

# Structural And Non-Structural Transformations Of School-Based Management Level Of Practice In Bislig City Division

Christopher O. Kimilat<sup>1</sup>, Elizabeth L. Baguio<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Senior Education Program Specialist, School Division of Bislig City

<sup>2</sup>Faculty, Graduate School, Saint Joseph Institute of Technology, Butuan City, Philippines

DOI: 10.29322/IJSRP.15.08.2025.p16404

<https://dx.doi.org/10.29322/IJSRP.15.08.2025.p16404>

Paper Received Date: 17th June 2025

Paper Acceptance Date: 27th July 2025

Paper Publication Date: 6th August 2025

**Abstract-** This study examines the implementation of School-Based Management (SBM) across various public schools, focusing on its effectiveness, challenges, and facilitating factors. SBM is a decentralized approach that transfers decision-making authority from central offices to individual schools, involving principals, teachers, students, and parents in key decisions related to budget, personnel, and curriculum. The research highlights that while SBM can enhance educational outcomes by fostering collaboration and accountability, its implementation often faces challenges such as limited stakeholder participation, resource allocation issues, and the absence of effective leadership. Findings indicate that schools at SBM Level 3 (Advanced) exhibit more structural and non-structural transformations, supported by active stakeholder involvement and established feedback mechanisms. Conversely, schools at lower levels struggle with transparency, document organization, and time constraints. The study concludes that tailored approaches, continuous training, and stakeholder engagement are critical for successful SBM implementation. Recommendations include enhancing leadership development, improving resource allocation, and fostering a culture of transparency and collaboration to ensure the effective operation of SBM across educational institutions.

**Index Terms-** School-Based Management, Level of Practice, Conventional Practices, Transformative Practices

## I. INTRODUCTION

Decentralizing school management has had schools practice their autonomy in engaging with stakeholders, tapping potentials among their personnel, and mostly, placing much of the responsibilities on the decision-making processes to the schools. School leaders play a crucial role in this decentralization of decision-making (Tshionza, 2018). At a vantage point, this is the core of school-based management. It empowers the school to enact reforms as it institutionalizes them (DepEd Order No. 83, s. 2012).

Organizational management has included the decentralization of authority (Martin, 2019) which is characterized by transferring the decision-making process from the higher office to those people directly involved in the local decision-making process. Shifting school management from a central to the local perspective has brought in school reforms. In school-based management, the organizational perspective of decentralization suggests the people in the organization have more control, can make decisions, and practice accountability for their actions to prompt and sustain improvements (Tshionza, 2018). Presumably, decentralization is only effective when educational leaders and managers are also effective. Their leadership and management styles impact learners and teachers in the improvement and delivery of better learning outcomes.

The Department of Education in the Philippines, in its Department Order 83, series of 2012, quoted school-based management as means to improve the quality and quantity in the delivery of education through decentralization of authority and decision making. This is done primarily because they are the ones who have better knowledge on the school and its environment. With this, Caraga region has developed its contextualized manual on school-based management to address governance practices and organizational effectiveness of the schools (Lagda) in compliance with the mandate of the Central Office. Lagda sa Kadumalahan noted field visit findings and recommendations intended for the region down to the schools' division offices, like in Bislig City, and the schools.

In Bislig City Division, school-based management continues to be a major education policy among its 70 public schools. The 51 elementary and 19 secondary schools have all submitted themselves for SBM assessment since 2018. Data for the school year 2021-

2022 became the baseline for its Division Education Development Plan for 2023-2028; thus, the generated report from the Enhanced Basic Education Information System (EBEIS) on Gross Enrolment Rate (GER) and Net Enrolment Rate (NER) in Elementary are 92.34% and 86.61% respectively. On the other hand, the GER and NER in Junior High School are 101.95% and 85.18% and for Senior High School 97.88% and 63.10% during the SY 2021-2022. The Division's data on Simple Dropout Rates in Public Elementary, Junior High School and Senior High School are at 0.78% pupils, 0.75% students and 2.90% students, respectively. However, efficiency indicators such as cohort survival rate, completion rates, and retention rates for elementary level and secondary level are fluctuating in trend. Historically, from SY 2014-2015 to SY 2018-2019, there is an increase of 14.08%, 13.28%, 2.86% in Cohort Survival Rate, Completion Rate, and Retention Rate, respectively, in the Elementary level. For the secondary level, there is also an increase of 3.58% in CSR, 5.62% in Completion Rate, but a slight decrease of 1.18% in its Retention Rate (BCD-DEDP 2023-2028).

The management and leadership capacity of school heads is considered as the primary factor in the improvement of schools. Accordingly, in Bislig City Division, there are 22 out of 51 elementary schools or 43.13% which are under SBM Level I (Developing), 24 out of 51 or 47.05% are under Level II (Maturing), and 5 out of 51 or 9.8% are under Level III (Advanced). In secondary schools, 5 out of 19 or 26.32% are under Level I, 12 out of 19 or 63.16% are under Level II, and 1 out of 19 or 5.26% school is under Level III (BCD-DEDP).

As of 2022, only six (6) schools in the division have been identified to have advanced or maintained their SBM Level III (Advanced) status, especially when the pandemic set the context for the delivery of education in the Philippines. In spite of the continuous provisions of training, and technical assistance, advancing to Level III, as the highest status for SBM assessment, remains elusive. This is a gap in itself which this proposal intends to address. As a way of managing the schools, the implementation of SBM is viewed to help their operations. Thus, this study proposes to evaluate the structural and non-structural transformations of school-based management level of practices in the Division of Bislig City, in consideration of the ACCESS principles on leadership and governance, curriculum and learning, accountability and continuous improvement, and management of resources. As an exploratory study, the researcher interviewed the participants from the different SBM Levels of Practice; the challenges and issues in the implementation of SBM were the qualitative data for this paper. With the end in mind to develop a technical assistance plan in the provision for an improved SBM level of practice for the public schools in Bislig City Division.

## II. IREVIEW OF RELATED STUDIES

It's the foremost preliminary step for proceeding with any research work writing. While doing this go through a complete thought Understand the scientific terms and jargon related to your research work. This section contains readings and literature from different sources like journals, books, and articles on school-based management, practices in Asia, and the framework implemented in the Philippines.

### **School-Based Management Defined**

Education reforms have always meant the provision of quality education. As one of the goals of the Education for All movement, or EFA, the importance of education has been made more prominent especially for developing countries. Ristea, Ciobanu, Ivan (2014) noted the need for flexible structuring in terms of decentralization of decision-making in the educational system from top management down to the local level. Aside from providing infrastructure support, training, and instructional materials, education reform has included the provision of 'some decision-making powers' (Barrera-Orsorio et al., 2009) to the local actors in schools. Thus, the school-based management (SBM) has found an increasing popularity among education institutions.

School-Based Management is the decentralization of authority from the central powers, and transfers some of this to the school level. This is primarily characterized by distributing the decision-making capacity to those who are directly involved in the schools' management and operation. Barrero-Orsorio et al (2009) described that in SBM, 'those who work in a school building should have greater management control of what goes on in the building.' Thus, together with the teachers and principal, SBM also requires the active involvement of the community and parents of the children who attend in the school in this decision-making process (Martin, 2019). Community participation also ensures school functioning improvement (Ristea, Ciobanu, & Ivan, 2014).

With this, SBM takes differing distinctions in relation to the contexts of the countries implementing the reforms for diverging reasons, at different measures, and realities. But all the same, school-based management looks at key features for quality education: autonomy in decision-making and accountability as results of the decentralization in management (Demas, 2020).

### **School-Based Management in Asia**

School-based management is known by various names. Rahim (2019) shared that SBM is known as Village Education Committee in India, SBM in the UK and USA, Site-Based Management in Israel, School Management Committees in Uganda and Parent Teacher Association (PTA)/PTC/School Management Committees in Pakistan. All the same, these are SBM at work in these nations. The programs primarily characterize the transfer of the decision-making capacity of schools in their human, infrastructure, and fiscal resources from a centralized government authority.

Asia saw the prominence and use of SBM in schools, albeit in different forms, as early as the 1990s. Barrera-Orsorio et al (2009) discussed that SBM reform in Hong Kong, China is referred to as School Management Initiative (SMI) which gave schools, in its management committees, autonomy in making decisions on their personnel, finances, and curriculum. This was in 1991, and the SBM reform being implemented was a reflection to that in Australia, the UK, and US. It was only in 1997 when its Education Commission approved the appellation School Management Initiative as its equivalent of SBM. As an initiative, the adoption of SMI was slow in Hong Kong, China. Even so, school-based management has been institutionalized in their schools to address the quality of education.

In Cambodia, there is Education Quality Improvement Project (EQIP) School Grants Program. This is the country's version of SBM, which was piloted in 1998 with a group of ten (10) clusters in Takeo Province (Barrera-Orsorio et al., 2009). Cash grants were provided to EQIP schools. Between 1998 to 2003, there were 1,000 schools in three (3) provinces that took part in EQIP.

Indonesia, on the other hand, has a School Operational Assistance (Bantuan Operasional Sekolah; BOS) program which incorporates a form of SBM. The program has set up committees in 2005 (Barrera-Orsorio et al., 2009). BOS is intended to give authority to these school committees to plan and decide over the schools' non-salary operational expenses. Its pilot implementation saw 79 schools in three (3) provinces funded by UNESCO, UNICEF, and the Government of Indonesia. The program reinforces SBM reforms by giving grants to all basic education schools. The grant is intended to reduce students' "financial burdens, improve access to and raise the quality of basic education, and further support SBM reforms that had started in 2003" (Demas, 2020).

### **SBM Framework in the Philippines**

SBM is defined and functions differently in varying contexts, and demands in the education systems of different countries. Consequently, a specific framework is in operation in every country to address the kind of SBM they need in improving their learning outcomes. In the Philippines, the SBM framework represents a system intended to secure and manage inputs efficiently and effectively, establish structures and mechanisms to achieve the objectives, sustain the continuous improvement process, and ensure that every school brings out the planned results on improved learning outcomes (DepEd-BESRA, 2009). This is supported at a greater length in its reform agenda as it eyes toward change in its education system.

A Child and Community-Centered Education Systems, or ACCESSs, is the Department's guide in implementing the SBM process. This serves as the "backbone of SBM" (Villanueva & Dela Cruz, 2019). ACCESSs upholds four (4) principles of a school system that will help build and produce SBM practices. Lagda sa Kadumalahan articulates these principles succinctly as: Leadership and Governance which serves as a network of leadership and governance that guides the education system to achieve its shared vision, mission, and goals making it responsive to the context of a diverse environment. Curriculum and Learning emphasizes how the systems are anchored on the community and learners' context and aspirations are collaboratively developed and continuously improved. Accountability and Continuous Improvement highlights a clear, transparent, inclusive, and responsive accountability system is in place, collaboratively developed by the school community, which monitors performance and acts appropriately on gaps and gains. Resource Management stresses the importance of being collectively organized, judiciously mobilized and managed with transparency, effectiveness, and efficiency to support targeted education outcomes (Lagda sa Kadumalahan- DepEd Caraga Region).

These ACCESSs principles provide a support mechanism which SBM practice can develop gradually in consideration to the school's context, typology, leadership quality, resources, learners' profiles, and stakeholders' engagement. In ACCESSs, the SBM framework evolves to develop a "functionally literate citizen".

This SBM framework conceptualizes that self-managing and self-renewing learning community enhance and assist schools on the delivery of education to all types of learners. Through environmental scanning and situational analysis, schools lay out plans to respond to the issues, challenges, and even opportunities inherent in their contexts. The four principles on leadership and governance, curriculum and learning (K to 12), accountability and continuous improvement, and resource management guide the schools in their decision-making process (Villanueva & Dela Cruz, 2019; Perez & Lumaad, 2021). Moreover, in this framework, open reception to input from the environment is represented by the broken lines encapsulating the framework. The Central, Regional, and Division offices of the Department of Education provide the technical and administrative assistance, and ensure that education policies, standards, and guidelines are implemented in the schools. The decentralization of decision-making process as characterized in SBM is an assurance that educational efficiency and effectiveness is accessible as information and knowledge is better acquired (Villanueva & Dela Cruz, 2019) by schools and the local community.

Assessing schools on their SBM practices entails an operational framework that includes the principles of ACCESs, and level of practices. Each of the principles have their equivalent indicators, and they are measured in a scale of 1 to 3 pointing to the level of SBM practice in school (DepEd Order No. 83, s. 2012). Through the Philippine Accreditation System for Basic Education, or PASBE, school operations are assessed according to the set standards on the quality of practices and learning outcomes.

Evidence of school-based management practices are evaluated in the Assessment Tool. It configures every public school to be classified at the level of SBM practices. The tool, then, recognizes the SBM practices in the schools as developing, maturing, or advanced (DepEd Order No. 83, s. 2012) Level I, or the Developing scale, is given to schools which are compliant with the minimum standards of SBM; Level II, or the Progressive scale, points to a school's intensification in the mobilization of its resources, and sustaining its continuous improvement processes; and Level III, or the Mature scale, indicates that schools have maximized their efforts in achieving learning outcomes in partnership with its local community and stakeholders. Assessment of the SBM practices begins at School level using the SBM Validation tool. Then, a group of practitioners and experts from the District and Division SBM Coordinating Team shall provide technical assistance to the schools. Once the school is found to be compliant after the District and Division SBM validation, the school's division office shall recommend to the region, through its Regional SBM Coordinating Teams, for further validation. The regional validation will provide recognition to the school which is found to be compliant and an SBM Level III Implementer (DepEd Order No. 83, s. 2012).

All in all, school-based management is mostly beneficial to scholastic institutions in their operations, management, and generation of better learning outcomes. This has been evident as the Philippines continually imposes the institutionalization of SBM through the Department of Education. Moreover, more and more researches have been conducted in order to gather empirical data on this education reform. Apparently, SBM is better complemented when institutional leaders also function effectively.

### III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The researcher used qualitative research design. Primary research method wherein data was collected directly to the subject of the study. The researcher used the Colaizzi's descriptive phenomenological method which follows the seven stages, to wit, (1) reading and rereading the transcript, (2) extracting significant statements that pertain to the phenomenon, (3) formulating meanings from meaningful words, (4) aggregating formulated meaningful words into theme clusters and themes, (5) developing an exhaustive description of the phenomenon's essential structure or essence, (6) a report of the fundamental form of the phenomenon is subsequently generated, and (7) validation of findings of the study through participants feedback to complete the data analysis. Thematic analysis was used as treatment in this research, which was based on the results of the Focus Group Discussion. Stages 1-3 of Colaizzi's method were used right after the researcher was able to finalize the transcription of the FGD. Furthermore, Stages 4-7 helped in formulating the analysis and discussion for results, discussions and findings. The analysis helped to gather data on the achievement and challenges faced by the School Head and School Governance Council, providing comprehensive views of the study's outcome.

#### Results and Discussion

There is an evident progression in the schools across the different SBM levels according to structural and non-structural indicators. Notably, Table 1 presents the transformations of schools belonging to SBM Level 1 of practice.

Table 1  
*Thematic Responses on Structural and Non-Structural Transformations for SBM Level 1 Schools.*

Theme	Conventional Practice	Transformative Practice
<b>Structural</b>	<b>Education facilities</b>	
	To put up gate as needed in the school context	from just the construction of an entrance gate, the exit gate is a continuing project of the school
	To put up fences to secure school from stray animals and burglars	every year, the school allots funds for the construction of at least a span fence.
	To maintain the cleanliness of the surrounding	The maintenance and general clean-up with stakeholders is done depending upon the request of the school.

### WINs Program

	To make water available in school	school has difficulty assessing water due to location of the school and limited resource of water. The school is currently lobbying to the Barangay officials for possible intervention.
	To put up handwashing facility	School is allocating funds for the construction handwashing facility.
	To put up gendered segregated Comfort Rooms	Gendered segregated CR is an on-going construction and is lobbied to stakeholders and Barangay officials
<b>Non-structural</b>	Key Performance Indicator (Enrolment, Drop-out, Completion, Cohort survival rate) should reach the standard requirement	The school is conducting advocacy programs and intensifying drop-out reduction programs because of low KPIs
	Feedback Mechanism must be in place.	Feedback mechanism is only conducted during the quarterly School Monitoring Evaluation and Adjustment with stakeholders
	The school must have active stakeholders' participation.	Involvement of a small number of consistent stakeholders. Advocacy programs with parents is conducted.

The table above for SBM level 1 schools indicates that the school's structural and non-structural transformations are visible and ongoing. Accordingly, their responses in the Structural practices can be organized under Education facilities and WinS Program, while the Non-structural practices include themes on key performance indicators, feedback mechanisms, and stakeholder's participation.

The responses at SBM Level 1 emphasized on the structural improvement, primarily for the educational facilities and the WinS program which transformation practices have not transcended beyond the conventional practices mentioned. Using the assumptions presented by Gamage's school-based management, the responses reflect that the schools are in want of better facilities as needed in the varied school contexts. The fifth assumption that schools need an interesting and effective means to improve their image addresses the issues presented (Bandur, 2012), particularly that of the gate, fences, cleanliness, and even the availability of water and handwashing facilities. These specific concerns on the structural indicator further substantiates how education facilities affect levels of enrolment (Bandur, 2012). Additionally, as the SBM Level 1 schools conform more in addressing the conventional practices, consideration for a broader, transformative practice becomes less of a concern as these schools strive to prioritize the problem areas fitting to their respective contexts.

For participants under the SBM Level 2 schools, Structural and Non-structural practices still mentioned education facilities, and WinS Program for the former, and key performance indicators, feedback mechanisms, and stakeholder's participation in the latter. Table 2 shows the thematic responses of these transformations for SBM Level 2 schools from the focused group discussion conducted.

Table 3

*Thematic Responses on Structural and Non-Structural Transformations for SBM Level 2 Schools.*

Theme	Conventional Practice	Transformative Practice
-------	-----------------------	-------------------------



<b>Structural</b>	<b>Education facilities</b>	
	To put up gate as needed in the school context	Completed construction of entrance and exit gates.
	To put up fences to secure school from stray animals and burglars	every year, the school allots funds for the construction of at least a span of fence and lobbied to the barangay for additional allocation
	To maintain the cleanliness of the surrounding	The maintenance and general clean-up with stakeholders is done depending upon the request
	<b>WASH in Schools Program</b>	
	To make water available in school	Some school has access to water while other school initiates rain collector to ensure availability of water. Some schools are also lobbying to the Barangay officials for possible intervention.
	To put up handwashing facility per number of student ration	Schools were able to complete the required handwashing facility over the total number of enrollees
	To put up gendered segregated Comfort Rooms	Schools were able to lobby to barangay and other stakeholders for the construction of gendered segregated CR.
<b>Non-structural</b>	Key Performance Indicator (Enrolment, Drop-out, Completion, Cohort survival rate) should reach the standard requirement	The school met the required key performance indicator per SBM Tool because of their intensified advocacies to increase enrolment
	Feedback Mechanism must be in place.	Feedback mechanism is only conducted during the quarterly School Monitoring Evaluation and Adjustment with stakeholders. also, during the crafting of SIP.
	The school must have active stakeholder's participation.	Involvement of a small number of consistent stakeholders. Advocacy programs with parents is conducted.

For SBM Level 2 schools, their responses have signs of transitioning to more proactive decisions leading to transformative practices. The responses show efforts to enhance security and safety by putting up fences to secure the school from various threats, including stray animals and burglars. Moreover, maintenance and cleanliness of the surrounding environment is mentioned, indicating a growing awareness of the holistic nature of school development. The participant schools in SBM Level 2 have shown their decisiveness, an effect of the decentralized power from the central authority to the local education leaders, as they address the needs of their schools. Tshiunza (2018) confirms this decentralization nature practiced in an organization as it begins to take responsibility, and become accountable in its decisions to stimulate growth, in the present study: in a public school system. Interestingly, responses coming from SBM Level 3 schools depict much progressive practices in its Structural and Non-structural indicators as shown in Table 3, as compared to the participants of SBM Level 1 and 2 schools, respectively.

Table 3

*Thematic Responses on Structural and Non-Structural Transformations for SBM Level 3 Schools.*

Theme	Conventional Practice	Transformative Practice
<b>Structural</b>	<b>Education facilities</b>	
	To put up gate as needed in the school context	Completed construction of entrance and exit gates with the financial support of the stakeholder
	To put up fences to secure school from stray animals and burglars	Completed perimeter fence with the financial supports of the stakeholders
	To maintain the cleanliness of the surrounding	The maintenance and general clean-up with stakeholders is done on a regular schedule set by the stakeholders themselves.
	<b>WINs Program</b>	
<b>Non-structural</b>	To make water available in school	Water is available to school 24/7 because of the involvement and support made by the school community.
	To put up handwashing facility per number of student ratio.	Schools were able to complete the required handwashing facility over the total number of enrollees as required in the WINs program
	To put up gendered segregated Comfort Rooms	Schools were able to lobby to barangay and other stakeholders for the construction of gendered segregated CR.
	Key Performance Indicator (Enrolment, Drop-out, Completion, Cohort survival rate) should reach the standard requirement	The school exceeded the required rating per key performance indicator in the SBM Tool because of their share responsibility with the stakeholders.
	Feedback Mechanism must be in place.	Feedback mechanisms are evident in every conduct of the different programs, activities and projects with the presence of the internal and external stakeholders.
	The school must have active stakeholders' participation.	Involvement of all members in the school community led and open communication led in achieving higher SBM level of practice.

As seen in the above table, all schools belonging to SBM Level 3 Schools are also Wash in Schools 3 Stars awardees. DepEd released policy guidelines on the WinS Program to ensure that all schools implement it. Emphasizing that the lack of access to these facilities poses risk to people's health. Adequate water supply and adequate toilet and proper handwashing facilities in schools are required to achieve good hygiene and sanitation (DepEd Order No. 10, s. 2012).

For non-structural transformations, SBM level 3 schools underscore the rewards and recognition they received because they successfully implemented programs, activities, and projects. In addition, the feedback process was institutionalized in SBM level 3 schools with active stakeholder participation. In comparison to SBM level 1 and level 2 schools, it also employs more sophisticated transformative approaches. Gamage's proposition can explain this transformative practice for the SBM Level 3 schools as it identifies that a school council includes relevant stakeholders who are representatives of the local community, parents, teachers, and students. The DepEd Order no. 26 series of 2022, further, warrants for the establishment of the School Governance Council for an effective school operation. In fact, with the council, the feedback mechanism is an organic element as it operates to provide basic public education.

Moreover, schools in the SBM Level 3 have also fully embraced the transformative practices for a holistic improvement and sustainable development of the school in the context of the local community. There is an evident progression in the responses which reflects commitment to structural enhancements and community engagement such as constructing entrance and exit gates and perimeter fences, demonstrating a proactive approach to security and infrastructure development.

On the other hand, there is a notable evolution in the non-structural theme particularly in stakeholder involvement from the barangay. This reiterates that shared governance recognizes the impact from partnership with the parents, community leaders, teachers, and students as specified in the School Governing Council, Parents-Teacher Association, and all other DepEd recognized associations (DepEd Order No 26 s 2022). In congruence, these transformative practices then creates in the school 'best practices' that uplifts its viability as a public school institution.

:

#### IV. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings of the study on School-Based Management (SBM) suggest the following conclusions:

1. **Level 3 Advancement:** SBM Level 3 demonstrates more advance structural and non-structural transformation compared to level 1 and 2, with established processes. However, each school is pursuing its own initiatives, activities and programs.
2. **Facilitating Factors:** Active stakeholder participation is crucial at SBM Level 1, while effective leadership is essential at level 2. SBM level 3 incorporates the facilitating factor of level 1 and 2 and requires a feedback mechanism and proper document organization for more transparent school operations.
3. **Hindering Factors:** Challenges at different levels include low key performance indicators, limited stakeholder participation, resources allocation, unorganized documents, absence of rewards and incentives and time constraints limiting stakeholder participation in decision-making.

These conclusions emphasize the need for a tailored approach to SBM implementation at each level, addressing specific facilitating factors and overcoming hindering factors to ensure the successful implementation across different schools.

#### Recommendations

Based on the conclusion drawn, the following recommendations are offered for considerations:

**Management.** That the officials of Bislig City Division will support the School-based Management Program by ensuring information dissemination, provision of technical assistance, consistently conduct training in line with SBM for internal and external stakeholders.

**Stakeholders.** There is a need to enhance stakeholders' participation. This can be achieved by reinforcing SBM training and Practical implementations in schools and further strengthening it technically and financially. Also, raise awareness and understanding among stakeholders about the importance of their participation in SBM. This can be done through workshops, seminars, and other forms of communication to educate stakeholders about the benefits of SBM and their role in the process

**School Leaders.** Emphasize the development of effective leadership at all levels of SBM implementation. Institutionalized feedback mechanism and document organization as it is essential to ensure smooth functioning. Additionally, school leaders should present future plans to stakeholders and seek suggestions, ideas and recognize their contributions to encourage their participation and support in the school's activities.

**Future Researchers.** Undertake future researches on school with SBM level 3 of practice and their most effective methods for reaching this level of implementation plan.



## REFERENCES

- [1] —. Lagda sa Kadumalahan: A contextualized manual on School-Based Management of Caraga region. Department of Education - Caraga Region.
- [2] Bandur, A. (2008). A study of the implementation of school-based management in Flores primary schools in Indonesia. Australia: University of Newcastle.
- [3] Bandur, A. (2012). School-based management developments and partnership: Evidence from Indonesia. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 32(2), 316-328.
- [4] Barrera-Osorio, F., Fasih, T., Patrinos, H. A., & Santibañez, L. (2009). *Decentralized decision-making in schools: The theory and evidence on school-based management*. World Bank Publications.
- [5] Bislig City Division-Division Education Development Plan (BCD-DEDP) 2023-2028.
- [6] Demas, A. (2020). 3 School-based management. Community Participation with Schools in Developing Countries: Towards Equitable and Inclusive Basic Education for All, 26.
- [7] Department of Education-Basic Education Sector Reform Agenda (DepEd-BESRA). (2009). A Manual on the Assessment of School-Based Management (SBM) Practices. Pasig City: Department of Education.
- [8] Department of Education Order no 83, s. 2012, Implementing guidelines on the revised school-based management (SBM) framework, assessment process and tool (APAT).
- [9] Department of Education Order no. 10 s. 2016, Policy and guidelines for the comprehensive water, sanitation, and Hygiene in Schools (WINS) program
- [10] Department of Education Order no 12 s. 2022, Omnibus Guidelines on the Regulation of Operations of Parent-Teachers Association
- [11] Department of Education Order no 26, s. 2022, Implementing Guidelines on the Establishment of School Governance Council
- [12] Martin, M. (2019). The implementation of school-based management in public elementary schools. *Asian Journal of Assessment in Teaching and Learning*, 9(1), 44-56.
- [13] Perez, D., & Lumaad, R. (2021). Educational leadership and management styles of public elementary school heads and level of school-based management of selected schools in Palawan, Philippines.
- [14] Rahim, B. (2019). Decentralized decision making and educational outcomes in public schools: Evidence from pakistan. *The International Journal of Educational Management*, 33(7), 1625-1640. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-04-2018-0143>
- [15] Ristea, B., Ciobanu, A., & Ivan, M. (2014). School manager profile in the decentralized educational system - comparative research in the European countries. *Administratie Si Management Public*, (23), 60-79. Retrieved from <https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/school-manager-profile-decentralized-educational/docview/1642606198/se-2?accountid=38643>
- [16] Sumarsono, R. B., Triwiyanto, T., Kusumaningrum, D. E., & Gunawan, I. (2019). Opportunities for the implementation of school-based management in the eastern area of Indonesia. *Int. J. Innov. Creat. Chang*, 5(4), 180-196.
- [17] Tshiunza, C. L. (2018). Theoretical Analysis on School- Based Management: Towards Geographical Approach Analysis of the Reforms, Challenges and Perspectives. *American Journal of Education Science*, 4(3), 41-56.
- [18] UNICEF. (2018). Global Baseline Report. <http://data.unicef.org/resources/wash-in-schools/>
- [19] Villanueva, J. S., & Cruz, R. A. O. D. (2019). The Praxis of School-based management on curriculum and learning in the Philippines. *International Journal of Social Sciences & Educational Studies*, 6(2), 89.

## AUTHORS

**First Author** – Christopher O. Kimilat, Senior Education Program Specialist, Schools Division of Bislig City and [christopher.kimilat@deped.gov.ph](mailto:christopher.kimilat@deped.gov.ph).

**Second Author** – Elizabeth L. Baguio, Faculty, Saint Joseph Institute of Technology

**Correspondence Author** – Christopher O. Kimilat, [christopher.kimilat@deped.gov.ph](mailto:christopher.kimilat@deped.gov.ph), +639452217768.