

Development of Division Technical Assistance Plan Focused on Schools with Developing School-Based Management Level Of Practice

Dr. Jonathan P. Domingo, Irene C. Domingo, Ian Ismael E. Marces

Department of Education
Antipolo City, Philippines

Abstract – The study aimed to determine the status of the schools with Developing SBM Level of Practice in terms of the thematic areas and principles and elicit perceptions from the School Heads and SBM Coordinators on factors affecting their SBM Level of Practice. This study utilized qualitative research through the analysis of submitted SBM documents focused on the SBM themes and principles and written interview as well as focus group discussion to the School Heads and SBM coordinators of 17 Schools in the Division of Antipolo City identified with Developing SBM Level of Practice regarding the facilitating and hindering factors. This study focused only on the 17 schools identified with Developing SBM Level of Practice from SY 2013-2015. Also, the study was limited only on reports gathered from SY 2013-2015 since there were no NAT results yet available from SY 2016 up to present. Based on the findings of this study, the following conclusions were drawn: (1) Majority of the developing schools were categorized as “Below Marginal” in terms Access while majority were categorized as “Marginal” in terms of Efficiency and Quality, (2) All of the 17 developing schools were categorized as “Good” in terms the 4 SBM principles, (3) Most hindering factor that affected the SBM level of practice is “Organizing and Filing of Artifacts” and (4) Most facilitating factor that helped to improve is “Support and Communication to the Stakeholders”. Therefore, based on the conclusions of this study, the following are hereby recommended: (1) The school should include programs and projects in E-SIP that answers school performance indicator, (2) The school should allow stakeholders to initiate programs and projects related to different SBM Principles, (3) The school should increase the teachers’ awareness on the importance of SBM and needed artifacts for the improvement of their SBM level of practice, (4) The school should sustain the best practices that facilitate improvement in their SBM level of practice and (5) A parallel study can be done by other schools division to determine the factors that affects the SBM level of practice in their respective divisions.

Keywords – Level of Practice, School-based Management, Technical Assistance

INTRODUCTION

DepEd Order No. 83 s. 2012 re: Implementing Guidelines on the Revised School-Based Management (SBM) Framework, Assessment Process and Tool (APAT) provides for the unified implementation of the enhanced SBM practice and school Accreditation Program through PASBE (Philippine Accreditation System for basic Education).

Based on DepEd Order No. 83 s. 2012, the SBM level of Practice is determined by a composite score derived from sixty percent (60%) demonstrated performance improvements (PI’s) along the following thematic areas: Access, Efficiency and Quality and forty percent (40%) from the result of the validated self-assessment process using the standardized SBM Assessment Rubric which composed the Governance portion. The system is guided by four ACCESS principles

on leadership and governance, curriculum and learning, resource management, and accountability for higher learning outcomes. The unit of analysis is the school system, the resulting level may be classified as developing, maturing, or advanced (accredited level).

While most of the schools have improved from Developing to Maturing, it was found out based on the SBM Reports collected that there were 17 out of 65 or 26% of the schools (14 Elementary and 3 secondary) remained with “Developing or Basic” SBM Level of Practice for three consecutive school years, from SY 2013-2015. This implies that the 17 developing schools are lagging in terms of the different performance indicators and depth of SBM practice alongside the 4 principles. In addition, record shows that 1 Elementary school belongs to District 1-A, 2 (1 Elem & 1 Sec) from District 1-D, 1 Elementary School from District 2-A, 2 Elementary Schools from District 2-B, 3 Elementary Schools from District 2-C, 2 Elementary Schools from Districts 2-D and 2-E, and 4 (2 Elem & 2 Sec) from District 2-F. In terms of size, record also shows that out of the 17 schools, 10 or 59% (8 Elem & 2 Sec) are categorized as small schools, 2 or 12% are medium (Elem only), 3 or 18% are large schools (2 Elem & 1 Sec), and 2 or 12% are very large (Elem only). In addition, data also shows that out of the 17 schools, 6 or 35% (4 Elem & 2 Sec) are from Rural area while 11 or 65% (10 Elem & 1 Sec). Furthermore, data revealed that 6 or 35% (4 Elem & 2 Sec) of the said schools have one shift of class, 9 or 53% (8 Elem & 1 Sec) have 2 shifts and 2 or 12% (Elem only) with 3 shifts.

This paper aimed to gather information as to the commonalities on the SBM thematic areas and principles where most of the 17 developing schools got low scores. Also, the researchers would like to determine the perceptions of the school heads and SBM Coordinators regarding the different facilitating and hindering factors that affected their SBM Level of Practice. The data gathered was used in crafting of the Division SBM Technical Assistance (TA) Plan to help the 17 schools improve their SBM Level of Practice from Developing to Maturing.

LITERATURE REVIEW

In 2000, San Miguel Central School of San Miguel, Leyte (Region VIII) showed poor pupil performance due to ineffective teaching, insufficient textbooks and IMs, uncooperative parents, dilapidated school buildings, and inadequate facilities. From that problem, they had needs-assessment session in 2002 with the school constituencies prior to the formulation of SIP/AIP; crafted various interventions and strategies to address identified problems. They used SIP/AIP as benchmarks for success; commitment from stakeholders to meet set targets. From that action, they were able to improve the MPS in NAT from 47.59 (in 2003) to 77.63 (in 2005)

Calaoacan Elementary School of Rizal, Kalinga (CAR) is a melting pot of people from diverse ethnic backgrounds and cultural origins: Igorots (dominant), Pangasinenses, Ilocanos, and Tagalogs. They have history of community involvement in education since 1999 whereas parents participate in school affairs and school beautification. Standards deteriorating; achievement scores were below national averages. In 2003, had the first documented PTCA meeting; it was during this meeting that the 5-yr SIP was reviewed, revised, and finalized. Low scores impelled school and its stakeholders to specify its targets, set indicators, and map out strategies such as INSET and parent cooperation to supervise studies at home. From that, they improved MPS in NAT from 46.50 (in 2003) to 74.29 (in 2005).

In 1999, Silingan Elementary School of RT Lim, Zamboanga Sibugay (Region IX) beset with problems of children’s lack of motivation to study, absences and tardiness due to house chores, inattentiveness in class due to hunger and malnutrition, high dropout rates, perceived lack of discipline and laxity of teachers, and school’s poor overall performance. PTCA and barangay supported the school as evidenced by the institutionalization of school feeding program for all pupils started in 1999. Prior to SBM, a certain degree of independence in decision making was already being practiced but with the formal

implementation of SBM, the school and principal enjoyed and optimized greater academic and fiscal leeway while being held responsible for student outcomes and accountable to a wider community. Shift in priority: from the rudimentary sense of meeting the most basic need (food) to moving school goals several notches higher – academic standards. Improved MPS in NAT from 44.93 (in 2003) to 67.55 (in 2005).

Recommendation from the study of Cabardo (2016) states that schools may improve the level of School-Based Management Implementation in order to improve the level of participation of the school stakeholders to the different school initiated activities. Seminars and conferences may be conducted within the school level to disseminate the information and the importance of School-Based Management to the different stakeholders.

According to the studies conducted by Domingo, J., Domingo, I., and Marces, I (2018), Majority of the SBM Coordinators expressed positive responses in determining the SBM Level of Practice after using the SBM E-tool and the utilization of the SBM E-tool helped the SBM Coordinators in making their report more accurate, easier and faster.

The improvement of the schools' performance in terms of their NAT results was achieved by San Miguel Central School of San Miguel, Leyte (2005), Calaoacan Elementary School of Rizal, Kalinga (2005) and Silingan Elementary School of RT Lim, Zamboanga Sibugay (2005) can be attributed from effective implementation of SBM in the schools by involving other stakeholders in the different school activities, crafting of SIP, supervise studies of own children at home, conduct of different programs and projects and among others. Likewise, the study of Cabardo recognizes the importance of involving the stakeholders in school-initiated activities in order to improve the SBM level of practice. While SBM initiatives in the above-mentioned schools yielded positive outcomes, perceptions of both the School Heads and SBM Coordinators regarding the facilitating and hindering factors were not clearly stated.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The study aimed to determine the status of the schools with Developing SBM Level of Practice in terms of the thematic areas and principles and elicit perceptions from the School Heads and SBM Coordinators on factors affecting their SBM Level of Practice.

Specifically, this study sought to find answers to the following questions:

1. What are the commonalities of the 17 Developing Schools in terms of the SBM thematic areas?

- 1.1. Access;
- 1.2. Efficiency; and
- 1.3. Quality?

2. What are the commonalities of the 17 Developing Schools in terms of the four (4) SBM principles?

- 2.1. Leadership and Governance;
- 2.2. Curriculum and Instruction;
- 2.3. Accountability and Continuous Improvement; and
- 2.4. Management of Resources?

3. What are the facilitating and hindering factors that affected their SBM Level of Practice as identified by their School Heads and SBM Coordinators?

4. What TA Plan can be proposed to address the identified hindering factors?

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study utilized qualitative research through the analysis of submitted SBM documents focused on the SBM themes and principles and written interview as well as focus group discussion to the School Heads and SBM coordinators regarding the facilitating and hindering factors. The study was divided into three parts: (1) Preparatory Activities, (2) Actual Conduct of the Action Research and (3) Post Activities. For the preparatory activities, memorandum for research was crafted and was uploaded for information dissemination. Guide questions was also crafted prior the interview to the School Heads and SBM Coordinators. For the actual conduct of the Action Research, a meeting with the School Heads and SBM Coordinators

was conducted. Interviews and FGDs was done during the meeting. Recording of the actual interview to the respondents was of great help to analyze and interpret what transpired during the interviews and FGDs. The responses was used in order to draw conclusion and eventually give recommendations. And for the post activities, using all the gathered data and results, the said research was completed and submitted.

The study was conducted in the 17 Schools in the Division of Antipolo City identified with Developing SBM Level of Practice comprising of 14 Elementary and 3 secondary Schools. The respondents of the study were the 14 Elementary and 3 Secondary School Heads and SBM Coordinators.

This study was focused only on the 17 schools identified with Developing SBM Level of Practice from SY 2013-2015. Also, the study was limited only on reports gathered from SY 2013-2015 since there were no NAT results yet available from SY 2016 up to present. The data collected from the said school years were validated by the Division SBM Validation Team. The SBM reports were also generated using the

SBM E-tool. Thus, the validity, accuracy and completeness of the reports are ensured.

SECONDARY SCHOOLS	SY13-14		SY14-15		SY15-16	
	Score	Level	Score	Level	Score	Level
1 Calawis NHS	1.01	Developing	1.01	Developing	0.73	Developing
2 Canumay NHS	0.74	Developing	1.19	Developing	1.09	Developing
3 Mayamot NHS	0.86	Developing	2.09	Developing	0.73	Developing

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS	SY13-14		SY14-15		SY15-16	
	Score	Level	Score	Level	Score	Level
1 Apia ES	1.06	Developing	1.02	Developing	0.96	Developing
2 Cabading ES	1.07	Developing	1.07	Developing	1.41	Developing
3 Canumay ES	1.06	Developing	1.47	Developing	1.17	Developing
4 Cupang ES	1.48	Developing	1.48	Developing	1.14	Developing
5 Cupang ES Annex	1.31	Developing	1.39	Developing	1.13	Developing
6 Dalig ES	1.03	Developing	1.02	Developing	0.76	Developing
7 Jesus Cabarrus ES	0.98	Developing	1.20	Developing	0.76	Developing
8 Juan Sumulong ES	0.51	Developing	0.51	Developing	1.02	Developing
9 Kaila ES	1.44	Developing	1.44	Developing	0.97	Developing
10 Kaysakat ES	1.05	Developing	1.05	Developing	1.24	Developing
11 Mambugan I ES	1.04	Developing	1.12	Developing	1.10	Developing
12 Pantay ES	0.56	Developing	1.06	Developing	1.45	Developing
13 Sta. Cruz ES	1.37	Developing	1.37	Developing	1.20	Developing
14 Teofila A. Rovero ES	1.06	Developing	1.19	Developing	1.47	Developing

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Table 1. Commonalities of the Developing Schools in terms of SBM Thematic Areas

SBM Thematic Areas	Below Marginal (below 0.1)	%	Marginal (0.1 – 1.09)	%	Average (1.1 – 2.09)	%	High (2.1 – 3.0)	%
1. Access	10	59%	6	35%	1	6%	0	0
2. Efficiency	4	24%	13	76%	0	0	0	0
3. Quality	0	0	12	71%	4	24%	1	5%

The table 1 presents the commonalities of the developing schools in terms of SBM thematic areas namely Access, Efficiency and Quality. It can be gleaned from the table that in terms of Access, out of 17 developing schools, 10 or 59% were categorized as “Below Marginal”, 6 or 35% categorized as “Marginal” while 1 or 6% categorized as “Average”. In terms of Efficiency, 4 or 24% were categorized as “Below Marginal”

and 13 or 76% categorized as “Marginal”. And in terms of Quality, 12 or 71% categorized as “Marginal”, 4 or 24% categorized as “Average” and 1 or 5% belongs to “High”. Therefore, majority of the developing schools in terms Access were categorized as “Below Marginal” while in terms of Efficiency and Quality, majority were categorized as “Marginal”.

Table 2. Commonalities of the Developing Schools in terms of SBM Principles

SBM Principles	Good (0.50-1.49)	%	Better (1.50-2.49)	%	Best (2.50-3.0)	%
1. Leadership and Governance	17	100%	0	0	0	0
2. Curriculum and Instruction	17	100%	0	0	0	0
3. Accountability and Continuous Improvement	17	100%	0	0	0	0
4. Management of Resources	17	100%	0	0	0	0

The table 2 presents the commonalities of the developing schools in terms of SBM principles namely Leadership and Governance, Curriculum and Instruction, Accountability and Continuous Improvement and Management of Resources. It

can be gleaned from the table that in terms of the 4 SBM principles, All of the 17 developing schools were categorized as “Good”, Therefore, All of the developing schools in terms the 4 SBM principles were categorized as “Good”.

Table 3. Theming and Coding on Hindering Factors that Affected the SBM Level of Practice as Identified by the School Heads and SBM Coordinators

Theme	Actual Responses	f	%
Organizing and Filing of Documents and Artifacts	(1) No proper documentation, (2) Undocumented activities, (3) Artifacts are not arranged and compiled properly according to their principle, (4) Tasking gathering and keeping of records, (5) Inconsistency of documentation due to overlapping of activities, (6) Revise filing, (7) Time consuming Data gathering, (8) Unorganized data, (9) Organizing of documents/data needed, (10) Profiling/ gathering of data, (11) Retrieval of data from previous years, (12) Collection of artifact from concern people/ teachers, (13) Collecting artifacts, (14) Data collection, (15) Collecting artifacts to persons involved, (16) Collecting of artifacts from the committee assigned teachers, (17) Gathering and keeping of records needed for the SBM E-tool, (18) We find it hard to file the artifacts for each principle.	18	18%
Teachers’ Attitude toward SBM	(1) Teachers attitude towards report, (2) Lack of responsibilities of teachers in giving their reports, (3) Too many task for a teacher, (4) Some members does not perform their designated task, (5) Cooperation of teachers, (6) Some faculty members are not doing their part, uncommitted, (7) overload of assignment, (8) Active engagement of stakeholders and parents, (9) Involvement of key players due to time constraints , (10) Not all teachers are cooperative and committees, (11) Participation of teachers in collecting the artifacts, (12) Participation of teachers, (13) Low commitment of teachers/staff, (14) Unsupportive (some staff), (15) Lack of cooperation from the members, (16) interest of the team to cooperate in the success of the coverage of SBM, (17) Poor participation of other teachers and dedicative is contributing how to improve the school measures.	17	17%

<p>Increasing Dropout rate</p>	<p>(1) The dropout rate which is really unavoidable, (2) The hindering factors that affected our SBM level of practice is Drop-out rate, (3) Dropout rate (though we are decreasing in terms of dropout rate we are still far from reaching our target), (4) The drop-out rate affects much on the SBM level of practice, (5) Uncontrolled performance indicators like drop-out rate, (6) Dropped out rate, (7) Some uncontrolled factors like dropped out rate, (8) Great number of dropouts , (9) The hindering factors that affect our SBM level of practice are the drop-out rate which is one of our problem. Sometimes dropout rate cause by far distance from school and child labor, (10) High drop-out rate, (11) Uncontrollable specifically school drop-out rates affect our level of practice, (12) Performance indicator which are repeatedly decreasing/ fluctuating – dropout, (13) Performance indicators in the thematic area especially (drop-out) efficiency.</p>	<p>13</p>	<p>13%</p>
<p>Insufficient Resources and Time</p>	<p>(1) Insufficient resources, (2) Lack of time in gathering data, (3) Not enough time, (4) Lack of resources, (5) Time, (6)Lack of labor force in consolidating data, (7)Lack of time due to other school matters that need to attend, (8) Insufficient funds to purchase materials for data filling purpose, (9) Time management and lack of human resources, (10) Time management, (11) Time management hinders the SBM level of practice, (12) Those members cannot fully supply the needed artifacts due to time.</p>	<p>12</p>	<p>12%</p>
<p>Incomplete Data and Documents</p>	<p>(1) Incomplete data or evidence, (2)Insufficient data, (3) Lost evidence/artifacts, (4) Lack of evidence/ artifacts, (5) Artifacts from concerned teachers are not organized and collected consistently, (6)Availability of some documents especially when reports in SBM are needed, (7) Lack of data on the previous years, (8) Sometimes data are not available, (9) Files are not available, (10) Some teachers failed to submit the needed artifacts for the SBM, (11) Lack of reports needed, (12) Lack of proper documenting of artifacts</p>	<p>12</p>	<p>12%</p>
<p>Stakeholder's Support</p>	<p>(1) Sustainable support from stakeholders, (2) The lack of community support, (3) Less stakeholders involvement, (4) Support from external stakeholders, (5) Community is resistant to the change being implemented even if being informed and help of the barangay sitio chairman, (6) The culture of the school GPTA officers and parents who are elected but don't cooperate due to fractioning of gossiping have been dismayed to the practice of past school heads, (7) Active participation of stakeholders and parents, (8) Communication and monitoring with stakeholders, (9) One school is lacked stakeholders, (10) Stakeholders time during our meeting, (11) The inconsistency of support from stakeholders</p>	<p>11</p>	<p>11%</p>
<p>Students' Performance</p>	<p>(1) Students' performance below EFA target as reflected on MPS of Periodical test, (2) Low NAT results, (3) Sometimes poor performance of students, (4) Students Low performance, (5) NAT results, (6) Test results are also affect our SBM level of practice because pupils has low retention budget for every projects on SBM area, (7) Our NAT result/ test result, (8) Low MPS, (9) Poor</p>	<p>11</p>	<p>11%</p>

	students performance, (10) Low performance during exam, (11) Factor that is uncontrollable most specially achievement rates		
Fluctuating Enrollment Rate	(1) Enrollment rate, (2) One of the factors that hinders the improvement of SBM level of practice was the result of (Access) enrolment rate, unfortunately our enrollment was decreasing and we get negative results, (3) Enrolment, (4) Fluctuating number of enrollees, (5) Our enrolment for the last 3 years is fluctuating and now it really went down due to the following reasons: Flood, newly opened school in SSS, (6) Decreasing enrolment rate	6	6%

The table shows the responses of School Heads and SBM Coordinators on hindering factors that affected the SBM level of practice. As it gleaned from the table, the hindering factors that affected the SBM level of practice includes “Organizing and Filing of Documents / Artifacts” which obtained 18 or 18%, “Teachers Attitude towards SBM” which obtained 17 or 17%, “Increasing Dropout Rate” which obtained 13 or 13%, “Insufficient Resources and Time” which

obtained 12 or 12%, “Incomplete Data and Documents” which obtained 12 or 12%, “Stakeholder’s Support” which obtained 11 or 11%, “Students’ Performance” which obtained 11 or 11%, and “Fluctuating Enrollment Rate” which obtained 6 or 6%. Therefore, this revealed that the most hindering factor that affected the SBM level of practice is “Organizing and Filing of Documents / Artifacts”.

Table 4. Theming and Coding of Facilitating Factors that Helped to Improve the SBM Level Of Practice As Identified By the School Heads and SBM Coordinators

Theme	Actual Responses	f	%
Communication to the Stakeholders and Stakeholders Support	(1) Support from our LGU, GPTA and other stakeholders to make our best practices continue for the welfare of our projects and our school, (2) Increase stakeholder’s involvement, (3) Strong mobilization of stakeholders, (4) Stakeholders who actively support and participate to DEPED’s VMG, (5) Increase the number of the involvement of both internal and external stakeholders, (6) Strengthen partnership with stakeholders, (7) Involvement of teachers and stakeholders, (8) The communication of the stakeholders in different programs, (9) More stakeholders to help our school that also help us improve our SBM level, (10) Involving the Community and stakeholders, (11) Stakeholders are included as a factor that can help in improving the SBM level, (12) Active stakeholders, (13) Cooperation of Stakeholders, (14) Stakeholders and parents as well as very helpful cooperative, (15) Positive relationship with the stakeholders/teachers, (16) Participation of stakeholders, (17) Open communication with the stakeholders, (18) Active participation of Stakeholders (parents/GPTA, LGU, Private sectors), (19)Encourage more stakeholders to participate in all the school’s programs and projects, (20) In our school we also invite different stakeholders for the improvement of our school, (21) The involvement of all stakeholders and informing them at the direction of the school doing SBM, (22) Active stakeholders were maintained and established strong relationship to them, (23) My principal has the energy and vigor to invite more stakeholders to help in our school’s performance	23	24%

<p>Commitment of SBM Team</p>	<p>(1) Cooperation of SBM Team, (2)Committed SBM members, (3) Committed SBM team, (4) Supportive members of the team, (5) Collaborative efforts of the SBM members and in gathering data, (6) The facilitating factors that helped improve our SBM level of practice is the commitment of the SBM coordinator and the other members of the SBM team in performing their tasks, (7) Hardworking team, (8) Cooperation of the team, (9) The members of the team must be very resourceful/industrious in getting/collecting data, (10) Cooperation of leaders in each dimension, (11) Performing the delegated works of SBM Team, (12) Commitment of delegated task of SBM team members, (13) The commitment of our team in different principle, (14) Performing tasks of each SBM team, (15) The commitment of the SBM leaders, including their members have an impact that really contributes in the SBM level of practice, (16) The whole team cooperatively work together and hand-in-hand in order to gather as much artifacts and documents that should be available</p>	<p>16</p>	<p>17%</p>
<p>Cooperation of Teachers and Other School Personnel</p>	<p>(1)Participation of other faculty members, (2) Involvement of teachers, (3) The facilitating factors that helped to improve the SBM level of practice are the support and helping hands of the teachers in collecting the artifacts needed, (4) The involvement of teachers helping them to realize the shared responsibility, (5) Cooperation of co-teachers, (6) Active cooperation of teachers, (7) Cooperation and unity of faculty and staff, (8) The support and helped from my co-teachers, (9) Cooperation of my co-teachers, (10) Teacher’s Participation, (11) Supportive teachers, (12) The full support of all faculty members, (13) One factor is the coordination of the teachers to uplift the performance of the learners, (14) The determination of the teachers to uplift the line of performance</p>	<p>14</p>	<p>15%</p>
<p>Initiating Activities related to School Performance</p>	<p>(1) Initiating activities to improve the school performance, (2) Document based activities, (3) Conducting activities, programs and projects are aligned in our SIP/AIP, (4) Continuous implementation of school’s programs and projects for school performance, (5) Consistent activities and projects which support the SBM principles, (6) We have our projects for dropout, repeater rate, (7) Doing programs and projects that were categorize based on SBM principles, (8) he school extensively implement programs to reduce drop-out rate, (9) Implementation of remediation program both affects MPS and promotion rate, (10) In terms of low performance during exam, remediations were conducted</p>	<p>10</p>	<p>11%</p>
<p>Technical Assistance from the Experts</p>	<p>(1) Technical assistance from the division SBM coordinator, PSDS, School head, Stakeholders participation and the assistance of our school SBM team, (2) Technical assistance, (3) Inclusion of technical assistance from the D.O., (4) Technical assistance, (5) Assistance from experts, (6) Technical assistance given by our district supervisor and also by our chief SGOD, (7) The technical</p>	<p>9</p>	<p>10%</p>

	assistance provided by the SGOD division of Antipolo is one good factor that influences the SBM level of practice, (8) PSDS helped me out on how to understand what is SBM all about, (9) Technical support from the experts when it comes to unclear info for the SBM		
Trainings and Seminar on SBM	(1) Trainings and seminars to improve performance indicator, (2) The orientation, seminars and TA provided by the supervisors on how to improve and be engaged more in SBM practices, (3) To improve our SBM level of practice we should have the knowledge to evaluate in our school level by attending workshops and seminars, (4) Updated orientation on School Based Management, (5) Seminars and reorientation like this refreshes and help us improve our SBM coordinator, (6) Seminar and orientation, (7) Seminars/ trainings, (8) Attending different seminars regarding SBM helped me a lot to organize and improve our SBM level of practice	8	8%
Supportive School Head	(1) Supportive school head, (2) Support from school head, (3) Support of the principal, (4) The school head is well-organized when it comes to SBM, (5) Active cooperation of school head, (6) Supportive school heads, (7) The facilitating factors that helped me improve our SBM level of practice is the guidance of my school head, (8) Guidance and supervision of our school principal who showed the SBM team her support and encouragement	8	8%
Allocation of Resources and Funds	(1) Sustaining of funds from MOOE to meet the needs of the project, (2) Provision of budget, (3) Availability of budgets to implement projects and programs, (4) Provision of financial support, (5) The school administrator provides needed materials for the improvement of the SBM area, (6) The school provided needed materials for the improvement of SBM area, (7) Inclusion of budget for SBM supplies/ materials especially in documentation process	7	7%

The table shows the responses of school heads and SBM coordinators on facilitating factors that helped to improve the SBM level of practice. As it gleaned from the table, the facilitating factors that helped to improve the SBM level of practice includes “Communication to the Stakeholders and Stakeholders Support” which obtained 23 or 24%, “Commitment of SBM Team” which obtained 16 or 17%, “Cooperation of Teachers and Other School Personnel” which obtained 14 or 15%,”Initiating Activities related to School

Performance” which obtained 10 or 11%, “Technical Assistance from the Experts” which obtained 9 or 10%, “Trainings and Seminar on SBM” which obtained 8 or 8%, “Supportive School Head” which obtained 8 or 8%, and “Allocation of Resources and Funds” which obtained 7 or 7%. Therefore, this revealed that the most facilitating factors that helped to improve is “Communication to the Stakeholders and Stakeholders Support”.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of this study, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. Majority of the developing schools were categorized as “Below Marginal” in terms Access while majority were categorized as “Marginal” in terms of Efficiency and Quality.

2. All of the 17 developing schools were categorized as “Good” in terms the 4 SBM principles.

3. Most hindering factor that affected the SBM level of practice is “Organizing and Filing of Documents / Artifacts”

4. Most facilitating factor that helped to improve is “Communication to the Stakeholders and Stakeholders Support”.

Based on the findings and conclusions of this study, the following are hereby recommended:

1. The school should include programs and projects in ESIP that answers school performance indicator.

2. The school should allow stakeholders to initiate programs and projects related to different SBM Principles.

3. The school should increase the teachers’ awareness on the importance of SBM and needed artifacts for the improvement of their SBM level of practice.

4. The school should sustain the best practices that facilitate improvement in their SBM level of practice.

5. A parallel study can be done by other schools division to determine the factors that affects the SBM level of practice in their respective divisions.

REFERENCES

- [1] Cabardo, J. O. (2016). Level of participation of the school stakeholders in the different school-initiated activities and the implementation of school-based management. *Journal of Inquiry and Action in Education*
- [2] Dep.Ed. (2012). Implementing guidelines on the revised school-based management (SBM) framework, assessment process and tool.
- [3] Domingo J., Domingo, I., Marces, I (2017). Determining the School Based Management (SBM) Level of Practice

with the Use of SBM E-Tool: An Innovation for Work Simplification.

- [4] Gecolea, P. G. and Gecolea, C. B. (2016). School-based management (SBM) level of practice: basis for the development of handbook on school-parent partnership. 2016 Philippine Conference of Basic Education Researchers Journal.