SCHOOL LEADERSHIP PRACTICES TO THE SCOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE

LOREVIE K. RIVERA, EdD

lorevie.rivera@deped.gov.ph

Laguna State Polytechnic University, Philippines

ABSTRACT

This study determined if the school leadership practices are significantly related to School-based Management Level of Performance. The respondents were public elementary school teachers and school heads in the Division of Laguna. Descriptive-correlational design was utilized. A survey questionnaire was used to gather data. The data gathered were treated using descriptive statistics (weighted mean and standard deviation). The T-test was used to determine significant difference between perception of the school leadership practices on the school-based management performance and Spearman Rho to test the significant relationship of practices with School-Based Management focus on performance. Multiple regression analysis was likewise applied to determine which among the independent variables singly or in combination predicts the dependent variables.

The school leadership practices along leading strategically, managing school operations and resources, focusing on teaching and learning, developing self and others, and building connections were all rated highly evident. Therefore, based on these findings it is concluded that the level of school leadership practices has no significant difference in the SBM Level of Performance as perceived by the respondents. While there is significant relationship between school leadership practices as to leading strategically, curriculum and instruction, accountability, and continuous improvement, and building connections and SBM performance as to access, efficiency, and quality.

Established educational leadership practices is needed to increase the school performance that affects the SBM level of practice thus, it is recommended that school heads and learning leaders may undergo training seminar courses focus on managing school operations, leading strategically and other leadership practices.

Keywords:

Leadership practices, school-based management, performance, access, efficiency, quality

INTRODUCTION

The Department of Education bears the flagship of basic education, the School Heads shall ensure that orders from higher offices pertaining but not limited to education are delivered in their full capacity under shared responsibilities with other stakeholders. As one of the Rationale stipulated in DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020 (National Adoption and Implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads), School Heads, as stewards of schools, play a crucial role in ensuring an enabling and supportive environment for effective teaching and learning. School heads are expected to lead strategically, manage schools, teach, and learn, continue to develop professionally, and build connections to increase the School-Based Management level of performance as to access, efficiency and quality. Hence, the researcher would like to find out whether School leadership practices affect the School Based Management performance among elementary Schools in the Division of Laguna.

This also sought to determine the strength and significance of relationship between the dimension of school leadership practices and School-Based Management level of performance:

1. What is the level of the dimension of school leadership practices of the school heads based on the perception of the teachers and school heads in terms of:
   a. Leading Strategically;
   b. Managing School Operations and Resources;
   c. Focusing on Teaching and Learning; and
   d. Developing Self and Others?

2. What is the level of School-Based Management Performance Practices based on the perception of the teachers and school heads as to:
   a. Access;
   b. Efficiency; and
   c. Quality?

3. Is there a significant relationship between school leadership practices and School-Based Management performance?

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In the Philippines educational context, School-Based Management (SBM) was officially implemented as a governance framework of DepEd with the passage of RA 9155 also known as Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001 as legal cover. TEEP, SEDIP and BEAM – two pilot projects implemented by DepEd – support the SBM as an effective mechanism to improve the quality of education in the basic level. Thus, SBM is a viable structural reform intervention used to improve the quality of education in the public school to produce functionally literate Filipinos. School-based management is a strategy to improve education by transferring significant decision-making authority from state and district offices to individual schools. Performance improvement under the School Based Management Level of Practice has the following sub-variables, access, efficiency, and quality.

Lewin (2015) cited that access to education includes: on-schedule enrolment and progression at an appropriate age, regular attendance, learning consistent with national achievement norms, a learning environment that is safe enough to allow learning to take place, and opportunities to learn that are equitably distributed. This is in consonance with Republic Act No. 10533, Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013 and DepEd Order no 21, s. 2019, titled Policy Guidelines on the K-12 Basic Education Curriculum, under Section V. Policy Statement Nos. 15 and 16, that the goal of the k-12 curriculum is for all learners to have access to quality and relevant education. These literatures were mentioned in the present study as access, efficiency and quality are variables of performance under the School-Based Management Levelof Practice.

As mentioned in the Philippine constitution, section 5 of Article XVI mandates that the state must enhance the teachers' capability to professional advancement and to ensure the best of the available talents. To ensure this to happen, training and workshops for school heads and administrators are created to safeguard quality of leadership and supervision among their subordinates.

Literature on leadership displays the pattern stages, which starts from focusing on the attributes and characteristics of a leader, then highlighted on behavior and finally confirms on the contextualized nature of the leadership (Boseman: 2018). Leadership comes in many forms and its effectiveness can inspire others to achieve organizational goals and visions. Inspiration as an emotional event requires

receptiveness and an awareness of social interdependence. When mentees are inspired by mentor role models, they can extend personal attributes and practices (Hudson: 2018).

All the literature cited is very useful for conceptualizing and constructing the framework of the study. Furthermore, all gathered literature will serve as a guide to finishing the study. School heads who display strong leadership qualities and skills are more likely to create an atmosphere where students can thrive and reach their potential.

METHODOLOGY

The respondents were public elementary school teachers and school heads in the Division of Laguna. Descriptive-correlational design was utilized. A survey questionnaire was used to gather data. The data gathered were treated using descriptive statistics such as weighted mean and standard deviation. The T-test was used to determine significant difference between perception of the school principals' leadership practices and competencies on the school-based management performance and principles. Spearman Rho was used to test the significant relationship of competencies and practices with School-Based Management focus on performance and principles. Multiple regression analysis was likewise applied to determine which among the independent variables singly or in combination predicts the dependent variables.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Table 1. Level of School Heads Leadership Practices in terms of Leading Strategically

Indicative Statement	Respondents		Ave	Adjectival Analysis
	Teacher	School Head		
1.Monitors and evaluates processes and tools to promote learner achievement.	M = 4.63 SD = 0.51	M = 4.50 SD = 0.55	M = 4.55 SD =0.53	Highly Evident
2. Empowers school personnel in designing and implementing needs-based programs.	M = 4.61 SD = 0.53	M = 4.50 SD = 0.55	M = 4.56 SD = 0.54	Highly Evident
3. Enhances the policies relevant to school operations based on implementation and review.	M = 4.56 SD = 0.54	M = 4.44 SD = 0.54	M = 4.50 SD = 0.54	Highly Evident
4. Establishes a culture of research for evidence-based innovations.	M = 4.41 SD = 0.62	M = 4.25 SD = 0.67	M = 4.33 SD = 0.65	Highly Evident
5. Aligns school policies, programs, projects and activities to Department of Education Vision, Mission, and Core Values.	M = 4.66 SD = 0.53	M = 4.69 SD = 0.47	M = 4.68 SD = 0.50	Highly Evident
Overall Mean / SD Verbal Interpretation	4.57: 0.47 Highly Evident	4.48: 0.49 Highly Evident	4.53: 0.48 Highly Evident	

Legend	Scale Range	Remark	Adjectival Analysis
5	4.20 – 5.00	Always (A)	Highly Evident (HE)
4	3.40 – 4.19	Very Often (V)	Very Evident (VE)
3	2.60 – 3.39	Often (O)	Moderately Evident (ME)
2	1.80 – 2.59	Sometimes (S)	Less Evident (LE)
1	1.00 – 1.79	Never (N)	Not Evident (NE)

As shown in Table 1, the combined averages of teacher and school head respondents describe leading strategically as very evident along monitoring and evaluating processes and tools to promote

learners' achievement, (M = 4.55, SD = 0.53), empowering school personnel in designing and implementing needs-based programs (M = 4.56, SD = 0.54), enhancing the policies relevant to school operations based on implementation and review (M = 4.50, SD = 0.54), establishing a culture of research for evidence-based innovations (M = 4.33, SD = 0.65), and aligning school policies, programs, projects andactivities to Department of Education Vision, Mission and Core Values (M = 4.68, SD = 0.50).

With a WM = 4.53, SD = 0.48 which is verbally interpreted as highly evident. The level of school Leadership Practices in terms of Leading Strategically is very evident based from the results given by the respondent; it also indicates that the school heads and teachers' answer have almost the same perception with regards to the school leadership practices as to leading strategically.

Table 2. Level of School Practices in terms of Managing School Operations and Resources

Indicative Statement	Respondents		Ave	Adjectival Analysis
	Teacher	School Head		
1. Assumes pivotal role in promoting and implementing the vision and mission of the organization.	M = 4.56 SD = 0.55	M = 4.58 SD = 0.54	M = 4.57 SD =0.55	Highly Evident
2. Applies effective management of staff in adherence to laws, policies, guidelines, and issuances.	M = 4.56 SD = 0.58	M = 4.58 SD = 0.54	M = 4.57 SD =0.56	Highly Evident
3.Manages emerging opportunities and challenges to ensure equality in addressing the needs of learners, school personnel and other stakeholders.	M = 4.51 SD = 0.59	M = 4.54 SD = 0.54	M = 4.53 SD =0.57	Highly Evident
4. Monitors utilization, recording, and reporting of funds.	M = 4.71 SD = 0.91	M = 4.69 SD = 0.51	M = 4.70 SD =0.71	Highly Evident
5. Uses technology to ensure efficient and effective school operations.	M = 4.69 SD = 0.90	M = 4.56 SD = 0.54	M = 4.62 SD =0.72	Highly Evident
Overall Mean / SD Verbal Interpretation	4.61: 0.88 Highly Evident	4.59: 0.49 Highly Evident	4.60: 0.69 Highly Evident	

As revealed in Table 2, respondents perceived school leadership practices focus on managing school operations and resources as highly evident in terms of assuming pivotal role in promoting and implementing the vision and mission of the organization (M = 4.55, SD = 0.55), applying effective management of staff in adherence to laws, policies, guidelines and issuances (M = 4.57, SD = 0.56), managing emerging opportunities and challenges to ensure equality in addressing the needs of learners, school personnel and other stakeholders (M= 4.53, SD = 0.57), monitoring utilization, recording and reporting of funds (M= 4.70, SD =0.71), and using technology to ensure efficient and effective school operations (M = 4.62, SD = 0.72).

The result shows that school leadership practices in terms of managing school operations and resources is highly evident as disclosed by the overall combined average of 4.60. Likewise, small standard deviation values in almost all the items under consideration indicate that respondents have almost the same perception with regards to the school heads leadership practices as to managing school operations and resources.

Table 3. Level of School Leadership Practices in terms of Focusing on Teaching and Learning

Indicative Statement	Respondents		Ave	Adjectival Analysis
	Teacher	School Head		
1. Integrates career awareness into the school curriculum and all other learning experiences.	M = 4.58 SD = 0.53	M = 4.50 SD = 0.55	M = 4.54 SD = 0.54	Highly Evident
2. Promotes best practices pertaining to learner achievements and performance indicators.	M = 4.62 SD = 0.54	M = 4.56 SD = 0.54	M = 4.59 SD = 0.54	Highly Evident
3. Conducts technical assistance to teachers to develop exemplary practices consistent with teaching standards and pedagogies within and across learning areas.	M = 4.60 SD = 0.55	M = 4.63 SD = 0.53	M = 4.62 SD = 0.54	Highly Evident
4. Uses obtained feedback from stakeholders for the improvement of the school performance.	M = 4.57 SD = 0.58	M = 4.48 SD = 0.62	M = 4.53 SD = 0.60	Highly Evident
5. Implements and sustains effective learner discipline policies.	M = 4.58 SD = 0.53	M = 4.58 SD = 0.54	M = 4.58 SD = 0.54	Highly Evident
Overall Mean / SD Verbal Interpretation	4.59: 0.48 Highly Evident	4.55: 0.50 Highly Evident	4.57: 0.49 Highly Evident	

As shown in Table 3, the level of school leadership practices of school heads in terms of focusing on teaching and learning got an adjectival rating of highly evident along integrating career awareness into the school curriculum and all other learning experiences (M = 4.54, SD = 0.54), promoting best practices pertaining to learner achievements and performance indicators (M = 4.59, SD = 0.54), conducting technical assistance to teachers to develop exemplary practices consistent with teaching standards and pedagogies within and across learning areas (M = 4.62, SD = 0.54), using obtained feedback from stakeholders for the improvement of the school performance (M = 4.53, SD = 0.60) and implementing and sustaining effective learner discipline policies (M = 4.58, SD = 0.54).

As to focusing on teaching and learning was perceived highly evident as disclosed by the combined average of 4.57. Likewise, small standard deviation values (SD = 0.49) obtained in all the items indicate almost the same or common perception of both group of respondents.

Table 4 displays the level of school head leadership practices along developing self and others.

As seen in Table 4, the school heads leadership practices along developing self and others was described using the combined averages of teachers and school heads. As manifested, a highly evident remarks were obtained in terms of executing the school rewards system (M = 4.48, SD = 0.60), employing efficient and effective performance management system to ensure career advancement for individual school personnel (M = 4.50, SD = 0.57). Other indicators of developing self and others got the same remarks of highly evident.

The overall combined average of 4.53 shows that school leadership practices in terms of developing self and others is highly evident. Further, small standard deviation values indicate that

respondents have almost the same perception as on how developing self and others are being put into practice by the school heads.

Table 4. Level of School Leadership Practices in terms of Developing Self and Others

Indicative Statement	Respondents		Average	Adjectival Analysis
	Teacher	School Head		
1. Executes the school rewards system.	M = 4.45 SD = 0.61	M = 4.50 SD = 0.58	M = 4.48 SD =0.60	Highly Evident
2. Employs efficient and effective performance management system to ensure career advancement for individual school personnel.	M = 4.50 SD = 0.59	M = 4.50 SD = 0.55	M = 4.50 SD =0.57	Highly Evident
3. Adapts leadership practices within and beyond school contexts for professional development.	M = 4.52 SD = .55	M = 4.46 SD = 0.54	M = 4.49 SD =0.55	Highly Evident
4. Maximizes colleagues' potential to enhance their practice.	M = 4.69 SD = 3.03	M = 4.52 SD = 0.55	M = 4.61 SD =0.73	Highly Evident
5. Facilitates workforce effectiveness through coaching, motivating, and developing people within the work environment to promote mutual trust and respect.	M = 4.57 SD = 0.56	M = 4.56 SD = 0.54	M = 4.57 SD =0.55	Highly Evident
Overall Mean / SD Verbal Interpretation	4.55 0.88 Highly Evident	4.51 0.51 Highly Evident	4.53 0.70 Highly Evident	

Table 5. Level of School-Based Management Performance with Regards to Access

Indicative Statement	Respondents		Ave	Adjectival Analysis
	Teacher	School Head		
1. Conducts regular projects and activities to increase enrolment.	M = 4.66 SD = 0.52	M = 4.67 SD = 0.52	M = 4.66 SD = 0.52	Highly Observed
2. Accounts all learners for no one is left behind.	M = 4.70 SD = 0.48	M = 4.69 SD = 0.47	M = 4.69 SD = 0.48	Highly Observed
3. Increases accessibility of the school to all types of learners.	M = 4.67 SD = 0.51	M = 4.63 SD = 0.53	M = 4.65 SD = 0.52	Highly Observed
4. Implements projects and activities to increase enrolment.	M = 4.67 SD = 0.52	M = 4.67 SD = 0.48	M = 4.67 SD = 0.50	Highly Observed
5. Develops a program to ensure out-of-school children to formal education.	M = 4.64 SD = 0.54	M = 4.63 SD = 0.53	M = 4.63 SD = 0.53	Highly Observed
Overall Mean / SD Verbal Interpretation	4.67: 0.45 Highly Observed	4.65: 0.45 Highly Observed	4.66: 0.45 Highly Observed	

Legend	Scale Range	Remark	Adjectival Analysis
5	4.20 – 5.00	Strongly Agree (SA)	Highly Observed (HO)
4	3.40 – 4.19	Moderately Agree (MA)	Moderately Observed (MO)
3	2.60 – 3.39	Agree (A)	Seldomly Observed (SO)
2	1.80 – 2.59	Disagree (D)	Less Observed (LO)
1	1.00 – 1.79	Strongly Disagree (SD)	Not Observed (NO)

As shown in Table 5, the result of the study showed that the School-Based Management performance as to access is highly observed in terms of conducts regular projects and activities to increase enrolment (M = 4.66, SD = 0.52), accounts all learners for no one is left behind (M = 4.69, SD = 0.48), increases accessibility of the school to all types of learners (M = 4.65, SD = 0.52), implements projects and activities to increase enrolment (M = 4.67, SD = 0.50), and develops a program to ensure out-of-school children to formal education (M = 4.63, SD = 0.53).

It is apparent, based on the overall combined average of 4.66, that the School-Based Management in line with Performance as to access is highly observed. Small standard deviation values on the other hand, indicate that teachers and school heads have almost the same perception with regards to access, a measure of performance improvement.

Table 6. Level of School-Based Management Performance with Regards to Efficiency

Indicative Statement	Respondents		Average	Adjectival Analysis
	Teacher	School Head		
1.Includes intervention program to increase the survival rate in strategic planning and implementation.	M = 4.67 SD = 0.49	M = 4.71 SD = 0.46	M = 4.69 SD = 0.48	Highly Observed
2.Boosts learners' confidence and competitiveness when they go out of the school.	M = 4.66 SD = 0.51	M = 4.71 SD = 0.46	M = 4.68 SD = 0.48	Highly Observed
3. Increases the cohort survival rate every year.	M = 4.64 SD = 0.52	M = 4.60 SD = 0.49	M = 4.62 SD = 0.51	Highly Observed
4. Gives constant attention to Dropout rate.	M = 4.68 SD = 0.51	M = 4.73 SD = 0.45	M = 4.70 SD = 0.48	Highly Observed
5. Ensures timely submission of financial and management reports.	M = 4.70 SD = 0.51	M = 4.75 SD = 0.44	M = 4.72 SD = 0.48	Highly Observed
Overall Mean / SD Verbal Interpretation	4.67: 0.43 Highly Observed	4.70: 0.41 Highly Observed	4.68: 0:42 Highly Observed	

It could be gleaned from table 6 that the School-Based Management performance in terms of efficiency is highly observed as revealed by the combined averages of both groups of respondents-the teachers and school heads. These were along including intervention program to increase the survival rate in strategic planning and implementation (M = 4.69, SD = 0.48), boosting learners' confidence and competitiveness when they go out of the school (M = 4.68, SD = 0.48), and increasing the cohort survival rate every year (M = 4.62, SD = 0.51) Other indicators of efficiency were also given a remark of highly observed.

It is evident, based on the overall combined average of 4.68, that the SBM Level of Practice in line with Performance as to efficiency was highly observed. Likewise, small standard deviation values indicate almost the same perception of the respondents as far as efficiency is concerned.

Table 7. Level of School-Based Management Performance as to Quality

Indicative Statement	Respondents		Average	Adjectival Rating
	Teacher	School Head		
1.Promotes academic excellence by creating intervention programs for achievers and under-achievers.	M = 4.69 SD = 0.50	M = 4.75 SD = 0.44	M = 4.72 SD = 0.47	Highly Observed
2.Capacitates teachers in shaping and developing the full potentials of learners.	M = 4.72 SD = 0.48	M = 4.75 SD = 0.44	M = 4.73 SD = 0.46	Highly Observed
3.Produces graduates that are functional literate.	M = 4.68 SD = 0.51	M = 4.63 SD = 0.49	M = 4.65 SD = 0.50	Highly Observed
4.Assesses learnings appropriately and timely.	M = 4.67 SD = 0.50	M = 4.63 SD = 0.53	M = 4.65 SD = 0.52	Highly Observed
5.Seeks continues professional education for teachers to capacitate themselves for their growth and development.	M = 4.71 SD = 0.48	M = 4.71 SD = 0.46	M = 4.71 SD = 0.47	Highly Observed
Overall Mean / SD Verbal Interpretation	4.69: 0.48 Highly Observed	4.69: 0.42 Highly Observed	4.69: 0.44 Highly Observed	

As reflected in Table 7, the teacher and school head respondents perceived that the School-Based Management performance level of practice as to quality is highly observed in terms of the way they promote academic excellence by creating intervention programs for achievers and under-achievers (M = 4.72, SD = 0.47), capacitate teachers in shaping and developing the full potentials of learners (M = 4.73, SD = 0.46), produces graduates that are functional literate, (M = 4.65, SD = 0.50), assesses learnings appropriately and timely (M = 4.65, SD = 0.52), and seeks continues professional education for teachers to capacitate themselves for their growth and development (M = 4.71, SD = 0.47).

The overall combined average of 4.69 indicates that the SBM Level of Practice in line with performance as to quality is highly observed. Small standard deviation values (SD=0.44) on the other hand, indicate that teachers and school heads have almost the same perception with regards to SBM Performance level of practice as to quality.

Table 8 presents the relationship between school leadership practices and School-Based Management Level of practice as to performance.

A strong correlation was obtained along leading strategically with efficiency (r = 0.759, p = 0.000) and quality (r = 0.765, p = 0.000). as well as focusing on teaching and learning with access (r = 0.754, p = 0.000), All other indicators of school leadership practices were found moderately correlated with SBM level of practice as in leading strategically with access (r = 0.669, p = 0.000), building connections with efficiency (r = 0.621, p = 0.000).

The probability values in all these relationships are less than 0.05 level (p < 0.05) indicating that the relationship is statistically significant. All indicators of leadership practices were found statistically significant with School-Based Management Performance as to access, efficiency, and quality.

Table 8. Relationship between School Leadership Practices and School-Based Management Performance as to Access, Efficiency and Quality

School Leadership Practices	SBM Performance		
	Access	Efficiency	Quality
Leading Strategically	r=0.669*	r=0.759*	r=0.765*
	p=0.000	p=0.000	p=0.000
	Moderate	Strong	Strong
Managing School Operations and Resources	r=0.739*	r=0.673*	r=0.708*
	p=0.000	p=0.000	p=0.000
	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate
Focusing on Teaching and Learning	r=0.754*	r=0.736*	r=0.739*
	p=0.000	p=0.000	p=0.000
	Strong	Moderate	Moderate
Developing Self and Others	r=0.675*	r=0.645*	r=0.647*
	p=0.000	p=0.000	p=0.000
	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate
Building Connections	r=0.699*	r=0.621*	r=0.687*
	p=0.000	p=0.000	p=0.000
	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate

Coefficient Interval	Correlation	*Significant
0.80 – 1.000	Very Strong	
0.60 – 0.799	Strong	
0.40 – 0.599	Moderate	
0.20 – 0.399	Weak	
0.00 – 0.199	Very Weak	

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings, it was found out that the level of dimensions of school leadership practices, in terms of leading strategically, managing school operations and resources, focusing on teaching and learning; and developing self and others and the level of SBM Performance as to access, efficiency and quality has no significant difference as perceived by teachers and school heads and that the of leadership practices and SBM level of performance as to access, efficiency, and quality has significant relationship.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. School heads may continue their practices in leading the school strategically, managing school operations & resources, developing self & others and building connections for achieving school's efficiency and for the staff to perform their duties with greater satisfaction.

2. School heads may continue raising the bar of providing quality and efficient system of education through effective administration and working hand in hand with the community to protect the child for quality education and better life.

3. Established educational leadership practices is needed to increase the school performance that affects the SBM level of practice thus, it is recommended that school heads and learning leaders may undergo training seminar courses focus on managing school operations, leading strategically and other leadership practices.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

REFERENCES

Boseman, Gloria (2018). Effective Leadership in a Changing World. Journal of Financial Service Professionals, 62(3), 36-38.

DepEd Order no 21, s. 2019, titled Policy Guidelines on the K-12 Basic Education Curriculum

DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020 (National Adoption and Implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads)

Hudson, Michael A. and Haynes, Katalin Takacs and Serpa, Roy (2018). Strategic Leadership for the 21stCentury. Business Horizons 53, 437-444, Mays Business School Research Paper No. 2012-23.

Lewin, Keith M. (2015). Educational access, equity, and development: Planning to make rights realities. UNESCO: International Institute for Educational Planning(Retrievedrom: https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000235003)

Philippine constitution, section 5 of Article XVI

Republic Act No. 9155 also known as Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001

Republic Act No. 10533, Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013