

Adherence To School-Based Management Practices in Labo West District Public Schools

CLARISA E. VELACRUZ, LPT, MAED¹, ANICIA S. MADARANG, EDD²

^{1,2} *Master of Arts in Education, Mabini Colleges, Inc.*

Abstract -This study aimed to assess the adherence to school-based management (SBM) practices in Labo West District public schools, focusing on key performance indicators (KPIs) such as access, efficiency, and quality. The study also examined the schools' adherence to SBM principles in leadership and governance, curriculum and learning, accountability and continuous improvement, and resource management. Additionally, it investigated the relationship between KPIs and adherence to SBM practices, identified challenges and opportunities faced by the schools, and proposed an intervention material to improve adherence to SBM guidelines. The study utilized the Social Cognitive Theory, Transformative Learning Theory, and Experiential Learning Theory as theoretical frameworks, employing a descriptive-correlational research design with survey questionnaires and structured interviews. Spearman Rank Correlation was used for statistical analysis. Among the nine schools, one achieved a rating of 3.0 for access, one achieved a rating of 3.0 for access for efficiency, and all nine schools were rated 2.0 for quality. Seven schools were categorized as "Better," while two were classified as "Good." The study found a maturing level between the SBM level of practice and principles, with a strong relationship between KPIs and SBM practices. Challenges included document collection, attitudes of school heads and teachers, resource and time constraints, and stakeholder support. The proposed intervention material, the TEAMS Handbook, aimed to enhance adherence to SBM principles. Recommendations included focusing on enrollment strategies, maintaining qualified stakeholders, conducting orientations, revisiting guidelines, and monitoring the TEAMS Handbook activities for implementation in the next school year.

Indexed Terms- Adherence, School Base Management, Key Performance Indicators, SBM principles

I. INTRODUCTION

School-Based Management (SBM) is a global initiative aimed at improving education by granting schools autonomy and transferring decision-making power from higher administrative levels to individual schools (Bandur, 2018).

In Iran, School-Based Management (SBM) involves increased participation of various stakeholders, including parents, students, teachers, officials, principals, and community groups, aiming to enhance the school's independence, responsibility, and accountability. This approach has led to improved academic achievement and other positive outcomes, such as closer monitoring of school staff, better student appraisal, alignment between school requirements and policies, and more effective resource utilization (Moradi et al., 2022). Similarly, in Indonesia, School Principals have a high level of autonomy in decision-making regarding personnel, pedagogy, instruction, and budget allocation. However, despite their responsibility for school management, decisions are rarely made independently without involving other stakeholders (Vernez et al., 2019).

In the Philippines, the implementation of School-Based Management (SBM) follows a similar concept found in other countries. Llego (2019) highlights that decision-making authority, which traditionally comes from the DEPED Central office, is decentralized to individual schools to improve education. This decentralization provides school heads and stakeholders with greater control over the education process, granting them fiscal autonomy, staff management, and curriculum planning. This approach aims to create effective learning environments and

empower school officials to make decisions based on their needs, thus improving the educational system. Similarly, Pangilinan (2022) describes SBM in the Philippines as a profound form of educational decentralization that recognizes the expertise of school leaders, including teachers, community leaders, and parents. It involves transferring power, authority, and resources to the school level, emphasizing shared responsibilities between the national government and local authorities. SBM aims to enhance school performance by addressing systemic issues and prioritizing professional development opportunities for educators. Given the challenges faced by education institutions, such as high dropout rates and limited capacity, the adoption and implementation of SBM serve as significant structural reform interventions initiated by the national government (Abulencia, 2019).

The implementation of School-Based Management (SBM) in the Philippines was established by the Department of Education (DepEd) through RA 9155 in 2001. DepEd introduced pilot projects, TEEP/SEDIP and BEAM, to enhance education quality at the elementary level. SBM aimed to improve education in public schools and develop functionally literate individuals. However, its implementation faced challenges. To address these challenges, DepEd issued DepEd Order No. 83, s. 2012, providing guidelines for the revised SBM framework, assessment process, and tool (APAT). DepEd also adopted the revised SBM framework, assessment process, and tool through DepEd Order No. 20, s. 2013, which introduced the Philippine Accreditation System for Basic Education (PASBE) as part of SBM. To ensure effective implementation, regional directors and school division/city superintendents reorganized SBM Task Forces and PASBE Core Groups, forming the Regional/Division SBM Coordinating Team. However, the successful implementation of SBM has been hindered by barriers such as stakeholder understanding, decision-making skills, communication, and trust issues. Statutory regulations, union contracts, and resistance from administrators and teachers further challenge the effective implementation of SBM in educational institutions (Oswald, 2018).

Various studies have examined the effectiveness of School-Based Management (SBM) in different contexts. Llego et al. (2019) found that autonomous schools in deprived areas demonstrated results comparable to other schools, attributed to their relative autonomy in staff selection and monitoring. Lindberg and Vanyushyn (2019) investigated Swedish upper secondary schools and discovered that administrative and firefighting tasks were considered highly important and performed well by school principals, while instructional leadership tasks were perceived as less important and performed at a lower level. Dondero (2018) conducted a study in the Cleveland, Ohio School District, revealing that SBM team participants reported higher levels of job satisfaction and perceived school effectiveness compared to non-participants. Additionally, Bekirogullari (2018) emphasized the need for a systematic review of SBM in Malaysia, highlighting the role of school leaders and teacher competency as crucial factors. The review suggested the development of a standard evaluation instrument with a focus on empowering school leaders through the involvement of district and state education officers.

Several studies have contributed valuable insights to the current research. Ballarta et al. (2022) investigated the practice of School-Based Management (SBM) in the DepEd MIMAROPA region and found a significant relationship between school profiles and the level of SBM practice. Similarly, Pepugal (2022) examined the perception of SBM implementation in a specific school and reported a moderate level of implementation exceeding the minimum standard. Perez and Lumaad (2021) explored the impact of educational leadership and management styles on SBM practice, revealing foundational structures and mechanisms in place but no significant relationship between leadership styles and SBM practice. Likewise, Perez et al. (2020) examined educational leadership and management styles, observing the presence of SBM principles and a significant relationship between leadership styles and management styles. Maca (2019) conducted a case study on the Third Elementary Education Project (TEEP) in the Philippines, highlighting SBM's role in fostering innovation. Additionally, Datu (2019) and Bucud (2018) emphasized the positive impact of SBM on public confidence and the importance of community

participation. The National Institute for Educational Research (2019) stressed the need for informed decision-making and correlated SBM with school performance. Other studies focused on SBM implementation, including Kadtong et al. (2018), Cogtas (2018), and Pepito et al. (2019), which evaluated SBM practices and identified areas for improvement. Overall, these studies provide valuable insights into the various aspects of SBM and its influence on school practices and outcomes.

Labo West District in SDO-Camarines Norte faces challenges in implementing School-Based Management (SBM) at an advanced level. Only a few schools have been validated, and none have reached the advanced level. Pepugal's study emphasizes the need to assess adherence to SBM practices and identify areas for improvement, such as resource decentralization, community partnership strengthening, and integrating management and instructional reforms. The researcher, an elementary school teacher in the district, has firsthand experience in preparing documents for SBM validation and collaborating with school heads and external stakeholders. This experience has highlighted the importance of SBM in school operations and motivated the researcher to improve adherence to the SBM management process.

This study aimed to assess the level of adherence to School-Based Management (SBM) practices in the public schools of Labo West District. The study focused on nine schools that had been validated by the Division validation team. The research aimed to answer several questions, including the SBM level of practice in selected schools based on key performance indicators related to access, efficiency, and quality. Additionally, the study aimed to evaluate the schools' adherence to SBM practices according to the principles of leadership and governance, curriculum and learning, accountability and continuous improvement, and management of resources. The researchers also investigated whether there was a significant relationship between the key performance indicators and the level of adherence to SBM practices across these four principles. Furthermore, the study explored the challenges and opportunities faced by the respondents in adhering to SBM principles and proposed intervention materials to improve adherence

to SBM guidelines. The hypothesis of the study proposed that there would be no significant relationship between the key performance indicators and the level of adherence to SBM practices across the four principles.

II. METHOD OF RESEARCH

Descriptive correlational statistics were used in this study to analyze and interpret the gathered data. For SOP 1 and 2, data analysis was conducted using the Division SBM validated report, which provided information on the schools' level of practice, Key Performance Indicators (access, efficiency, and quality), and adherence to the four SBM principles. Spearman Rank Correlation ($r_s = 1 - 6\sum d^2/n(n-1)$) was employed for SOP 3 to determine the relationship between the key performance indicators and SBM practices. A checklist was used for SOP 4 to identify the challenges and opportunities faced by the respondents. The checklist included indicators for challenges related to document collection, attitudes toward SBM, resources and time, and stakeholder support. Opportunities were adapted from DO 83, s.2012.

Population, Sample Size and Sampling Technique. The study involved participants from nine schools in the Labo West district, including school heads and teachers.

- Description of the Respondents.

The selection of schools was based on validation by the Division Validation team to ensure their suitability for the study. All school heads were included as respondents, while teacher respondents were selected through purposive sampling. The teachers chosen met specific criteria, such as being committee members involved in document preparation, serving as the School LIS Coordinator or SMEA Coordinator, or fulfilling specific roles related to School-Based Management (SBM). The total number of respondents in the study was 63, consisting of nine school heads, nine LIS Coordinators, nine SMEA Coordinators, and four Chairpersons representing each SBM dimension.

- Research Instrument

The study assessed the SBM final rating based on the performance in the areas of access, efficiency, quality, and the four SBM dimensions.

The KPIs, covering access, efficiency, and quality, comprised 60% of the evaluation, while the remaining 40% was validated through Documentary analysis, Observation, and Discussion (DOD). The final rating, which determined the level of SBM practice, was computed based on the KPIs and DOD results. Challenges and opportunities were assessed through a face-to-face administration of a checklist, ensuring compliance with health protocols. The checklist captured insights and perspectives on the challenges and opportunities faced by the respondents. The checklist included indicators for challenges related to document collection, attitudes toward SBM, resources and time, and stakeholder support. Opportunities were adapted from DepEd Order 83, s.2012. An interview guide was also used to gather additional information from the respondents.

- Data Gathering Procedure

The researcher obtained permission from the Schools Division Superintendent, the Public Schools District Supervisor, and the School Heads of the nine schools before conducting the study. Consent was also obtained from the teacher respondents for ethical purposes. The Division team SBM validated report of the nine schools was obtained with permission to determine the SBM level of practice based on Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) and the four SBM principles.

The responses were tabulated, analyzed, and presented in a table, considering their frequency and ranking. These findings were used to inform the study's outcomes and recommendations.

III. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

This part provides the detailed discussion of the papers regarding the adherence to school-based management practices in Labo West district public schools which became the basis in developing a proposed output of this research.

SBM Level of Practice in selected schools in Labo West District along Key Performance Indicators

Performance indicators are essential for evaluating educational performance at various levels of the education system. They provide quantitative measures to assess the effectiveness and outcomes of educational practices, serving as valuable tools for reporting the education system's status to local, national, and global communities. In this study, performance indicators are categorized into three groups: access, efficiency, and quality. Access indicators measure educational opportunities and resources available to students, while efficiency indicators assess resource allocation and utilization. Quality indicators focus on learning outcomes and overall education quality. These indicators are crucial in evaluating School-Based Management (SBM) practices, constituting 60% of the assessment. Analyzing the results helps identify strengths and areas for improvement, supporting evidence-based decision-making and enhancing the education system's effectiveness and efficiency.

The access key performance indicator is crucial for evaluating education's accessibility within a school, considering factors such as student enrollment across different grade levels. It provides insights into inclusivity and the availability of educational opportunities. In the study, the access indicator was examined for nine schools. School H had the highest rating of 3.0, indicating strong accessibility, while School G had a rating of 2.0, suggesting moderate accessibility. The remaining seven schools received a rating of 1.0, indicating a need for improvement.

Further analysis focused on School H, which had both elementary and secondary sections. The school's advantageous location and transportation options made it easily accessible. Factors such as proximity and community involvement contributed to higher enrollment rates. These findings highlight the importance of location, transportation, and community engagement in promoting access to education. Policymakers and school administrators can learn from these insights to improve access in other schools within the Labo West District, ensuring equal learning opportunities for all students.

Efficiency was exemplified by School E, with a top rating of 3.0. Its favorable location along the highway facilitated uninterrupted learning and easy monitoring of students. Initiatives like Project WATCH resulted in high completion and survival rates. In contrast, School H and School A received the lowest rating of 1.33, indicating areas for improvement. Challenges such as student absences due to gold-panning activities affected these schools' efficiency and completion rates, particularly at the secondary level.

In terms of quality, all nine schools received a rating of 2.0, indicating a "Better" performance level. The assessment was based on the Mean Percentage Score (MPS) per learning area, reflecting an average final rating of learners between 76% and 85%. Due to the pandemic, modifications were made, replacing summative exams with written works and performed tasks. Blended learning modalities also contributed to maintaining quality education delivery.

The evaluation of efficiency and quality provides insights for improving School-Based Management practices. By addressing challenges and learning from successful strategies, administrators, and policymakers can enhance education within Labo West District schools. Teacher attendance and participation are crucial, particularly in distance learning, according to Maxwell's study. The current study's findings align with this, emphasizing the significance of teacher engagement for effective education.

resulted in higher dropout rates and decreased completion and cohort-survival rates.

Baah et al.'s study (2020) in Ghana supports the findings, identifying poverty, lack of regular employment, and disinterest in class as reasons for dropout rates. Poverty, specifically related to education expenses and limited job opportunities, was a significant factor in Labo West. However, disinterest in studying was not explicitly mentioned. Comparative findings from different contexts highlight challenges such as poverty, lack of employment, and disinterest in class. These issues impact attendance, dropout rates, and educational outcomes. By recognizing these challenges and adopting successful strategies, policymakers and educators can enhance adherence to SBM practices and address underlying issues.

Level of Adherence to School-Based Management Practices along with Leadership and Governance, Curriculum and Learning, Accountability, and Resource Management

Table 2 presents the results of the nine schools' Validated Practices Using Documentary Analysis, Observation, and Discussion (DOD), accounting for 40% of the evaluation.

In terms of the 1st principle, Leadership and Governance, three schools achieved the Best category, while six schools were categorized as Better. School F obtained the highest rating of 2.59 among these schools. This can be attributed to the organized and functional School Parents Teachers Association (SPTA) and School Governing Council (SGC), which received support and special funds from Barangay Sanggunian.

Table 1
Improvement of Learning Outcome (KPIs) (60%)

Indicators Schools	II - Validated Practices Using DOD (40%)								Summary (A+B+C+D) Weighted Rating	Interpretation
	A	Weighted Rating 30%	B	Weighted Rating 30%	C	Weighted Rating 25%	D	Weighted Rating 15%		
A	2.50	0.75	2.68	0.80	2.88	0.72	2.74	0.41	2.69	Best
B	2.47	0.74	2.43	0.73	1.69	0.42	2.66	0.40	2.29	Better
C	2.56	0.77	2.83	0.85	2.53	0.63	2.89	0.43	2.68	Best
D	2.37	0.71	2.06	0.62	1.81	0.45	1.62	0.24	2.02	Better
E	2.01	0.60	2.13	0.64	2.17	0.54	1.17	0.18	1.96	Better
F	2.59	0.78	2.32	0.70	2.93	0.73	2.67	0.40	2.61	Best
G	2.11	0.63	2.72	0.82	2.35	0.59	2.70	0.41	2.44	Better
H	1.78	0.53	1.91	0.57	1.43	0.36	0.90	0.14	1.60	Better
I	2.14	0.64	1.94	0.58	2.02	0.51	1.58	0.24	1.97	Better

Among the schools, Bagong Silang I High School received the lowest rating of 0.50-1.40, attributed to challenges such as student engagement in low-paid jobs and increased household responsibilities. This

Table 2
Validated Practices Using Documentary Analysis, Observation, and Discussion (DOD) (40%)

Indicators Schools	I - Improvement of learning Outcome (KPIs) (60%)							Summary (A+B-C) Weighted Rating	Interpretation
	A - Access Rating	Weighted Rating 45%	B - Efficiency Rating	Weighted Rating 25%	C - Quality Rating	Weighted Rating 30%			
A	1.0	0.45	1.33	0.33	2.0	0.60	1.38	Good	
B	1.0	0.45	2.0	0.50	2.0	0.60	1.55	Better	
C	1.0	0.45	2.0	0.50	2.0	0.60	1.55	Better	
D	1.0	0.45	1.67	0.42	2.0	0.60	1.47	Good	
E	1.0	0.45	3.0	0.75	2.0	0.60	1.80	Better	
F	1.0	0.45	2.67	0.67	2.0	0.60	1.72	Better	
G	2.0	0.90	2.0	0.50	2.0	0.60	1.55	Better	
H	3.0	1.35	1.33	0.33	2.0	0.60	2.28	Better	
I	1.0	0.45	2.33	0.58	2.0	0.60	1.63	Better	

Legend: Numerical Rating Scale-Description: 0.50-1.40 - Good; 1.50-2.49 - Better; 2.50-3.00 - Best

Legend: Numerical Rating Scale-Description: 0.50-1.40 – Good; 1.50-2.49 – Better; 2.50-3.00 – Best
 DOD: A – Leadership and Governance, B – Curriculum and Learning, C – Accountability & Continuous Improvement, D – Management of Resources,

Regarding the 2nd principle, Curriculum, and Learning, three schools reached the Best category, and the remaining six were classified as Better. School C achieved the highest rating of 2.83 Best. The school demonstrated the delivery of a relevant and effective basic education curriculum, with regular communication through transparency boards, meetings, and report cards. However, not all activities were adequately documented.

For the 3rd dimension, Accountability & Continuous Improvement, three schools were rated as Best, five schools as Better, and one school as Good. School F ranked first with a rating of 2.93 Best. The school had non-teaching staff assisting with accountable documents and inventories, an active School Parents Teachers Association (SPT), and a monthly recognition program called PRAISE. On the other hand, School H received the lowest rating of 1.43 Good, as it faced challenges in community involvement and holistic development due to its remote location.

Lastly, in the 4th dimension, Resource Management, School C achieved the highest rating of 2.89 Best. The school had documentation for all activities, designated property custodians, and proper record-keeping. Conversely, School H received the lowest rating of 0.90 due to ongoing repairs, limited space for document safekeeping, and a newly appointed School Head. These findings provide insights into the strengths and areas for improvement in terms of leadership, curriculum, accountability, and resource management within the evaluated schools.

• *School-Based Management Level of Practice*

Table 3 displays that all nine schools have achieved Level II-Maturing in their School-Based Management (SBM) Level of Practice. This indicates that these schools have initiated and sustained a continuous improvement process, involving wider participation and leading to improved performance and learning

outcomes. However, to reach Level III-Advanced, these schools need to continue implementing programs and activities with the involvement of the community and other stakeholders.

Table 3
SBM Level of Practice

Indicators (Schools)	I – Performance Improvement 60% (KPIs)		II – SBM Assessment Score (DOD) 40%		Total (I+II) WS	Level	Overall Level of Practice
	Score	Weighted Score (WS)	Score	Weighted Score (WS)			
A	1.38	0.83	2.69	1.08	1.91	II	Maturing
B	1.72	1.03	2.29	0.92	1.95	II	Maturing
C	1.55	0.93	2.68	1.07	2.00	II	Maturing
D	1.47	0.88	2.02	0.81	1.69	II	Maturing
E	1.80	1.08	1.96	0.78	1.86	II	Maturing
F	1.72	1.032	2.61	1.044	2.08	II	Maturing
G	1.55	0.93	2.44	0.98	1.91	II	Maturing
H	2.28	1.37	1.60	0.64	2.01	II	Maturing
I	1.63	0.98	1.97	0.79	1.77	II	Maturing

Interpretation: Developing - Level I; Maturing - Level II; Advanced - Level III
 Legend: Numerical Rating Scale-Description: 0.50-1.40 – Developing; 1.50-2.49 –Maturing; 2.50-3.00 – Advanced

These findings align with the results of a study by Asido et al. (2022), which investigated educational resources, faculty training, and stakeholder participation in schools' resource management. The study revealed that public funding sources are limited, necessitating efficient resource management by educational institutions to maximize learning benefits for students. While teachers lacked training in resource management, various stakeholders consistently participated in the development and implementation of resource plans.

Overall, these findings emphasize the importance of continuous improvement and stakeholder involvement in enhancing the SBM practices of schools, as supported by both the current study and previous research.

Relationship Between Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) and the Level of Adherence to SBM Practices along the Four SBM principles

Table 4
Relationship Between Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) and Level of Adherence to SBM Principles

KPIs	Level of Adherence to SBM Principles			
	Leadership and Governance	Curriculum and Learning	Accountability and Continuous Improvement	Resource Management
Access	$r_s = -0.548^*$	$r_s = -0.548^*$	$r_s = -0.548^*$	$r_s = -0.548^*$
Efficiency	$r_s = 0.085$	$r_s = 0.017$	$r_s = 0.298$	$r_s = -0.128$

Legend: *- Significant, **- Highly Significant

The Spearman Rank Correlation (r_s) was utilized to examine the relationship between Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) and the level of School-Based Management (SBM) practices across its four principles. The results, presented in Table 5, indicate a significant relationship between the KPIs, particularly access, and adherence to SBM practices. This suggests that higher KPI scores are associated with stronger adherence to SBM. Several factors contribute to these findings, such as the implementation of the Annual DepEd standard - Office Performance Commitment and Review Form (OPCRF) for school heads and the Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF) for teachers and non-teaching personnel, as well as the provision of resources and support from the Department of Education and various agencies. Additionally, the establishment of the School Governance Council, as mandated by DepEd Order no. 26, s. 2022, promotes shared governance and collaboration among parents, learners, staff, stakeholders, and the school head to improve learning outcomes and create an inclusive learning environment.

- *Challenges Encountered by the Respondents in Adhering to SBM Principles*

Table 5 presents the challenges encountered by the respondents in adhering to School-Based Management (SBM) principles, categorized into four dimensions. The major challenges identified by the nine schools were related to the collection of SBM documents and artifacts for validation. These challenges arose from factors such as unorganized filing systems, personnel turnover, limited knowledge and immersion of new teachers, and time constraints due to teaching responsibilities. Additionally, the COVID-19

pandemic posed difficulties in initiating activities and diverted school funds to pandemic-related expenses. Despite these challenges, the community showed strong support for the school's implementation of SBM. The table provides a comprehensive overview of the challenges, highlighting areas that require attention and improvement in the SBM process.

The Collection of Documents dimension poses significant challenges in maintaining and preserving SBM-related documentation. The most prevalent challenge is the loss of documents and artifacts, which occurred frequently (f=63). This issue highlights the importance of implementing proper document management and storage systems to ensure the safekeeping of essential records. Other challenges within this dimension include difficulties in organizing and labeling documents, confusion and misinterpretation of indicators, undocumented activities, lack of orientation on SBM principles and filing systems, difficulty in appreciating documents by the validating team, and absence of benchmarking to previously validated documents. These challenges underscore the need for clear guidelines, comprehensive training programs, and an efficient filing system to enhance documentation and the evaluation process.

In the dimension of School Heads and Teachers' Attitudes Towards SBM, challenges primarily revolve around the attitudes and workload of School Heads (SH) and teachers. The challenges of assignment overload for teachers (f=40) and the burden of numerous tasks on SH and teachers (f=45) indicate that heavy workloads may hinder their active participation in SBM initiatives. To address these challenges, it is crucial to implement workload management strategies, support mechanisms, and clear role delineation to alleviate the strain on educators. Additional challenges include the presence of new committee members unfamiliar with SBM principles and indicators (f=50) and a lack of cooperation between dimension committees (f=10). These challenges highlight the importance of comprehensive orientation programs for new committee members, fostering cooperation, and promoting a collaborative approach to SBM implementation.

Table 5
Challenges Encountered by the Respondents in Adhering to SBM Principles

Challenges	Frequency (f)	Rank
I - Collection of documents		
Lost documents and artifacts	63	1
Difficult to organize/unlabeled documents for 3 years	50	6.5
Confusion, and misinterpretation of the indicators	52	4
Undocumented activities	60	2
Lack of orientation on SBM principles/indicators and filing system.	40	10.5
Difficulty in appreciation of documents by the validating team	20	16.5
No benchmarking was done to previously validated to enable us to actually see how documents were prepared.	41	9
II - School Head and Teachers' Attitudes Towards SBM		
Assignment overload for teachers	40	10.5
Many tasks of SH and teachers	45	8.0
Some committee members are new and not familiar with SBM principles and its indicators	50	6.5
Lack of cooperation between each dimension committee	10	19
Working beyond office hours and weekends to compile the documents.	30	13.5

III - Resources and Time		
Lack of time in collecting, organizing, and filing artifacts	51	5
Insufficient resources to purchase materials for data filing purposes.	20	16.5
Limited space /area for safekeeping documents	56	3
IV - Stakeholder Support		
Inadequate knowledge of SBM protocols	30	13.5
Lack of resources to support SBM programs	31	12
Less stakeholder participation and involvement	15	18
Inadequate knowledge by stakeholders of what SBM is and how it works.	29	15
Resistance of stakeholders to change implemented by the schools	6	20

The dimension of Resources and Time highlights challenges related to resource availability and time management. Challenges include a lack of time for collecting and organizing artifacts (f=51), insufficient resources for data filing (f=20), and limited space for document storage (f=56). These challenges underscore the need for efficient resource allocation, effective time management strategies, and appropriate infrastructure.

In the Stakeholder Support dimension, challenges include inadequate knowledge of SBM protocols (f=30), lack of resources for SBM programs (f=31), limited stakeholder participation (f=15), inadequate understanding of SBM among stakeholders (f=29), and resistance to change (f=6). Addressing these challenges requires stakeholder engagement, effective communication, and capacity-building initiatives to enhance understanding and support for SBM.

In conclusion, these challenges provide insights into areas that require improvement in SBM implementation. Strategies such as proper documentation systems, comprehensive training

programs, workload management, resource allocation, infrastructure improvement, stakeholder engagement, and effective communication are needed. Addressing these challenges will enhance the effectiveness of SBM initiatives and improve educational outcomes. Similar studies conducted in Albay and Camarines Sur (Osea, 2020) and Nigeria (Sumerianz Journal of Social Science, 2020) also highlight challenges in SBM implementation, emphasizing the importance of stakeholder cooperation, knowledge, and motivation.

• *Opportunities Encountered by the Respondents in Adhering to SBM Principles*

Despite the challenges faced by the respondents, they also encountered opportunities in adhering to SBM principles. Table 6 illustrates the opportunities experienced, with indicators 1 and 2 being the most significant. For example, some School Heads and teachers were promoted or transferred to other schools based on their SBM results. Additionally, all schools had collaborative efforts in preparing their 3-year School Improvement Plan (SIP) and Annual Implementation Plan, as evidenced by the signatures of internal and external stakeholders. These findings are supported by Llego's (2021) study, which highlights the advantages of SBM for schools and their communities. Based on the study's findings, a proposed SBM handbook titled "Together we Envision SBM Assessment and Monitoring a Success (TEAMS)" aims to address the challenges encountered during SBM validation and uplift the schools' SBM level of practice.

Table 6

Challenges Encountered by the Respondents in Adhering to SBM Principles

Opportunities	Freq. (f)	Rank
SBM level of practice is one of the requirements for SH promotion or re-classification.	63	1
The school takes responsibility to plan and implement its School Improvement Plan (SIP) and Annual Implementation Plan (AP)	60	3

Redirect resources (MOOE) and other funds to support the goals for development in each school.	60	3
Lead to realistic budgeting.	50	9.5
Enhanced Mobilization of local resources	51	8
Lead to greater creativity in the design of the program	58	5
Improve teachers; morale and nurture leadership	50	9.5
The decision is devolved to School Head, teacher, and stakeholders (school empowerment)	54	7
School leaders are accountable to stakeholders	60	3
Allow competent individuals in the school to make decisions that will improve the learning process.	55	6
Focus accountability for decisions	50	9.5

Indicators Adapted from D.O 83, s. 2012 Proposed Intervention Material to Improve the Level of Schools' Adherence to SBM Guidelines

IV. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Among the nine schools validated for SBM level of practice, seven schools were classified as Better and two schools as Good in terms of improvement in learning outcomes (60%) and adherence to SBM Principles (40%). The SBM level of practice along KPIs and SBM Principles was interpreted as Maturing Level. There was a significant relationship between Key Performance Indicators and SBM Practices, particularly in Leadership and Governance, Curriculum and Learning, Accountability and Continuous Improvement, and Resource Management. Challenges were categorized into four themes: Collection of documents, School Head and Teachers' Attitudes towards SBM, Resources and Time, and

Stakeholder Support. These challenges need to be addressed to enhance adherence to SBM principles. Additionally, opportunities were identified, such as career promotions for School Heads and teachers. To address the challenges, the proposed innovation material "Together We Envision SBM Assessment and Monitoring a Success Handbook" aimed to enhance adherence to SBM principles.

The study's findings suggest several recommendations for the SBM implementer and the school to enhance their adherence to SBM principles and improve educational outcomes. These recommendations include increasing enrolment through collaborative efforts with stakeholders, having qualified stakeholders to assist in implementing activities, conducting orientations on SBM guidelines and principles, revisiting guidelines to plan innovative activities for curriculum and learning, implementing the TEAMS Handbook, and conducting regular monitoring. Furthermore, future researchers are encouraged to conduct comparative studies, explore the role of school administrators and stakeholders, provide comprehensive training programs, investigate the relationship between SBM variables, and evaluate and enhance intervention materials. These recommendations aim to improve SBM practices and promote effective implementation for better educational outcomes.

V. FINDINGS

The findings of the study were summarized as reflected below:

1. The evaluation of efficiency and quality provides insights for improving School-Based Management practices in each performance indicator. By addressing challenges and learning from successful strategies, administrators, and policymakers can enhance education within Labo West District schools. Teacher attendance and participation are crucial, particularly in distance learning, according to Maxwell's study. The current study's findings with this, emphasize the significance of teacher engagement for effective education.

Among the schools, Bagong Silang I High School received the lowest rating of 0.50-1.40, attributed to

challenges such as student engagement in low-paid jobs and increased household responsibilities. This resulted in higher dropout rates and decreased completion and cohort-survival rates.

Baah et al.'s study (2020) in Ghana supports the findings, identifying poverty, lack of regular employment, and disinterest in class as reasons for dropout rates. Poverty, specifically related to education expenses and limited job opportunities, was a significant factor in Labo West. However, disinterest in studying was not explicitly mentioned. Comparative findings from different contexts highlight challenges such as poverty, lack of employment, and disinterest in class. These issues impact attendance, dropout rates, and educational outcomes. By recognizing these challenges and adopting successful strategies, policymakers and educators can enhance adherence to SBM practices and address underlying issues.

2. Level of Adherence to School-Based Management Practices along with Leadership and Governance, Curriculum and Learning, Accountability, and Resource Management were found to be better and best as reflected in the table below based on the documentary analysis, observation and discussion, and accounting.

In terms of the 1st principle, Leadership, and Governance, three schools achieved the Best category, while six schools were categorized as Better. This can be attributed to the organized and functional School Parents Teachers Association (SPTA) and School Governing Council (SGC), which received support and special funds from Barangay Sanggunian.

Regarding the 2nd principle, Curriculum, and Learning, three schools reached the Best category, and the remaining six were classified as Better. The school demonstrated the delivery of a relevant and effective basic education curriculum, with regular communication through transparency boards, meetings, and report cards. However, not all activities were adequately documented.

For the 3rd dimension, Accountability & Continuous Improvement, three schools were rated as Best, five schools as Better, and one school as Good. The school had non-teaching staff assisting with accountable

documents and inventories, an active School Parents Teachers Association (SPT), and a monthly recognition program called PRAISE.

Lastly, in the 4th dimension, Resource Management, School C achieved the highest rating of 2.89 Best. The school had documentation for all activities, designated property custodians, and proper record-keeping. These findings provide insights into the strengths and areas for improvement in terms of leadership, curriculum, accountability, and resource management within the evaluated schools.

3. School-Based Management Level of Practice of the nine schools involved in this study achieved Level II-Maturing. This indicates that these schools have initiated and sustained a continuous improvement process, involving wider participation and leading to improved performance and learning outcomes. However, to reach Level III-Advanced, these schools need to continue implementing programs and activities with the involvement of the community and other stakeholders.

These findings align with the results of a study by Asido et al. (2022), which investigated educational resources, faculty training, and stakeholder participation in schools' resource management. The study revealed that public funding sources are limited, necessitating efficient resource management by educational institutions to maximize learning benefits for students. Overall, these findings emphasize the importance of continuous improvement and stakeholder involvement in enhancing the SBM practices of schools, as supported by both the current study and previous research.

4. The Relationship Between Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) and the Level of Adherence to SBM Practices along the Four SBM principles was calculated using the Spearman Rank Correlation (r_s). Statistics revealed that there is a significant relationship between the KPIs, particularly access, and adherence to SBM practices. This suggests that higher KPI scores are associated with stronger adherence to SBM. Several factors contribute to these findings, such as the implementation of the Annual DepEd standard - Office Performance Commitment and Review Form (OPCRF) for school heads and the

Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF) for teachers and non-teaching personnel, as well as the provision of resources and support from the Department of Education and various agencies. Additionally, the establishment of the School Governance Council, as mandated by DepEd Order no. 26, s. 2022, promotes shared governance and collaboration among parents, learners, staff, stakeholders, and the school head to improve learning outcomes and create an inclusive learning environment.

5. The challenges encountered by the respondents in adhering to SBM principles were categorized into four dimensions. The majority of the nine schools 'challenges were related to the collection of SBM documents and artifacts for validation. These challenges arose from factors such as unorganized filing systems, personnel turnover, limited knowledge and immersion of new teachers, and time constraints due to teaching responsibilities.

The Collection of Documents dimension poses significant challenges in maintaining and preserving SBM-related documentation. The most prevalent challenge is the loss of documents and artifacts. Other challenges within this dimension include difficulties in organizing and labeling documents, confusion and misinterpretation of indicators, undocumented activities, lack of orientation on SBM principles and filing systems, difficulty in appreciating documents by the validating team, and absence of benchmarking to previously validated documents. These challenges underscore the need for clear guidelines, comprehensive training programs, and an efficient filing system to enhance documentation and the evaluation process.

In the dimension of School Heads and Teachers' Attitudes Towards SBM, challenges primarily revolve around the attitudes and workload of School Heads (SH) and teachers. The challenges of assignment overload for teachers ($f=40$) and the burden of numerous tasks on SH and teachers ($f=45$) indicate that heavy workloads may hinder their active participation in SBM initiatives. Additional challenges include the presence of new committee members unfamiliar with SBM principles and

indicators (f=50) and a lack of cooperation between dimension committees (f=10).

The dimension of Resources and Time highlights challenges related to resource availability and time management. Challenges include a lack of time for collecting and organizing artifacts (f=51), insufficient resources for data filing (f=20), and limited space for document storage (f=56). These challenges underscore the need for efficient resource allocation, effective time management strategies, and appropriate infrastructure.

In the Stakeholder Support dimension, challenges include inadequate knowledge of SBM protocols (f=30), lack of resources for SBM programs (f=31), limited stakeholder participation (f=15), inadequate understanding of SBM among stakeholders (f=29), and resistance to change (f=6). Addressing these challenges requires stakeholder engagement, effective communication, and capacity-building initiatives to enhance understanding and support for SBM.

In conclusion, these challenges provide insights into areas that require improvement in SBM implementation. Strategies such as proper documentation systems, comprehensive training programs, workload management, resource allocation, infrastructure improvement, stakeholder engagement, and effective communication are needed. Addressing these challenges will enhance the effectiveness of SBM initiatives and improve educational outcomes. Similar studies conducted in Albay and Camarines Sur (Osea, 2020) and Nigeria (Sumerianz Journal of Social Science, 2020) also highlight challenges in SBM implementation, emphasizing the importance of stakeholder cooperation, knowledge, and motivation.

6. The opportunities encountered by the respondents in adhering to SBM Principles were related to making collaborative efforts in preparing their 3-year School Improvement Plan (SIP) and Annual Implementation Plan, as evidenced by the signatures of internal and external stakeholders. These findings are supported by Llego's (2021) study, which highlights the advantages of SBM for schools and their communities. The researchers saw these as an opportunity to come up with a proposed SBM handbook titled "Together we Envision SBM Assessment and Monitoring a Success (TEAMS)" which aims to address the challenges

encountered during SBM validation and uplift the schools' SBM level of practice.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the study, the following conclusions were derived by the researchers:

1. Among the nine schools validated for SBM level of practice, seven schools were classified as Better and two schools as Good in terms of improvement in learning outcomes (60%) and adherence to SBM Principles (40%). The SBM level of practice along KPIs and SBM Principles was interpreted as Maturing Level.
2. There was a significant relationship between Key Performance Indicators and SBM Practices, particularly in Leadership and Governance, Curriculum and Learning, Accountability and Continuous Improvement, and Resource Management.
3. Challenges were categorized into four themes: Collection of documents, School Head and Teachers' Attitudes towards SBM, Resources and Time, and Stakeholder Support. These challenges need to be addressed to enhance adherence to SBM principles.
4. The proposed output of this study provided the researchers to identify the opportunities for career promotions for School Heads and teachers which is written in an innovative material called "Together we Envision SBM Assessment and Monitoring a Success Handbook. It aimed to enhance further the adherence of the school heads' practices and strategic directions to the SBM principles.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the conclusions, the following recommendations were provided in this study.

The study's findings suggest several recommendations for the SBM implementer and the school to enhance their adherence to SBM principles and improve educational outcomes.

1. School heads need to increase further enrolment through collaborative efforts with stakeholders, in assisting the DepEd in the implementation of activities in each school.

2. There is a need to intensify the orientation of the school heads on the guidelines and principles of SBM.
3. School heads should revisit the SBM guidelines to ensure that their plans are innovative enough to support the curriculum and learning, which are all stated in the TEAMS Handbook which is the output of the study.
4. Periodic meetings and regular monitoring of the school heads, and public school district supervisors to see to it that SMB principles are well implemented in each school/district.
5. Future researchers are encouraged to conduct comparative studies, explore the role of school administrators and stakeholders, provide comprehensive training programs, investigate the relationship between SBM variables, and evaluate and enhance intervention materials to improve SBM practices and promote effective implementation for better educational outcomes.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The researchers extend their heartfelt gratitude to those who contributed to the completion of this study. Special thanks go to Nympha D. Guemo, the Schools Division Superintendent of Camarines Norte, for granting approval to conduct the study. Appreciation is also expressed to Dr. Anicia S. Madarang, the adviser, for her invaluable assistance and creative suggestions in reviewing the manuscript. The unwavering support and guidance of Dr. Sonia S. Carbonell, the Dean of the Graduate School of Mabini Colleges, are also acknowledged. Gratitude is extended to the panel of experts led by Dr. Erlinda J. Porcinula, Dr. Julia Tessa Lastrella, and Dr. Helen B. Abordo for their insightful suggestions and guidance. The researcher also acknowledges the Public Schools District Supervisor of Labo West District, the SDO Validating Team, the School Heads, and all the teaching and non-teaching personnel of the nine schools for granting permission and participating in the study. Special thanks are given to my best friend, Janice A. Cruz, and the researcher's family for their unwavering support. Lastly, gratitude is expressed to the Heavenly Father for guidance throughout the research process.

REFERENCES

BOOKS

- [1] Baah, A., Owusu-Agyeman, K., Boateng, S., Aboagye, B., & Ampofo, E. T. (2020). The Impact of Illicit Gold Mining on School Dropout: A Case of Senior High Schools in Asante Akim Municipality. *Social Education Research*, 245-253.
- [2] Moradi, S., Hussin, S. B., & Barzegar, N. (2012). School-based management (SBM), opportunity or threat (education systems of Iran). *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 69, 2143-2150.

JOURNALS

- [3] American International Journal of Education and Linguistics Research. Vol. 2, No. 2; 2019. ISSN 2641-7987. E-ISSN 2641-7995. Published by American Center of Science and Education, USA.
- [4] DepEd Teacher Contributor. (2020, March 12). Basic Education Statistics in the Philippines. Retrieved from <https://www.teacherph.com/basic-education-statistics-philippines/>
- [5] Dondero, Grace Marie. "School-based management, teachers' decisional participation levels, school effectiveness, and job satisfaction." (1993). ETD Collection for Fordham University. AAI9328408.
- [6] Department of Education, Pasay City. (n.d.). Education Support System for Schools (EDSS). Retrieved from <http://edses.depedpasay.ph/>
- [7] Magayana, M. J. S. (2023). SDO-Pasay keeps the SBM (ball) rollin'. Retrieved from <https://www.depedpasay.ph/sdo-pasay-keeps-the-sbm-ball-rollin/>
- [8] Morenike, O. V. (2019). Scale Validation: School-Based Management Inventory First Edition (SBMI-1). *American International Journal of Education and Linguistics Research*, 2(2), 22–28. <https://doi.org/10.46545/aijelr.v2i2.185>

ELECTRONIC SOURCES / WEBSITES

- [9] American English Dictionary. (2005). Challenge. Retrieved from <https://dictionary>.

[10] [cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/challenge](https://www.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/challenge)

PUBLISHED THESIS

[11] Abulencia, A. S. (2019). Philippine Normal University ed Management anchored on the decentralization trend of the 70s. In *School-Based Management: A Structural Reform Intervention* (pp. 1-12). ResearchGate. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/277957224_School](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/277957224_School-Based_Management_A_Structural_Reform_Intervention)

-
Based_Management_A_Structural_Reform_Intervention

[12] Acido, J. V., & Kilongkilong, D. A. A. (2022). Resource Management Practices of a Public Higher Institution in the Philippines. Online Submission.

[13] Bustamante, J. (2021). School-Based Management (SBM) Practices and Effective School Performance. Sto. Angel Norte Elementary School, Santa Cruz 4009 Laguna, Philippines.

[14] Cabardo, J. R. O. (2016). Levels of Participation of the School Stakeholders to the Different School-Initiated Activities and the Implementation of School-Based Management. *Journal of Inquiry & Action in Education*, 8(1). Retrieved from <https://digitalcommons.buffalostate.edu/jiae/vol8/iss1/5>

[15] Cabardo, J. R. O. (2019). School-initiated activities and the implementation of school-based management. *Journal of Inquiry & Action in Education*, 11(1), 1-15. doi:10.1177/1550576419853052

[16] Camacho, R., & Farrales, S. (2020). School-Based Management Validation of Schools: A Case Study of Olongapo City Division. Retrieved from <https://deped-olongapo.com/school-based-management-validation-of-schools/>

[17] Chatterji, P., & Li, Y. (2021). Effects of COVID-19 on school enrollment. *Economic of Education Review*, 83, 102128. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2021.102128>

[18] Cheong Cheng, Y. (1993). The theory and characteristics of school-based management. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 7(6).

[19] Cogtas, C. (2018). School-based Management Practices and Teacher Productivity in Public Elementary Schools in Davao City. *Philippine E-Journal*, 2(1), 1-15.

[20] Datu Lipus Makapandong National High School. (2023, March 8). Accountability and Continuous Improvement. Retrieved from <https://dlmnhs.net/accountability-and-continuous-improvement/>

[21] F, Claudia. "Interpreting a Non-Significant Outcome." Study.com, Study.com, 18 Mar. 2020, <https://study.com/academy/lesson/interpreting-a-non-significant-outcome.html>.

[22] Laraño, C. (2019). The Level of Community Participation in School-Based Management of Department of Education Division of Laguna. *Ascendens Asia Journal of Multidisciplinary Research Abstracts*, 3(2L).

[23] Lindberg, E., & Vanyushyn, V. (2013). School-Based Management with/without Instructional Leadership: Experience from Sweden. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 2(3), 39-50.

[24] Llego, Mark Anthony A. (2018). SBM Assessment Tool with Contextualized Means of Verifications (MOVs). Retrieved June 4, 2023, from <https://www.teacherph.com/sbm-assessment-tool-with-contextualized-means-of-verifications-movs/>

[25] Llego, Mark Anthony A. (2021) A Comprehensive Guide to School-Based Management (SBM) <https://www.teacherph.com/a-comprehensive-guide-to-school-based-management-sbm>

[26] Maca, M. N. (2019). School-based Management in the Philippines: Fostering Innovations in the Public Education System. *Romblon State University Research Journal*, 2(1), 35-59.

[27] Maxwell, G. (2021). COVID-19: The Pandemic's Impact on Grading Practices and Perceptions at the High School Level.

[28] Morenike, O. V. (2019). Scale Validation: School-Based Management Inventory First Edition (SBMI-1). *American International Journal of Education and Linguistics Research*, 2(2), 22-28.

- [29] Office of Research Education/Consumer Guide. (2019). *Assessing School-Based Management in the Philippines*. Quezon City, Philippines: Department of Education.
- [30] Osea, E. A. (2023). *Issues and Challenges in the Implementation of School-Based Management: Bases For Policy Recommendation*. *International Education Trend Issues*, 1(1), 30-39.
- [31] Pangilinan, Evelyn. A. (2022). *A Quick Refresher on School-Based Management in the Philippines*. *Diyaryo Milenyo*, August 8, 2022.
- [32] Patrinos, H. A., & Fasih, T. (2009). *Decentralized decision-making in schools: The theory and evidence on school-based management*. World Bank Publications.
- [33] Pepito, G. C., & Acibar, L. B. (2019). *School-based management and performance of public elementary school heads: basis for technical assistance plan*. *International Journal of Innovation and Research in Educational Sciences*, 6(1), 67-83.
- [34] 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*. *European Journal Humanities and Educational Advancements*, 2(1), 35-50.
- [35] Prew, M., & Fellow, V. (2018). *Note on school-based management in secondary education in sub-Saharan Africa*.
- [36] 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.
- [37] Ya, K. Z., Giatman, M., Rizal, F., & Wulansari, R. E. (2020). *Revisiting the School-Based Management Recent Studies*. *Pedagogi: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*, 20(2), 119-127.
- OTHERS (DEPED ISSUANCES AND REPUBLIC ACT)
- [38] *Datu Lipus Makapandong National High School*. (n.d.). *School-based management*. Retrieved June 4, 2023, from [https://dlmnhs.net/school-based-management/Department of Education](https://dlmnhs.net/school-based-management/Department%20of%20Education%20(Philippines).%20(n.d.).%20School-based%20management.%20Retrieved%20June%204,%202023,%20from%20https://sites.google.com/deped.gov.ph/nhsmariki%20na/school-based-management)
- (Philippines). (n.d.). *School-based management*. Retrieved June 4, 2023, from [https://sites.google.com/deped.gov.ph/nhsmariki na/school-based-management](https://sites.google.com/deped.gov.ph/nhsmariki%20na/school-based-management).
- [39] Department of Education. (2012, November 29). *Implementing Guidelines on the Revised School-Based Management (SBM) Framework, Assessment Process and Tool (APAT)*. Retrieved from <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2012/11/29/do-83-s-2012-implementing-guidelines-on-the-revised-school-based-management-sbm-framework-assessment-process-and-tool-apat/>
- [40] Department of Education. (2013, April 8). *The Philippine Accreditation System for Basic Education (PASBE) Supplemental Guidelines to DepEd Order No. 83, S. 2012 (The Implementing Guidelines of the Revised SBM Framework, Assessment Process and Tool)*. Retrieved from <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2013/04/08/do-20-s-2013-the-philippine-accreditation-system-for-basic-education-pasbe-supplemental-guidelines-to-deped-order-no-83-s-2012-the-implementing-guidelines-of-the-revised-sbm-framework-asses/>
- [41] Department of Education. (2022, August). *DepEd Memorandum No. 75, s. 2022 or "Guidelines on the Transition from DepEd Order No. 31, s. 2020 or the Guidelines on Assessment and Grading in Light of the Basic Education Learning Continuity Plan to Proposed Interim Guidelines on Assessment and Grading School Year 2022-2023"*. *Free Educational Tools*. Retrieved from [https://www.freeeducationaltools.com/2022/08/deped-Memorandum -no-75-s-2022 or.html#:~: text=The%20 Department%20of%20Education %20issues,transition%20from%20DepEd%20O rder%20No.](https://www.freeeducationaltools.com/2022/08/deped-Memorandum-no-75-s-2022-or.html#:~:text=The%20Department%20of%20Education%20issues,transition%20from%20DepEd%20Order%20No.)
- [42] Department of Education. (n.d.). *Curriculum and instruction functions*. Retrieved June 4, 2023, from <https://www.deped.gov.ph/about-deped/central-office/curriculum-and-instruction-functions/>
- [43] Department of Education. (n.d.). *Interim guidelines for assessment and grading in light of the basic education learning continuity plan*. *DepEd Tambayan*. Retrieved from <https://depedtambayan.org/interim-guidelines-for-assessment-and-grading-in-light-of-the->

basic-education-learning-continuity-plan/#:~:text=The%20Department%20of%20Education%20(DepEd,for%20school%20year%202020%2D2021.

- [44] Republic Act No. 9155. (2001, August 11). Retrieved from <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/2001/08/11/republic-act-no-9155/>
- TeacherPH. (2023, March 8). Basic education statistics in the Philippines. Retrieved June 4, 2023, from <https://www.teacherph.com/basic-education-statistics-philippines/>