-326.

PSA Cohort Survival https://psa.gov.ph/content/cohort-survival-rate-1 Cohort Survival (2019) Retrieved from: https://media.alexandriava.gov/docs-archives/planning/info/lrefp/cohort-survival-rate=summary=10=25.pdf

Richards M, Elliott A, Woloshyn V & Mitchell C (eds.) 2021. Collaboration uncovered: The forgotten, the assumed, and the unexamined in collaborative education

Rosalina, et. al. (2021) Strategy for improving the quality of education through meeting the standards manpower of education in junior high school. DO - 10.29210/021041jpgi0005. JPGI (Jurnal Penelitian Guru Indonesia)

Safir, S. (2017). The listening leader: Creating the conditions for equitable school transformation. John Wiley & Sons

Samant et.al. (2018). World Journal of Science Technology and Sustainable Development.https://www.researchgate.net/publication/299406193_A_selected_literature_review_on_the_changing_role_of_stakeholders_as_value_creators

Semke et.al (2017). Community | National Center on Safe Supportive Learning Environments (NCSSLE). https://safesupportivelearning.ed.gov/ training-technical-assistance/roles/community

Sevari et.al (2019). The Effective Implementation of Professional Learning Communities – ed. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1194725.pdf

Shah (2019) The Impact of Quality on Satisfaction, Revenue, and Cost as Perceived by Providers of Higher Education, Journal of Marketing for Higher Education, 19:2, 125-141, DOI: 10.1080/08841240903451324

Strom et. al. (2017). Dropping out of high school: A meta-analysis assessing the effect of messages in the home and in school. Communication Education, 56, 433-452. doi:10.1080/03634520701413804

Strunk, K.O., Marsh, J.A., Bush-Mecenas, S.C., & Duque, M.R. (2016). The best laid plans: An examination of school plan quality and implementation in a school improvement initiative. Educational Administration Quarterly, 52(2), 259–309. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X15616864

Suskie, L., 2019. Assessing student learning: A common sense guide. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass

Womac et.al (2018). Journal of Career Development. Retrieved from: https://eric.ed.gov/?q=Commitment%2B&id=EJ1170227

Xia, et. al (2019). Tight, loose, or decoupling? A national study of the decision-making power relationship between district central offices and school principals. Educational Administration Quarterly, 56(3), 396–434. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X19851174

Yemini, M., Oplatka, I., Sagie, N. (2018). Educational Planning and Its Unique Characteristics. In: Project Management in Schools. Palgrave Pivot, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-78608-7_3

Zareie et.al (2017). Elaborating the purpose and content of professional development plan for preschool teachers. Retrieved from: https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1111451.pdf

Zvoch, K. (2006). Freshmen year dropouts: Interactions between student and school characteristics and student dropout status. Journal of Education for Students Placed At Risk, 11, 97-117. doi:10.1207/ s15327671espr1101_6

https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/DO_s2022_029-corrected-copy.pdf