

Benchmarking On School-Based Management

Jemma O. Lipit, EdD

jemlipit.lj@gmail.com

PHINMA Union College, Santa Cruz, Laguna, 4009 Philippines

Gov. Felicisimo T. San Luis Integrated Senior High School, Bubukal, Santa Cruz, Laguna, 4009 Philippines

University of Perpetual Help System Dalta, Alabang-Zapote Road- Pampalona Tres, Las Pinas City 1740 Philippines

Abstract

This study focused on benchmarking School-Based Management practices in Laguna Division during the School Year 2017-2018. The researcher used the questionnaire as the main data-gathering instrument. Frequency counts, percentages, and weighted mean were used for descriptive analysis, and a t-test for independent samples was used to find the difference among the perceptions of the school heads, teachers, and stakeholders on the School-Based Management. The majority of the school heads are middle-aged, married females with doctoral degrees, have an adequate number of years of experience as school heads, have school-based management training, and are members of local professional organizations. The school heads, teachers, and stakeholders have comparable insights as to how the school heads have effectively observed and implemented various practices in different aspects of the school-based management system. Despite the very high rating provided by stakeholders, they still consistently have the lowest level of evaluation towards the school heads' performance, which might mean a need for further transparency of schemes and encouragement of active participation of every member of the school community towards the improvement of the institution. The researcher recommended that School heads must undergo comprehensive school-based management training so as to enable them to efficiently utilize their administrative skills in operating and enhancing the entire school system. They must be encouraged to pursue and finish their post-graduate courses for them to attain supplementary learning necessary to manage their respective educational institutions. They must inspire and communicate with their subordinates, faculty, staff, students, parents, and other members of the school community to actively participate and commit themselves to various programs designed to effectively implement the policies, consequently improving schools' performances.

Keywords: School-Based Management, Benchmarking, Stakeholder Perceptions, Administrative Training, Transparency

1. Introduction

The achievement of an organization's goals and objectives is based upon different variables that a leader incorporates into their actions. These factors are classified as internal and external factors. Internal factors refer to those inherent traits that comprise his/her personality. On the other hand, external factors refer

to those things that are widely observed and adopted from the environment. Such factors as communication skills, visualization skills, teaching skills/experience, and managerial expertise are considered as internal variables, while such factors as influence from others, training experiences, and peer pressure are considered as external factors.

In educational organizations, it is important to establish clear goals and realistic objectives. (Lolos – Depusig, 2003) stresses “Education is like an open field in which all the factors can show up; it could mold a nation; could make into habit values needed by citizenry; could move indifference among fellowmen; and could pull heartaches to happiness and camaraderie for a lasting friendship.” This comment suggests education can bring about good effects and influences and therefore should always be paid attention to.

The school-based management (SBM) thrusts are based on the Republic Act. 7160, also known as the Local Government Code of 1991 and the Republic Act. 9155, also known as “Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001,” whose primary purpose is to implement the decentralization of the decision-making process from the central or state to individual schools to promote effective schools through empowering the managerial expertise of school heads. “A key to a successful school or educational institution is the presence of an official school head that can sharpen the school towards continuous improvement.” (DepEd, 2007)

Section 2 of R.A. 9155 states that it is hereby declared the policy of the State to protect and promote the right of all citizens to quality basic education and to make such education accessible to all by providing all Filipino children a free and compulsory education in the elementary level and free education in the high school level. Such education should also include alternative learning systems for out-of-school youth and adult learners. It shall be the goal of basic education to provide them with the skills, knowledge, and values they need to become caring, self-reliant, productive, and patriotic citizens.

The school shall be the heart of the formal education system. It is where children learn. Schools shall have a single aim of providing the best possible basic education for all learners. Governance of basic education shall begin at the national level. It is at the regions, divisions, schools, and learning centers herein referred to as the field offices, where the policy and principle for the governance of basic education shall be translated into programs, projects, and services developed, adapted, and offered to fit local needs.

The State shall encourage local initiatives to improve the quality of basic education. The State shall ensure that the values, needs, and aspirations of a school community are reflected in the program of education for the children, out-of-school youth, and adult learners. Schools and learning centers shall be empowered to make decisions on what is best for the learners they serve. The policy highlights the role of the government in establishing educational organizations as training grounds for its citizens, particularly for out-of-school youth and adult learners. It also highlights the policy-making bodies and hierarchy of authority of public schools

from the national down to lower management and how they decentralized the management

As a school head who directs the planning, implementation and evaluation of various projects/activities, he/she is also privileged to manage its funds and other financial resources by means of establishing the Parent-Teachers and Community Association (PTCA), an organization specifically intended for the school's over-all projects and other renovation projects. (Abrugar, 2001) Noted that teachers and parents should work together in developing pupil excellence. The community should provide an atmosphere that is conducive to learning – a community that is free from negative factors for learning, like gambling, drinking, and other vices. The teachers, parents, and the barangay officials should actively participate in the development of pupil excellence for the improvement of its inhabitants or the community.

Also noted in School-Based Management are the decentralization functions and responsibilities of school heads, namely: administrative management and instructional leadership. The administrative management refers to setting up the school vision, mission, and goals, developing and implementing school improvement, planning, and mobilizing community participation for the improvement of educational outcomes. On the contrary, instructional leadership refers to creating a school environment conducive to learning and being accountable for learning outcomes.

One way to decentralize decision-making power in education is popularly known as School-Based Management (SBM). There are other definitions and names for this concept, but they all refer to the decentralization of authority from the central government to the school level. SBM emphasizes the individual school as represented by the school head or principal, staff, parents, learners, internal and external stakeholders. They are the members of the primary unit for improving education and the redistribution of decision-making authority over school operations as the primary means by which this improvement can be stimulated and sustained.

Responsibility and decision-making over school operations are transferred to principals, teachers, parents, sometimes students, and other school community members. The school-level actors and actresses, however, have to conform to or operate within a set of centrally determined policies. SBM programs take on many different forms, both in terms of who has the power to make decisions as well as the degree of decision making devolved to the school level. While some programs transfer authority to principals or teachers only. Others encourage or mandate parental and community participation, often in school committees.

In general, SBM programs transfer authority over one or more of the following activities: Budget allocation, requesting new teaching as the need arises, curriculum development, instructional development, educational material procurement, infrastructure improvement, setting the school calendar to better meet the specific needs of the local community, monitoring and evaluation of teacher performance and students'

learning outcomes. SBM also includes school-development plans, requisition of SBM Financial Grants for Instructional Updates and Improvement, and preparation of long-term plans like the School Improvement Plans and Annual Improvement Plans.

A reading from the handouts of Teachers' Instructional Support System (TISS, 2000), explains that instructional supervision is a dynamic process that involves the systematic study and analysis of the entire teaching- learning situation, utilizing a carefully planned program cooperatively derived from the situation and, which is adapted to the needs of those involved in it.

The school heads are held responsible and should run the school efficiently and effectively. They should make a periodic report to stakeholders about the school's performance, especially the learning outcomes of students. Communicating the school's real situation, such as learning outcomes, financial status, issues, and concerns, would generate more support from the external stakeholders for the school's improvement.

Hence, the aim of the present study is to determine the network of secondary school heads on benchmarking on school-based management practices in the Laguna Division.

Theoretical Framework

This study is anchored on the theory of learning as pointed out by educational psychologists, which states that learning involves the interaction of new formation with related knowledge that the child also possesses.

As the learners add more and more links of connections associated with the concept, they gradually develop their own experience based on a hierarchy of related concepts in a cognitive structure. This is how the concepts become fully understood by the child. Such a theory of learning implies that the teacher should know the learner's prior knowledge, which he, the teacher, will use as a starting point in helping the learner develop the concept in his mind and, along with other concepts learned, are consolidated and form the basis for evaluation.

This study is concerned with achievement evaluation, which is a terminal evaluation that is done at the end of the process to sum up the learning outcomes in a predetermined terminal behavior. This study is in line with the principle stated by Palma (2002), which states that the proof of learning is seen in the testing. In line with this, Palma says that evaluation cannot be undertaken apart from teaching, because it is an integral part and parcel of the teaching and learning process. Citing Bloom's definition, Palma (2002) states that evaluation is a systematic collection of evidence to determine whether, in fact, certain changes are taking place in the learner as well as to determine the degree of change in individual students.

School principals play a key role in school success, and their leadership skills highly contribute to

the effectiveness of schools. A competent and effective leader is one who affects others in the success of the organization, motivates them, and includes them in the process. The primary duty of school principals is to have their school reach its goals. As the roles expected from school principals are related to the assumptions of leadership theories, school principals should carry the leadership features described in different leadership theories. The theory of "formative leadership" is based on the belief that many leaders exist within a school. The theory supports the teacher as a school leader and the principal as the leader of leaders.

Conceptual Framework

In August 2001, Republic Act 9155, otherwise known as Governance of Basic Education Act, was passed transforming the name of the Department of Education, Culture and Sports (DECS) to the Department of Education (DepEd) and redefining the role of field offices (regional, division, district, and school offices). RA 9155 provides the overall framework for school head empowerment by strengthening their leadership roles and school-based management within the context of transparency and local accountability. The goal of basic education is to provide the school-age population and young adults with skills, knowledge, and values to become caring, self-reliant, productive, and patriotic citizens. The Department of Education is now implementing the school-based Management (SBM), a key component of the Basic Education Sector Reform Agenda (BESRA).

In SBM it aims to empower school to continuously improve its performance in attaining desired outcomes for students; engage stakeholders in shared decision-making; lead the school staff, together with other stakeholders in identifying and addressing school issues and concerns that affect students outcomes; create support network of community-based stakeholders that will mobilize social, political, cultural, and economic resources and make stakeholders accountable for school performance and student outcomes.

Statement of the Problem

This study sought to determine the status of benchmarking on School-Based Management of secondary school heads in Laguna Division during the School Year 2017- 2018.

Specifically, it sought to answer the following sub-problems:

1. What is the profile of the secondary school heads in terms of their:

- 1.1 Age;
- 1.2 Sex;
- 1.3 Civil Status;
- 1.4 Highest Educational Attainment;
- 1.5 Area of Specialization;

- 1.6 Number of Years of Experience as School Head;
 - 1.7 Attendance in School Based Management training; and
 - 1.8 Membership to Professional Organization?
2. What is the status of benchmarking on school-based management as perceived by the secondary school heads themselves, teachers, and stakeholders in terms of the following parameters:
- 2.1 Vision, mission goals and objectives
 - 2.2 School Program Development and School Improvement Plan;
 - 2.3 Personnel, Physical and Fiscal Resources Management;
 - 2.4 Teaching and Non-teaching Staff Development;
 - 2.5 School-community Networks set-up and parents-teachers, non-academic personnel participation
 - 2.6 School Environment;
 - 2.7 School Curriculum: Implementation, Monitoring and Assessment;
 - 2.8 School Programs, Projects and Services; and
 - 2.9 Innovative Modes of Instruction?
3. Is there a significant difference between the status of perceived benchmarking on school-based management among school heads, teachers, and stakeholders on the School Based Management across the parameters?
4. Is there a significant relationship between the perceived competence and the profile of the secondary school heads?
5. Based on the findings, what best practices benchmarking on School-based Management can be proposed to improve their level of management?

Research Methodology

The descriptive design, particularly comparative, was employed in this study. Descriptive research includes studies that purport the present facts concerning the nature and status of anything. According to Project Talent (US Office of Education), descriptive research seeks to find answers to questions through the analysis of variable relationships. To achieve an efficient school-based management best practice benchmarking and to empower faculty members' performance, the following insights are taken into considerations as influencing factors namely: vision, mission, goals and objectives, school program development and school improvement plan, personnel, physical, and fiscal management resources management, teaching and non-teaching staff development, school-community network set-up and parents – teachers and non-academic personnel participation, donations, gifts and other grants, school environment and school curriculum: implementation, monitoring and assessment.

This study covered the secondary school heads, teachers, and stakeholders of Laguna Division.

One set with three parts of the research instrument was used in gathering the data in this study.

The first part was a questionnaire which elicited valuable data from the secondary school heads in terms of their personal characteristics such as age, sex, civil status; professional characteristics such as highest educational attainment, no. of years of experience as school head, and attendance in SBM trainings, and membership in professional organizations.

The second part focused on the status of school-based management best practice benchmarking as perceived by the school heads themselves, teachers and stakeholders in terms of vision, mission goals and objectives; School Program Development and School Improvement Plan; Personnel, Physical and Fiscal Resources Management; Teaching and Non-teaching Staff Development; School-community Networks set-up and parents-teachers, non-academic personnel participation; School Environment; School Curriculum: Implementation, Monitoring and Assessment; School Programs, Projects and Services; and Innovative Modes of Instruction.

The third part focused on the factors that influence the implementation of SBM and the factors that influence the achievement of school heads' goal of efficient school-based management, best practices benchmarking in their respective schools.

For the teachers, they requested to rate the status of school-based management practices in Laguna Division.

The indicators/items on the status of school-based management best practices benchmarking were taken from the School-Based Management Primer.

The researcher sought permission from the Office of the Schools Division Superintendent of Laguna.

To derive valid and accurate results, appropriate statistical measures were employed.

To answer question no. 1 on the profile of the school heads, frequency counts and percentages were used.

$$\text{Percentage} = \frac{F}{N} \times 100$$

Where:

F = Frequency

N = total number of respondents

To answer question no. 2 on the status of school-based management best practices benchmarking,

average weighted mean (AWM) was used using the formula below:

$$\frac{\sum WM}{I}$$

I

Where:

$\sum WM$ = Weighted Mean

I = no. of items/indicators

Relative Value	Statistical Limits	Descriptive Equivalent
5	4.21-5.00	Very High (VH)
4	3.41-4.20	High (H)
3	2.61-3.40	Moderately High (MH)
2	1.81-2.60	Low (L)
1	1.00-1.80	Very Low (VL)

To answer question no. 3, a t-test for independent samples was used to determine the significant difference among the perceptions of the school heads, teachers, and stakeholders on the School-Based Management of school heads.

The formula for t-test is shown below:

$$t = \frac{X_1 - X_2}{\sqrt{\frac{SS_1 + SS_2}{n_1 + n_2 - 2} \left(\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2} \right)}}$$

Where:

t = value

X1 = mean of the first variable

X2 = mean of the second variable

SS1 = Sum of squares of the first variable

SS2 = sum of the squares of the second variable

n1 = no. of respondents of the first variable

n2 = no. of respondents of the second variable

To answer sub-problem 4, Pearson Product Moment Coefficient was used.

Results and Discussion

1. Profile of School Heads

To answer problem number 1, the succeeding tables portray the profile distribution of the secondary school heads.

Table 2a

Profile of Secondary Schools Heads in Terms of Age, Sex, Civil Status

(N=40)

Profile	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Age (Years)		
20-35	5	12.50
36-50	25	62.50
51-65	10	25.00
Total	40	100
Sex		
Male	15	37.50
Female	25	62.50
Total	58	100
Civil Status		
Single	3	7.50
Married	35	87.50
Widower	2	5.00
Total	40	100

Age. Based from table 2a, out of 40 secondary school heads who participated in the study, middle adults at 36-50 years of age consists the larger distribution of the respondents (25 or 62.50%). This is followed by 10 school heads with age ranging from 51 to 65 years (10 or 25%) while least of the respondents are at younger age bracket of 20-35 years (5 or 12.50%). This means that schools heads are considered young not only in terms of age but also as school head.

Sex. In terms of sex, it can be viewed from the same table that female school heads (25 or 62.50%) predominated the male respondents (15 or 37.50%). The results support the common notion that teaching is a

female dominated profession. As observed, there are more female professionals who are with the teaching profession than male professionals.

Civil Status. If distributed according to civil status, similar illustration displays that majority of the population are married (35 or 87.50%), some are single (3 or 7.50%) while the remaining 2 are widower (5%). This shows that school administrators have their families to support.

Table 2b

Professional Profile of Schools Heads in Terms of Highest Educational Attainment, Number of Years of Experience as School Head, Attendance in School-Based Management, Membership to Professional Organization

(N=40)

Profile	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Highest Educational Attainment		
Ed.D./Ph.D.	16	40.00
With Doctoral Units	24	60.00
Total	40	100
Number of Years of Experience as School Head		
0-5	7	17.50
6-10	6	15.00
11-15	14	35.00
16-20	8	20.00
21 above	5	12.50
Total	40	100
Attendance in School-Based Management Training		
1	7	17.50
2	14	35.00
3	13	32.50
4	6	15.00
Total	40	100
Membership in Professional Organization		
Local	21	52.50
Regional	14	35.00
National	5	12.50
Total	40	100

Highest Educational Attainment. As can be gleaned in Table 2b, most of the school heads have doctorate degree units with a frequency of 24 or about 60% of the population. Close to these figures are 16 doctorate degree holders who comprise the 40 percent of the respondents. This implies that all of the school heads have continued their education by taking post-graduate courses.

Number of Years of Experience as School Head. Same table portrays that majority of the school heads (14 or 35%) have been in service for about 11-15 years while some (8 or 20%) have been working as school heads for about 16-20 years,

. Furthermore, there are 7 respondents (17.50%) who claimed to be in such position from 0-5 years whilst the other 6 (15%) have been in service 6-10 years. The remaining 5 (12.50%) have 21 and above years of experience being the head of their institution. This implies that the respondents are still new in this type of managerial status.

Attendance in School-Based Management Training. When it comes to school-based management training, it is depicted as well in Table 2b that bulk of the respondents has 2 trainings (14 or 35%). However, there are 13 school heads (32.50%) who have attended 3 trainings, whilst 7 school principals (17.50%) have 1 SBM training, and the remaining 6 (15%) have taken part in four trainings/seminar/workshops. The result entails that school heads lack essential trainings on management and must therefore be encouraged to partake in such to effectively utilize their administrative skills.

Membership in Professional Organization. Based from the gathered data, most of the respondents (21 or 52.50%) are affiliated to local professional organization. Some (14 or 35%) are members of regional licensed body. However, there are also few who are associates of nationwide professional organization.

1. Status of School-Based Management Practices

The succeeding tables (Table 3a to 3i) depict the perception of the school heads, faculty members and stakeholders on the status of school-based management practices. These provide answer to problem number 2.

Table 3a**Status of School-Based Management Practices in Terms of Vision, Mission, Goals and Objectives**

Indicators	School Heads		Teachers		Stakeholders	
	AWM	DE	AWM	DE	AWM	DE
1. Leads the stakeholders in developing the school vision, mission, goals and objectives.	4.57	VH	4.62	VH	4.42	VH
2. Ensures the alignment of the school vision, mission, goals and objectives with the thrust of the national government.	4.64	VH	4.56	VH	4.38	VH
3. Makes plans and decisions with stakeholders in accordance with the school vision, mission, goals and objectives.	4.60	VH	4.61	VH	4.39	VH
4. Perform his administrative responsibilities/functions towards the attainment of the school vision.	4.67	VH	4.59	VH	4.47	VH
5. Performs instructional leadership functions/responsibilities towards the attainment of the school vision.	4.67	VH	4.59	VH	4.46	VH
Summated Mean	4.63	VH	4.59	VH	4.42	VH

Legend:

Rating	Mean Scale	Descriptive Equivalent (DE)
5	4.21 – 5.00	Very High (VH)
4	3.41 – 4.20	High (H)
3	2.61 – 3.40	Moderate (M)
2	1.81 – 2.60	Low (L)
1	1.00 – 1.80	Very Low (VL)

In general, Table 3a reveals that the secondary school heads, the teachers and the stakeholders have a very high perception in attaining the vision, mission, goals and objectives of every school as indicated by the corresponding summated means of 4.63, 4.59 and 4.42 with 4.63 from the school heads' being the highest

among the evaluation ratings This implies that all of the respondents have comparable insights on how the school heads able to effectively manage and use their skills in realizing the institutions' vision, mission, goals and objectives.

Table 3b

Status of School-Based Management Practices in Terms of School Program Development and School Improvement Plan

Indicators	School Heads		Teachers		Stakeholders	
	AWM	DE	AWM	DE	AWM	DE
1. Develop a School Improvement Plan (SIP) in accordance with the DepEd macro development.	4.64	VH	4.68	VH	4.48	VH
2. Organizes/expands school, community and local government networks and groups who will actively participate in school improvement.	4.48	VH	4.52	VH	4.40	VH
3. Leads in developing and implementing the SIP with the participation of the school constituency and community.	4.55	VH	4.56	VH	4.41	VH
4. Organizes committee and other group committees that meet on regular basis and provides recommendations for leadership in school improvement and further provides guidelines for the faculty for the assessment of the performance and related activities.	4.48	VH	4.49	VH	4.35	VH
5. Ensures that the School Improvement Plan is geared toward the vision and mission of the national government.	4.55	VH	4.57	VH	4.34	VH
Summated Mean	4.54	VH	4.56	VH	4.39	VH

Legend:

Rating	Mean Scale	Descriptive Equivalent(DE)
5	4.21 – 5.00	Very High (VH)
4	3.41 – 4.20	High (H)
3	2.61 – 3.40	Moderate (M)
2	1.81 – 2.60	Low (L)
1	1.00 – 1.80	Very Low (VL)

Similarly, the head teachers, faculty members and stakeholders have very high ratings on the school heads' school program development and school improvement plan as revealed by the computed summated

means of 4.54, 4.56 and 4.39, respectively. If looked closely, the teachers this time have the highest assessment score towards the school heads' performance on the aforementioned parameter. This means that school heads are efficiently doing their jobs in implementing schemes for the betterment of their respective institutions.

Table 3c

Status of School-Based Management Practices in Terms of Personnel, Physical and Fiscal Resources Management

Indicators	School Heads		Teachers		Stakeholders	
	AWM	DE	AWM	DE	AWM	DE
1. Administers the management of all personnel, physical and fiscal resources of the school.	4.69	VH	4.56	VH	4.39	VH
2. Observes properly a system of internal auditing.	4.71	VH	4.44	VH	4.34	VH
3. Maintains transparency of financial matters at all times.	4.84	VH	4.51	VH	4.39	VH
4. Prioritizes funds according to the needs of the school.	4.83	VH	4.51	VH	4.35	VH
5. Informs the teachers regularly about the financial conditions of the school.	4.83	VH	4.46	VH	4.32	VH
Summated Mean	4.78	VH	4.50	VH	4.36	VH

Legend:

Rating	Mean Scale	Descriptive Equivalent
5	4.21 – 5.00	Very High (VH)
4	3.41 – 4.20	High (H)
3	2.61 – 3.40	Moderate (M)
2	1.81 – 2.60	Low (L)
1	1.00 – 1.80	Very Low (VL)

As for the status of personnel, physical and fiscal resources management, the school heads have rated themselves of a very high performance on this particular aspect as indicated by the summated mean of 4.78 which is shown in Table 3c. Likewise, the teachers and stakeholders have the same perception as regards to how the school heads handle personnel with 4.50 and 4.36 summated means, respectively, signifying a very

high appraisal. With careful scrutiny, the teachers and stakeholders have lower scores compared to the school heads' self-assessment. However, these ratings are considered all very high.

Table 3d**Status of School-Based Management Practices in Terms of Teaching and Non-Teaching Staff****Development**

Indicators	School Heads		Teachers		Stakeholders	
	AWM	DE	AWM	DE	AWM	DE
1. Encourages teachers to share their experience and assists/helps each other in the area that needs improvement.	4.72	VH	4.60	VH	4.46	VH
2. Provides regular time for faculty conferences.	4.62	VH	4.53	VH	4.35	VH
3. Maintains policies that support teaching staff development like benchmarking, conducting research and applying innovative teaching strategies.	4.47	VH	4.55	VH	4.31	VH
4. Encourages teaching and non-teaching staff to attend seminars and training development program.	4.79	VH	4.57	VH	4.44	VH
5. Provides sufficient and appropriate training for both teaching and non-teaching staff for effective implementation of the School Improvement Plan (SIP).	4.53	VH	4.51	VH	4.39	VH
Summated Mean	4.63	VH	4.55	VH	4.39	VH

Legend:

Rating	Mean Scale	Descriptive Equivalent
5	4.21 – 5.00	Very High (VH)
4	3.41 – 4.20	High (H)
3	2.61 – 3.40	Moderate (M)
2	1.81 – 2.60	Low (L)
1	1.00 – 1.80	Very Low (VL)

Table 3d comparably reflects a generally very high evaluation of the school heads, the lecturers and the stakeholders as regards to the teaching and non-teaching staff development of the principals with the following corresponding means 4.63, 4.55 and 4.39. The principals' self-assessment rating is once again greater as compared to the evaluation of the other two groups of respondents.

Table 3e

Status of School-Based Management Practices in Terms of School Community Networks Set-up and Parent-Teachers Non-academic Personnel Participation

Indicators	School Heads		Teachers		Stakeholders	
	AWM	DE	AWM	DE	AWM	DE
1. Encourages active involvement and participation of parents, local government units and other stakeholders in managing the school.	4.59	VH	4.57	VH	4.34	VH
2. Informs parents, community member, local government units about the condition of the school.	4.67	VH	4.55	VH	4.42	VH
3. Establishes strong relationship with other schools for benchmarking of best practices on school administrative and instructional matters.	4.60	VH	4.51	VH	4.33	VH
4. Organizes external stakeholders association that can provide support and assistance to school improvement.	4.43	VH	4.54	VH	4.34	VH
5. Recognizes that students, teachers and parents are aware of their rights and responsibilities as primary stakeholders.	4.69	VH	4.57	VH	4.36	VH
Summated Mean	4.60	VH	4.55	VH	4.36	VH

Legend:

Rating	Mean Scale	Descriptive Equivalent
5	4.21 – 5.00	Very High (VH)
4	3.41 – 4.20	High (H)
3	2.61 – 3.40	Moderate (M)
2	1.81 – 2.60	Low (L)
1	1.00 – 1.80	Very Low (VL)

When it comes to the school community networks set-up and parent-teachers, non-academic personnel participation, the result of the analysis reveals that the school heads have rated themselves very high with a 4.60 summated mean. Though a bit lower than the school heads perception, still, the teachers as well as the stakeholders have given them (school heads) a very high performance assessment with summated means of 4.55 and 4.36, respectively.

Table 3f**Status of School-Based Management Practices In terms of School Environment**

Indicators	School Heads		Teachers		Stakeholders	
	AWM	DE	AWM	DE	AWM	DE
1. Organizes committees responsible for pupil's and personnel discipline, and other areas of school management.	4.57	VH	4.60	VH	4.38	VH
2. Implements and monitors school policies that encourage a child-friendly school environment.	4.69	VH	4.57	VH	4.46	VH
3. Ensures that the school environment is conducive to teaching and learning.	4.78	VH	4.57	VH	4.44	VH
4. Enforces the rules and regulations related to peace, order and security of the school.	4.71	VH	4.61	VH	4.40	VH
5. Properly informs the school community, parents and visitors regarding the security plan of the school.	4.60	VH	4.54	VH	4.36	VH
Summated Mean	4.67	VH	4.58	VH	4.41	VH

Legend:

Rating	Mean Scale	Descriptive Equivalent(DE)
5	4.21 – 5.00	Very High (VH)
4	3.41 – 4.20	High (H)
3	2.61 – 3.40	Moderate (M)
2	1.81 – 2.60	Low (L)
1	1.00 – 1.80	Very Low (VL)

In the aspect of school environment management practices, the heads of the integrated schools have generally given themselves the highest score among the ratings with a summated mean of 4.67 as portrayed in Table 3f. Although the summated means generated from the perception of the faculty members (4.58) and stakeholders (4.21) are lesser, these are still considered as very high.

Table 3g

Status of School-Based Management Practices In terms of School Curriculum, Implementation, Monitoring and Assessment

Indicators	School Heads		Teachers		Stakeholders	
	AWM	DE	AWM	DE	AWM	DE
1. Ensures that teachers implement the prescribe learning competencies.	4.72	VH	4.62	VH	4.43	VH
2. Assists the teachers in localizing and customizing curriculum based on pupil's needs.	4.53	VH	4.49	VH	4.37	VH
3. Encourages and assists the teachers to integrate the use of ICT's in the classroom.	4.59	VH	4.52	VH	4.36	VH
4. Assesses teachers to introduce, adapt or adopt new and innovative modes of instruction.	4.52	VH	4.54	VH	4.33	VH
5. Manifest knowledge of the curriculum design and content.	4.48	VH	4.46	VH	4.30	VH
Summated Mean	4.57	VH	4.52	VH	4.36	VH

Legend:

Rating	Mean Scale	Descriptive Equivalent
5	4.21 – 5.00	Very High (VH)
4	3.41 – 4.20	High (H)
3	2.61 – 3.40	Moderate (M)
2	1.81 – 2.60	Low (L)
1	1.00 – 1.80	Very Low (VL)

Meanwhile, Table 3g shows the perception of school heads, teachers and stakeholders on school curriculum, implementation, monitoring and assessment methods done by the first. As shown from the illustration, the preceptors have generally given themselves the highest rating with a summated mean of 4.57. This is followed by the overall scores from the teachers with 4.52 and from the stakeholders with 4.36 summated mean. The three overall assessment ratings are described as very high.

Table 3h**Status of School-Based Management Practices in Terms of School Programs, Projects, and Services**

Indicators	School Heads		Teachers		Stakeholders	
	AWM	DE	AWM	DE	AWM	DE
1. Provides school services such as guidance and counseling, health and safety services, food and nutrition services.	4.55	VH	4.51	VH	4.37	VH
2. Develops projects and programs which offer services to community.	4.43	VH	4.48	VH	4.24	VH
3. Develop outreach programs and projects for the learners in the community.	4.26	VH	4.41	VH	4.18	H
4. Designs with teachers school-based or cluster-based programs that will assist pupils including disadvantaged children and those with special needs.	4.41	VH	4.47	VH	4.27	VH
Summated Mean	4.41	VH	4.47	VH	4.26	VH

Legend:

Rating	Mean Scale	Descriptive Equivalent(DE)
5	4.21 – 5.00	Very High (VH)
4	3.41 – 4.20	High (H)
3	2.61 – 3.40	Moderate (M)
2	1.81 – 2.60	Low (L)
1	1.00 – 1.80	Very Low (VL)

In terms of the activities on school programs, projects and services, the teaching staffs have given the greatest rating of 4.47 summated mean indicating that the teachers perceive a very high performance of school heads in this particular responsibility. School heads and stakeholders likewise recognize the same generating summated means of 4.41 and 4.26, respectively. However, if examined closely, the development of outreach programs and projects for the learners in the community only gained a 4.18 weighted mean from the stakeholders signifying only a high level of evaluation. If compared to the self-assessment of the school heads

and views of teachers, this particular task is also graded with the lowest score among under activities under the above-mentioned parameter.

Table 3i**Status of School-Based Management Practices In terms of Innovative Modes of Instruction**

Indicators	School Heads		Teachers		Stakeholders	
	AWM	DE	AWM	DE	AWM	DE
1. Monitors the teaching and learning programs, focuses on established learning goals, and continually presses the pupils to higher level of achievement and development.	4.55	VH	4.56	VH	4.43	VH
2. Adopts individualized instruction especially for bottom-half or at risk pupils (slow learners).	4.43	VH	4.47	VH	4.33	VH
3. Implements the use of team teaching.	4.24	VH	4.41	VH	4.27	VH
4. Uses appropriate and accepted instruments for observing teachers.	4.55	VH	4.58	VH	4.35	VH
5. Guarantees that new and innovative teaching strategies are integrated in the teacher's daily lesson log/lesson plan and implemented in the classroom.	4.53	VH	4.59	VH	4.37	VH
Summated Mean	4.46	VH	4.52	VH	4.35	VH

Legend:

Rating	Mean Scale	Descriptive Equivalent (DE)
5	4.21 – 5.00	Very High (VH)
4	3.41 – 4.20	High (H)
3	2.61 – 3.40	Moderate (M)
2	1.81 – 2.60	Low (L)
1	1.00 – 1.80	Very Low (VL)

Overall, the respondents have given the school heads a very high assessment score as regards the implementation of innovative modes of instruction, as implied by the computed summated means of 4.46, 4.52 (being the highest), and 4.35 generated from the school heads themselves, faculty, and stakeholders, respectively.

2. Difference on the Perception of School Heads, Teachers, and Stakeholders on the School-Based Management.

To answer sub-problem number 3, the differences in the perception of secondary school heads, teachers, and stakeholders on the school-based management practices were determined using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). The results were portrayed in Tables 4a to 4i with their corresponding narrative explanation.

Table 4a

Difference on the Perception of School Heads, Teachers, and Stakeholders along Vision, Mission, Goals, and Objectives

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-value	Sig.
Between Groups	3.715	2	1.858	7.536**	0.001
Within Groups	127.192	516	0.246		
Total	130.907	518			

** - highly significant at 0.01

As delineated in Table 4a, the difference on the perception of the respondents along vision, mission, goals and objectives is highly significant at 0.01 level as signified by the F-value of 7.536 with significance of 0.001 which is lower than the set level of significance. This pertinent finding leads the researcher to reject the null hypothesis indicating that there is no significant difference among the perceptions of the school heads, teachers, and stakeholders along Vision, Mission, Goals and Objectives.

The highly significant differences could be further explained by the succeeding post-hoc test which determined who among the respondents have the highest rating towards the school heads' performance on the aforementioned parameter.

Post-Hoc Test

Compared Variables	Mean	Rank
School Heads	4.63 ^a	1
Teachers	4.59 ^a	2
Stakeholders	4.42 ^b	3

Means with the same superscripts are comparable

It is reflected from the above table that school heads and teachers have the same perception towards the management practices of the first in observing the mission, vision, goals and objectives of the school, in which the assessment ratings given are higher (4.63 and 4.59, respectively) compared to the stakeholders (4.42).

Table 4b

Difference on the Perception of School Heads, Teachers and Stakeholders along School Program Development and School Improvement Plan

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-value	Sig.
Between Groups	3.217	2	1.609	6.718**	0.001
Within Groups	123.570	516	0.239		
Total	126.788	518			

** - highly significant at 0.01

Similarly, the F-value of 6.718 with significant value of 0.001 denotes a highly significant difference at 0.01 level among the views of the principals, educators and stakeholders along school program development and school improvement plan. The null hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference among the perceptions of the respondents along school program development and school improvement plan is therefore rejected. The result can be more expounded in the post-hoc test presented in the next illustration.

Post-Hoc Test

Compared Variables	Mean	Rank
School Heads	4.54 ^a	2
Teachers	4.56 ^a	1
Stakeholders	4.39 ^b	3

Means with the same superscripts are comparable

After the post-hoc test, the analysis shows that the teachers have the highest evaluation rating on the school heads' practices on school program development and school improvement plan with the computed mean of 4.56, which however is analogous to the self-evaluation of the school heads (4.54). Yet again, the stakeholders have the lowest computed mean of 4.39.

Table 4c
Difference on the Perception of School Heads, Teachers and Stakeholders along Personnel, Physical and Fiscal Resources Management

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-value	Sig.
Between Groups	7.887	2	3.943	12.528**	0.000
Within Groups	162.417	516	0.315		
Total	170.303	518			

** - highly significant at 0.01

As for the difference among the perception of school heads, teachers and stakeholders along personnel, physical and fiscal resources management, the F-value 12.528 sig significance of 0.000 is highly significant at 0.01 level. The null hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference among the perception of school heads, teachers and stakeholders along personnel, physical and fiscal resources management is rejected. This can be explained in details in the illustrated in the next tabulated post-hoc test.

Post-Hoc Test

Compared Variables	Mean	Rank
School Heads	4.78 ^a	1
Teachers	4.50 ^b	2
Stakeholders	4.36 ^b	3

Means with the same superscripts are comparable

Based from the post-hoc test, the school heads have the highest perception on the management practices in line with personnel, physical and fiscal resources (4.78). The teachers and stakeholders, on the other hand, have comparable assessment with means 4.50 and 4.36, respectively.

Table 4d
Difference on the Perception of School Heads, Teachers and Stakeholders along Teaching and Non-Teaching Staff Development

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-value	Sig.
Between Groups	3.889	2	1.944	7.726**	0.000
Within Groups	129.856	516	0.252		
Total	133.744	518			

** - highly significant at 0.01

The f-value 7.726 and significance value of 0.000 likewise suggest a highly significant difference among the perception of the respondents along Teaching and Non-Teaching Staff Development. The result of the analysis signals the researcher to reject the null hypothesis saying that there is no significant difference among the perception of school heads, teachers and stakeholders along teaching and non-teaching staff development. The post hoc test reveals as to what group of the respondents have the highest perception on the abovementioned aspect of management practices.

Post-Hoc Test

Compared Variables	Mean	Rank
School Heads	4.63 ^a	1
Teachers	4.55 ^a	2
Stakeholders	4.39 ^b	3

Means with the same superscripts are comparable

It can be gleaned from the illustrated post-hoc test that school heads once again have greater perception on the teaching and non-teaching staff development as indicated by 4.63 mean, which however is comparable to teachers' evaluation with mean of 4.55. The stakeholders, once more, have provided the lowest assessment score to school heads on the said school-based management aspect.

Table 4e

Difference on the Perception of School Heads, Teachers and Stakeholders along School-Community Networks Set-up, Parents-Teachers, and Non-Academic Personnel Participation

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-value	Sig.
Between Groups	4.725	2	2.362	9.750**	0.000
Within Groups	125.019	516	0.242		
Total	129.744	518			

** - highly significant at 0.01

As for the school-community networks set-up, parents-teachers, and non-academic personnel participation, the difference on the perception of the respondents along with this parameter is also highly significant at 0.01 level as revealed by the F-value 9.750 with significance of 0.000. Hence, the null hypothesis which tells that there is no significant difference among the perception of school heads, teachers

and stakeholders along school-community networks set-up, parents-teachers, and non-academic personnel participation is rejected. The tabulated post-hoc test further describes the result of this analysis.

Post-Hoc Test

Compared Variables	Mean	Rank
School Heads	4.60 ^a	1
Teachers	4.55 ^a	2
Stakeholders	4.36 ^b	3

Means with the same superscripts are comparable

From the given outcome of the post-hoc test, the above table describes that the school heads and teachers have the same insights on the management practices of the heads on the said aspect as indicated by the nearly close means of 4.60 and 4.55, correspondingly. Stakeholders have lower level of viewpoints (4.36) compared to the other two groups of respondents.

Table 4f

Difference on the Perception of School Heads, Teachers and Stakeholders along School Environment

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-value	Sig.
Between Groups	4.367	2	2.184	10.504**	0.000
Within Groups	107.275	516	0.208		
Total	111.642	518			

** - highly significant at 0.01

Based from the statistical analysis presented in Table 4f, the null hypothesis which stated that there is no significant difference on the perception of school heads, teachers and stakeholders along school environment is rejected since the F-value of 10.504 with significance of 0.000 denotes a highly significant difference. The following post-hoc test reveals who among the respondents have greater views on the particular management parameter.

Post-Hoc Test

Compared Variables	Mean	Rank
School Heads	4.67 ^a	1
Teachers	4.58 ^a	2
Stakeholders	4.41 ^b	3

Means with the same superscripts are comparable

Just like the previous analyses, the school heads have the greatest self-assessment on the management practices on school environment as signified by the weighted mean of 4.67 which is comparable to the teachers' weighted mean of 4.58. The stakeholders have quite low perception the school environment status as evidenced by 4.41 mean.

Table 4g

Difference on the Perception of School Heads, Teachers and Stakeholders along School Curriculum, Implementation, Monitoring and Assessment

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-value	Sig.
Between Groups	3.579	2	1.790	7.689**	0.001
Within Groups	120.097	516	0.233		
Total	123.676	518			

** - highly significant at 0.01

A highly significant difference among the perception of school heads, teachers and stakeholders along school curriculum, implementation, monitoring and assessment is denoted by the F-value 7.869 and significance of 0.001. This leads the researcher to reject the null hypothesis which tells that there is no significant difference among the perception of school heads, teachers and stakeholders along school curriculum, implementation, monitoring and assessment. This is further explained by post-hoc test presented on the next table.

Post-Hoc Test

Compared Variables	Mean	Rank
School Heads	4.57 ^a	1
Teachers	4.52 ^a	2
Stakeholders	4.36 ^b	3

Means with the same superscripts are comparable

From the post-hoc test, it reveals that the school heads have the highest evaluation on themselves with mean of 4.57 which is also quite near teachers' perception with 4.52. The two values are comparable which means they have the same perception on how the school heads able to manage school curriculum, implementation, monitoring and assessment. Stakeholders have lower ratings compared to the other respondents.

Table 4h
Difference on the Perception of School Heads, Teachers and Stakeholders along School Programs, Projects and Services

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-value	Sig.
Between Groups	4.527	2	2.263	7.359**	0.001
Within Groups	158.713	516	0.308		
Total	163.240	518			

** - highly significant at 0.01

In terms of school programs, projects and services, the difference among the Perception of school heads, teachers and stakeholders is highly significant as conveyed by the F-value of 7.359 with significance of 0.001. This consequently leads to the rejection of null hypothesis saying there is no significant difference among the Perception of school heads, teachers and stakeholders along school programs, projects and services. Furthermore, post hoc test further elucidate this particular result.

Post-Hoc Test

Compared Variables	Mean	Rank
School Heads	4.41 ^a	2
Teachers	4.47 ^a	1
Stakeholders	4.26 ^b	3

Means with the same superscripts are comparable

As presented, the educator have the greater assessment score towards the school heads with 4.47 mean however still comparable with the heads' self-evaluation generating 4.41 mean. The stakeholders once again have the lowest perception towards the heads in terms of the responsibilities on school programs, projects and services.

Table 4i
Difference on the Perception of School Heads, Teachers and Stakeholders along Innovative Modes of Instruction

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F-value	Sig.
Between Groups	3.253	2	1.627	7.014**	0.001
Within Groups	119.672	516	0.232		
Total	122.926	518			

** - highly significant at 0.01

Lastly, the F-value 7.014 with significance of 0.001 indicates a highly significant difference among the perception of school heads, teachers and stakeholders along innovative modes of instruction. This results to the rejection of the null hypothesis which states that there is no significant difference among the perception of school heads, teachers and stakeholders along innovative modes of instruction. Moreover, the result is more justified based on the post-hoc test.

Post-Hoc Test

Compared Variables	Mean	Rank
School Heads	4.46 ^{ab}	2
Teachers	4.52 ^a	1
Stakeholders	4.35 ^b	3

Means with the same superscripts are comparable

Looking at the post-hoc test, it shows that the teachers have highest level of perception towards the school heads' management practices on innovative modes of instruction with mean of 4.52. This is followed by the assessment of the school heads having a mean of 4.46 and from stakeholders with a 4.35 mean. It can also be gleaned that the self-evaluation of the school principals can actually be similar to the perception of both teachers and stakeholders. This might mean that they (school heads) actually agree to the insights of the other group of respondents.

The relationship between the status of school-based management practices of school heads in the integrated school and their corresponding profiles revealed to be all not significant as indicated by r- values of 0.086 (age), -0.023 (sex), 0.061 (civil status), -0.031 (highest educational attainment), -0.042 (school attended), -0.035 (area of specialization), 0.169 (years of experience), 0.162 (attendance in training) and 0.000 (membership) with significance values of 0.523, 0.866, 0.652, 0.818, 0.757, 0.795, 0.205, 0.224 and 0.998, respectively.

3. Relationship Between the Status of School-Based Management Practices in Integrated School and Profile of School Heads

Table 5

Relationship Between the Status of School-Based Management Practices in Integrated School and Profile of School Heads

Profile of School Heads	Status of School-Based Management Practices	
	r – value	Significance
Age	0.086 ^{ns}	0.523
Sex	-0.023 ^{ns}	0.866
Civil Status	0.061 ^{ns}	0.652
Highest Educational Attainment	-0.031 ^{ns}	0.818
School Attended	-0.042 ^{ns}	0.757
Number of Years of Experience as School Head	0.169 ^{ns}	0.205
Attendance in Training	0.162 ^{ns}	0.224
Membership in Professional Organization	0.000 ^{ns}	0.998

ns – not significant

The result implies that profile of school heads did not affect the status of school-based management as practiced by school heads in schools.

This led to the acceptance of the null hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between the status of school-based management practices in the schools and the profile of school heads.

Summary of Findings

Based on the analysis and interpretation of data, the following are the findings of the study:

This study determined the status of Benchmarking on School-Based Management in Laguna Division during the school year 2018-2019. Specifically, it dealt on the profile of the secondary school heads in terms age, sex, civil status, highest educational attainment, number of years of experience as school head, attendance in school based management training, membership to professional organization; the status of school-based management practices as perceived by the school heads themselves, teachers and stakeholders in terms Vision, mission goals and objectives, School Program Development and School Improvement Plan, Personnel, Physical and Fiscal Resources Management, Teaching and Non-teaching Staff Development, School-community Networks set-up and parents-teachers, non-academic personnel

participation, School Environment, School Curriculum: Implementation, Monitoring and Assessment, h. School Programs, Projects and Services, and Innovative Modes of Instruction; and significant differences among the perceptions of the school heads, teachers, and stakeholders on the School-Based Management along the aforementioned parameters.

Findings

1. Profile of Respondents

Age. Out of 40 secondary school heads who participated in the study, middle-aged adults aged 36-50 years comprise the largest distribution of the respondents (25 or 62.50%). This is followed by 10 school heads with ages ranging from 51 to 65 years (10 or 25%), while the least of the respondents are in the younger age bracket of 20-35 years (5 or 12.50%).

Sex. In terms of sex, female school heads (25 or 62.50%) predominated over the male respondents (15 or 37.50%).

Civil Status. The majority of the population is married (35 or 87.50%), some are single (3 or 7.50%), while the remaining 2 are widows (5%).

Highest Educational Attainment. Most of the school heads have a doctorate degree, with a frequency of 24, or about 60% of the population. Close to these figures are 16 doctorate degree holders who comprise 40 percent of the respondents.

Number of Years of Experience as School Head. The majority of the school heads (14 or 35%) have been in service for about 11-15 years, while some (8 or 20%) have been working as school heads for about 16-20 years.

Furthermore, there are 7 respondents (17.50%) who claimed to be in such a position for 0-5 years, whilst the other 6 (15%) have been in service for 6-10 years. The remaining 5 (12.50%) have 21 years or more of experience as the head of their institution.

Attendance in School-Based Management Training. The bulk of the respondents have 2 trainings (14 or 35%). However, there are 13 school heads (32.50%) who have attended 3 trainings, whilst 7 school principals (17.50%) have 1 SBM training, and the remaining 6 (15%) have taken part in four trainings/seminars/or workshops.

Membership in Professional Organization. Based on the gathered data, most of the respondents (21 or 52.50%) are affiliated with a local professional organization. Some (14 or 35%) are members of regional licensed body. However, there are also a few who are associates of a nationwide professional organization.

2. Status of School-Based Management Practices

On Vision, Mission, Goals, and Objectives. The school heads, the teachers, and the stakeholders have a very high perception of attaining the vision, mission, goals, and objectives of every school as indicated by the corresponding summated means of 4.63, 4.59, and 4.42

On School Program Development and School Improvement Plan. The head teachers, faculty members, and stakeholders have very high ratings on the school heads' school program development and school improvement plan as revealed by the computed summated means of 4.54, 4.56, and 4.39, respectively.

On Personnel, Physical, and Fiscal Resources Management. As for the status of personnel, physical and fiscal resources management, the school heads have rated themselves of a very high performance on this particular aspect as indicated by the summated mean of 4.78. Likewise, the teachers and stakeholders have the same perception with 4.50 and 4.36 summated means, respectively, signifying a very high appraisal.

On Teaching and Non-teaching Staff Development. There is generally a very high evaluation of the school heads, the lecturers and the stakeholders as regards to the teaching and non-teaching staff development of the principals, with the following corresponding means 4.63, 4.55, and 4.39

On School-community Networks set-up and parents-teachers, non-academic personnel participation. The result of the analysis reveals that the school heads have rated themselves very high, with a 4.60 summated mean. Likewise, the teachers as well as the stakeholders have given them (school heads) a very high performance assessment with summated means of 4.55 and 4.36, respectively

On School Environment. In this aspect, the heads of the integrated schools have generally given themselves the highest score among the ratings, with a summated mean of 4.67. Although the summated means generated from the perception of the faculty members (4.58) and stakeholders (4.21) are lower, these are still considered as very high.

On School Curriculum: Implementation, Monitoring and Assessment. The preceptors have generally given themselves the highest rating with a summated mean of 4.57. This is followed by the overall scores from the teachers with 4.52 and from the stakeholders with 4.36 summated mean. The three overall assessment ratings are described as very high.

On School Programs, Projects, and Services. The teaching staff has given the greatest rating of 4.47 summated mean, indicating that the teachers perceive a very high performance of school heads in this

particular responsibility. School heads and stakeholders likewise recognize the same generating summated means of 4.41 and 4.26, respectively.

On Innovative Modes of Instruction. Overall, the respondents have given the school heads a very high assessment score as regards the implementation of innovative modes of instruction, as implied by the computed summated means of 4.46, 4.52 (being the highest), and 4.35 generated from the school heads themselves, faculty, and stakeholders, respectively.

3. Differences in the Perception of School Heads, Teachers, and Stakeholders on the School-Based Management

Along with Vision, Mission, Goals, and Objectives. The difference in the perception of the respondents along vision, mission, goals, and objectives is highly significant at the 0.01 level, as signified by the F-value of 7.536, with significance of 0.001, which is lower than the set level of significance

Along with the School Program Development and the School Improvement Plan. The F-value of 6.718 with a significant value of 0.001 denotes a highly significant difference at the 0.01 level among the views of the principals, educators, and stakeholders on school program development and school improvement plan.

Along with Personnel, Physical, and Fiscal Resources Management. As for the difference among the perception of school heads, teachers, and stakeholders along personnel, physical, and fiscal resources management, the F-value 12.528, with a significance of 0.000, is highly significant at the 0.01 level.

Along with Teaching and Non-teaching Staff Development. The f-value 7.726 and significance value of 0.000 likewise suggest a highly significant difference among the perception of the respondents along Teaching and Non-Teaching Staff Development.

Along with the School-community Networks set-up, parents, teachers, and non-academic personnel participate. As for the school-community networks set-up, parents-teachers, and non-academic personnel participation, the difference in the perception of the respondents along with this parameter is also highly significant at the 0.01 level as revealed by the F-value 9.750 with significance of 0.000.

Along School Environment. The F-value of 10.504 with significance of 0.000 denotes a highly significant difference in the perception of school heads, teachers, and stakeholders regarding the school environment is rejected since

Along School Curriculum: Implementation, Monitoring and Assessment. A highly significant difference among the perception of school heads, teachers, and stakeholders along school curriculum, implementation, monitoring, and assessment is denoted by the F-value 7.869 and significance of 0.001.

Along with School Programs, Projects, and Services. In terms of school programs, projects, and services, the difference among the perceptions of school heads, teachers, and stakeholders is highly significant, as conveyed by the F-value of 7.359 with significance of 0.001.

Along with Innovative Modes of Instruction. The F-value 7.014 with significance of 0.001 indicates a highly significant difference among the perceptions of school heads, teachers, and stakeholders along innovative modes of instruction.

4. Significant Relationship between the Perceived Skills and the Profile of the School Heads

The relationship between the status of school-based management practices of school heads in the integrated school and their corresponding profiles revealed to be all not significant as indicated by r-values of 0.086 (age), -0.023 (sex), 0.061 (civil status), -0.031 (highest educational attainment), -0.042 (school attended), -0.035 (area of specialization), 0.169 (years of experience), 0.162 (attendance in training) and 0.000 (membership) with significance values of 0.523, 0.866, 0.652, 0.818, 0.757, 0.795, 0.205, 0.224 and 0.998, respectively.

Conclusions

Based on the findings, the following conclusions are drawn:

1. School heads are 36-50 years old, married females, with doctoral units, with 11-15 years of experience as school heads, have limited school-based management training, and are members of local professional organizations.
2. The school heads, teachers, and stakeholders have comparable insights as to how the school heads have effectively observed and implemented various practices in different aspects of the school-based management system.
3. Despite the very high rating provided by stakeholders, they still consistently have the lowest level of evaluation towards the school heads' performance, which might mean a need for further transparency of schemes and encouragement of active participation of every member of the school community towards the improvement of the institution.
4. The profile of school heads did not affect the status of school-based management as practiced by school heads.

Recommendations

Based on the conclusions, the following are recommended.

1. School heads must undergo comprehensive school-based management training so as to enable them to efficiently utilize their administrative skills in operating and enhancing the entire school system.

2. They must be encouraged to pursue and finish their post-graduate courses for them to attain supplementary learning necessary to manage their respective educational institutions.
3. They must inspire and communicate with their subordinates, faculty, staff, students, parents, and other members of the school community to actively participate and commit themselves to various programs designed to effectively implement the policies, consequently improving schools' performances.

References

- Abu-Duhou, I., "Fundamentals of Educational Planning: School-Based Management", UNESCO: International Institute for Educational Planning, 2009.
- Brown, Daniel. "Decentralization and School Based Management, Rex Bookstore, 2000.
- Downie, N.M & Health, R.W (Fifth Edition), Basic Statistical Methods, 2000.
- Fernandino, V.L. "The Embattled principal. New York Prentice Hall, 2003.
- Levacie, R. "Local Management of Schools: Analysis and Practice, Buckingham: Open University Press, 2007.
- Local Government Code of the Philippines (R.A. 7160)
- Department of Education. A Primer on Republic Act 9155 or the Governance of Basic Education Act was ratified in 2001.
- Department of Education. A Primer on Medium-Term Philippine Development Plan (MTPDP 2004-2010)
- Department of Education. A Primer on School-Based Management, 2006.
- DESC Order No. 230
- Cawelti, H. Maximizing the Performance of Education System: The Care of teacher Absenteeism in the Many Faces of Corruption Tracking, 2004.
- Coomb, A Multi-level Framework for Self Management in Schools. International Journal of Educational Management, 2004.
- Cavanaugh & Clark, S.A. Assessment of SBM, Vol. 1: Findings and Conclusions, Los Angeles, University of South California, 2007.
- David, N.F. How to Make the Most of Local Management, 2005.
- Hackman & Johnson, Emerging Dimensions of Decentralization Debate in the Age of Globalization, Munich, University of Munich, 2000.
- Hughes, Duskby and Staniszewski, Building Partnerships Towards the Creation of Effective Schools: An Australian Case Study: Paper Presented at the ERA-AARE Joint Conference, Singapore, 2008.

- Kouzes and Posner, *The Politics of School Management: Understanding the Process of Devolving the Authority in Urban School Districts*, 2002
- Lapus, J. and M. Suan, *Principals Role in School Empowerment*, 2008.
- Liethwood, C.K., *Department of Education Management and Policy Studies, University of Pretoria, South Africa*, 2002.
- Lindelow, J., *The Social Context of Effective Schools*, 2009
- Lontayo, K.M., *Forms and Effects of SBM: A Review*, 2007.
- Myres and Stonehill, *Creating and Managing the Democratic School*, 2007.
- Moore & Kearsley, *SBM, How Effective Is It?*, 2006.
- Pepper & Thomas, *School Leadership and Administrator: Adopting a Cultural Perspective*, London, Routledge, *New Boundaries of School-Based Management* 2002.
- Rousmaniere, R.T., *Who Should Govern Education. Journal of Educational Planning and Administration*, 2007.
- Sergiovanni, E.M. *SBM: Key Strategies for Success*, 2006.
- Usdan, McCloud, & Podmostko, *SBM and Its Effects On Teachers Commitment. International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 2000.
- Wohlstetter, *Transforming Education on the Ground: Fifty Studies of SBM under TEEP*, 2004.
- Carrera, Wilma S. "Implementation of School Improvement Plans of the Top Five Performing Schools in the Division of Pangasinan I, Unpublished Dissertation, University of Pangasinan, 2011.
- Pablo, Jonardo Y. "Development and Validation of a Culture-Bound Instrument to Assess the SBM Functions of Public Elementary School Managers", Unpublished Dissertation, Philippine Normal University, Manila, 2009.
- Recto, Angel S. "Initial Assessment of the Responsibilities of Public Elementary School Principals in a Division Using School-Based Management (SBM) Model: Input to Leadership and Management Guidelines Formulation" Unpublished Dissertation, Philippine Normal University, Manila, 2009.
- Talavera, Catherine P. "Readiness Level of School Managers on SBM: Basis for the Development of Leadership and Management Manual", Unpublished Dissertation, Philippine Normal University, Manila, 2007.
- Tuguinayo, Jose Jr. "School-Based Management Practices: The Case of Public Secondary School Principals in the Cordillera Administrative Region (CAR)", Unpublished Dissertation, Philippine Normal University, Manila, 2010.

<http://www.lhstech.com/chair/ETPP/History%20of%20Management%20Theory.pdf>
www.globaleducation.com.
educ.consumer guide, no.4,jan.1993)
<http://www.relatedliterature.com>.