



School-Based Management in Benguet, Philippines: Its Impact to Quality Improvement among Public Secondary School Heads

Percyveranda A. Lubrica^{1*}, Imelda G. Parcasio¹, Jingle P. Cuevas¹, Manolita N. Alvaro¹,
Alma Vida G. Gallardo¹, and Ruth S. Batani²

1 - College of Teacher Education, Benguet State University

2 - College of Arts and Sciences, Benguet State University

* Corresponding author email address: plubrica@yahoo.com

Abstract

Experts agree that there is a need for continuous evaluation and upgrading for school-based management (SMB) to be fully realized. In the Philippines, there had been few attempts at the national level but in-depth, localized evaluation is being recommended. Hence, this study was conceptualized to document and determine the effect of SMB on the school heads' governance of secondary school in Benguet, Philippines. The study employed both quantitative method (structured survey) and qualitative method (focused group discussion and interviews). Results showed that the use of SMB by school heads is a key factor in effectively running the school system. Manifestations of these are observed in the very satisfactory application of the SMB knowledge and skills in school governance with minimal support and guidance from their superiors. In addition, the school heads' extent of application of the acquired SBM knowledge and skills have influenced their capability in school governance. However, the school heads expressed developmental needs to further their management skills. Such results imply a substantial realization on the implementation of SMB in secondary schools embarking on institutionalizing quality improvement measures in all program areas as mandated in their respective school systems.

KEYWORDS

School-based Management
school head
school governance

Introduction

In recent times, many countries around the world have begun to devolve more authority and resources to schools in an effort to improve teaching and learning conditions. School-based management (SBM) reforms are one of this kind. SBM is the decentralization of authority from the central administration to the school level (Caldwell, 2005). It is based on the concept

that people, who are closer to students, should decide about their educational programs such as curriculum, equipment, schedule and individuals, facilities, and other sources. It is claimed that the increased involvement of parents, students, teachers, officials, principals, and beneficiary groups of the community and local organizations may increase the independency, responsibility, and accountability of the school. By increasing the

level of school responsibility, it is expected that the efficiency of plan is promoted and education effectiveness would be improved (Weng, 2003).

In 2001, the Department of Education (DepEd) adopted SMB in the Philippines. Subsequently, trainings and seminars on SMB were conducted for the school heads in all parts of the country. With almost two decades of its implementation, there is a need to evaluate if SMB had effected its desired outcomes. There have been initial works on this such as those by Khattri et al. (2010) and World Bank and AusAID (2013; 2016). However, these works are at the national level and are mostly based on administrative reports and surveys. These works admit that they were only able to provide a first glimpse on the potential for SMB in an East Asian context. The authors suggested localized evaluation of SMB to determine the specific aspect that leads to the desired results and the negative effects as well. Such evaluations should not only provide more accurate estimates of the effectiveness of the reforms, but could also help answer policy-related questions regarding design and implementation of those reforms in different socio-cultural contexts. These concerns lead to the conceptualization of the study – to look into the impacts of SMB in Benguet in Cordillera Administrative Region, one of the many major socio-cultural context in the Philippines.

Recent studies from many different countries have shown that school-based management can have a positive impact in terms of increasing access to education and improving learning outcomes (AusAID ERF, 2011). However, these reviews have also shown that the type of SBM reforms being implemented varies enormously from country to country and that the reforms can take some time to yield results. Moreover, their success depends critically on parental participation, political support, and effective implementation (Gertler et al., 2007). The success of SBM is dependent, in part, on how school systems are run by the principal, also known as school heads.

The position of the school principal is an enduring feature of the schools. In most countries, the principal is the key educational leader and the one person in school who has the most opportunity to exercise leadership. There is, however, a considerable debate concerning the

impact that principals have in school-based management, especially in terms of student learning outcomes (Hallinger & Heck, 1996; Mulford, 1996). These concerns had generated considerable research interest (Leithwood & Riehl, 2003). In the Philippines, however, the interest in this area of SMB had been discussed in several meetings but no concrete evidence (in the form of published studies) had been provided. Our study aimed to help in this regard by documenting the role played by the school head (principal) in implementing SMB, their developmental needs, and the effect of SMB to their respective school.

The study aimed to determine the distinguishing characteristics of school-based management that would have an impact on quality improvement in school governance among secondary schools in Benguet, Philippines. Specifically, it aimed to: ⁽¹⁾determine the school heads' capability in applying the knowledge and skills acquired in school-based management (SBM) along Instructional Leadership, Leadership and Administration, Fiscal Management, Human Resource Development, Monitoring and Accountability and Planning and Development; ⁽²⁾identify the developmental needs of the school heads and corresponding interventions along the varied school-based management domains; and ⁽³⁾determine the impact of school-based management to school quality improvement among the secondary schools in the province.

The reliance of the study on the school heads as the primary source of data about the school-based management will not be limiting but may be conclusive. Such results could improve the school system through better decisions making because the principals will know the area where they are strong and areas which to improve. Further, it would provide data, which would serve as a basis for higher education institutions (HEIs) in crafting capability-building program for school administrators.

Theoretical Framework of the Study

This study is anchored on the premise that management training improves the capability of the school heads. The improved capabilities and competencies of school heads are manifested in the interventions employed in addressing the developmental needs and challenges encountered



in their respective schools. It presupposes that with the acquired competencies, school heads have developed good practices in managing schools worthy of emulation. These assumptions are grounded on the systems theory which states that an organization with management acting as subsystem reproduces and expands faster than an organization without such a management system (Daft, 2008).

Capability building among principals or school heads is of utmost importance in the management of schools. Wallace Foundation (2013) pointed out that the principal remains the central source of leadership influence in any school amidst the presence of other leadership patterns such as assistant principals, formal and informal teacher leaders, and parents. An earlier study conducted by Lubrica et al. (2011) proves that school-based management was already in place in the secondary school system in Benguet and Ifugao, Philippines. It is now high time to evaluate the effects of SMB. The study aimed to evaluate the effects of SMB on the capacity of school head along with the different management areas such as Instructional Supervision, Leadership and Administration, Fiscal Management, Human Resource Development, Monitoring and Evaluation, and Planning and Development.

Instructional supervision. Instructional supervision is one of the management tasks of a principal and is vital for the realization of quality improvement both for teacher and student achievement. The country's version of SBM, in fact, is anchored on an empowered school principal (Gamage & San Antonio, 2006), legalized by DECS Order No.17 of 1997 that gives school principals with instructional, administrative, and fiscal autonomy. Nelly (2008) underscored that the main purpose of a school's existence is to enable teaching and learning process to take place. In this context, the school management must create conducive conditions that allow quality teaching and learning. One way of doing it is through shared governance. However, studies revealed that one of the major problems in shared governance is the lack of clear areas of responsibility, causing the exercise of instructional leadership functions to become fragmented and inconsistent in many secondary schools (Hallinger, 1991). Further studies conducted by Sharma and Kannan (2012) pointed out that instructional supervision should

be conducted in more systematic manner by involving teachers, principals, subject teachers and subject specialists. To make practices more meaningful, the supervision processes should not be mundane and the principals need to upgrade themselves with skills of supervision.

Administration and leadership. The leadership and administrative skills of the principal or school head is brought to the fore and greatly highlighted with the autonomy ushered in by the decentralization of authority and powers through SBM. The country's version of SBM, legalized thru DECS Order No. 17 of 1997, empowered school principals with instructional, administrative, and fiscal autonomy (Gamage & San Antonio, 2006). This entails the principal's initiative to put into place a form of collaborative school governance that involves him/her and various stakeholders in the management of the school (Walker & Dimmock, 2000). However, this collaborative governance, also dubbed as participatory school administration, leadership, and management (PSALM), while acknowledged as an essential ingredient in the quest for better schools (Gamage & San Antonio, 2006), is strongly suggested to go beyond mere participation of stakeholders but towards meaningful involvement (Waters et al., 2003).

Studies proved that a school's academic performance is strongly influenced by trust in and among its decision-makers (Forsyth et al., 2006; Bryke & Schneider, 2002). Building trust is directly proportional to the level of stakeholders' involvement through collaborative governance. It now becomes evident that the hallmarks of an effective school principal as leader and administrator are the presence of trust in the organization and the implementation of PSALM in decision making (Blasé & Blase, 2001; Tschannen-Moran, 2001; Siegal & Worth, 2001).

Fiscal management. As school heads and stakeholders introduce learning programs and goals, the role of the school head is to make sure allocations are followed and funds are properly disbursed because the success of programs is more often dependent on the effective and efficient management of the funds provided. Hence, financial planning, budget management, and accounting system are among the skills and competencies a leader should possess.



Part of the decentralized decision-making powers delegated to principals and, often, even teachers and community members, is fiscal management or school-based budgeting (SBB). In accordance with the goals of SBM, SBB does not actually seek to reduce costs but to improve school productivity by making sure that fiscal decisions are made “closest to the student” (Spear, 1983). The Philippines’ version of SBM reveals a gradual move from the school head that directly performs fund management duties, e.g., accounting and/or bookkeeping functions (Level I, Standard SBM Practice) to the school head being the fund manager and devoting more attention to instructional leadership and supervision (Level III, Mature SBM Practice) (BESRA & SBM-TWG, 2009).

Human resource management. In human resource development, Itika (2011) cited the advanced organization life cycle theory, which characterizes organizational development from formation, growth, maturity, decline, and death. According to the theory, the driving force in all these stages is the nature of the workforce. At the maturity stage, the organization cannot continue to grow or survive if there is no organizational structure that supports human resource creativity, innovation, teamwork, and high performance, which will withstand pressure from competitors (Cameron & Whetton, 1981). It is then the role of the school leader to ensure the survival and growth of the human resources in school in order to improve quality and student achievement by harnessing “all available resources including people to find the best in them in order to achieve whatever may be needed or desired” (Itika, 2011).

Monitoring and accountability. The drive for academic achievement as the hallmark of school performance provides the impetus for school-based accountability system. This is through the reforms brought about by the SBM, which moved the focus of accountability systems from the district level to the performance of individual schools (Goertz, 2000). This is from the proposition that performance-based accountability should focus on educational policy, administration, and practice directly on teaching and learning by “defining goals, allocating authority, managing incentives, building capacity, measuring progress, reporting results, and enforcing consequences”– all related and redounding to student performance (Adams &

Kirst, 1999). These emphases are reflected in the SBM accountability system adopted by the Philippines, where accountability measures revolve around the management of the school’s resources, classroom instruction, and student achievement (BESRA & SBM-TWG, 2009).

Planning and development. Abulencia (2013) stressed that with the decentralization of decision-making from the central office to the school level, the principal or the school head is now empowered more than ever to exercise his/her role in the functions of policymaking, revenue generation, curriculum design, school administration, and teacher management. School heads are expected to lead in setting clear mission and goals that are in tune with the context of his/her school and to be receptive and respond appropriately and effectively to local needs (Santibañez, 2006). This entails careful planning to achieve such ends. Barrera-Osorio et al. (2009) stressed that planning and development could facilitate ⁽¹⁾added parent and community participation which could lead to more input and resources from parents (whether in cash or in-kind); ⁽²⁾more effective use of resources; ⁽³⁾a more open and welcoming school environment with the involvement of the community in the decision-making processes leading to more collegial relationships and increased satisfaction; ⁽⁴⁾improved student performance as a result of reduced repetition rates, reduced dropout rates; and eventually, ⁽⁵⁾better learning outcomes.

Methodology

Data Gathering

The study involved the total enumeration of all the 43 school heads of the secondary schools in the 13 municipalities of Benguet, Philippines. A combination of quantitative and qualitative methods were used in this research. The quantitative method involved the use of a structured survey questionnaire to draw data on the capability of principals in school governance, while the qualitative data was gathered through focus group discussions and in-depth interviews. These were used to determine experiences of school heads in their management and supervisory tasks using SBM as framework of governance. The data gathering involved



two phases: Phase I included the evaluation of school principals in terms of the management interventions they implement after the SMB trainings they had undergone. This was done by accomplishing an inventory sheet adopted from SBM Framework (RA 9155, 2011) containing each item carefully stated in a particular situation. Following this was a round table discussion where school heads were given the opportunity to share their experiences regarding the implementation of school-based management in their respective sectors.

Phase II included the impact assessment of the training on the improvement of the school. The structure of the questions included indicators along each domain of school-management operation namely Instructional Leadership, Leadership and Administration, Fiscal Management, Human Resource Development, Monitoring and Accountability, and Planning and

Development. To substantiate the result of the survey, focused group discussions and interviews were performed. Guide questions were used in their facilitation and conduct.

Data Analysis

In interpreting the result of the survey, two scales (Table 1 & 2) were used as adopted from Lubrica et al. (2011). The interpretation of the every scale was adopted from SBM Framework provided in RA 9155 (2001). The descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze the data gathered. The descriptive statistics such as frequency, percent mean were primarily used in presenting the data. Inferential statistics such as the t-test, Analysis of Variance, and other related tests were used to analyze the significant differences between and among groups. The school heads were group into two, namely as principals or as teacher-in-charge.

Table 1
Scale Used in Interpreting the School Heads' Capacity in Implementing SMB (adopted from Lubrica et al., 2011; SBM Framework, 2001)

| Scale | Descriptive Equivalent (DE) | Interpretation |
|------------|-----------------------------|--|
| 4.21–5.00 | Exemplary (E) | Knowledge and skills acquired are enriched and applied in school governance without support and guidance |
| 3.41 –4.20 | Very satisfactory(VS) | Knowledge and skills acquired are enriched and applied in school governance with minimal support and guidance from superiors |
| 2.61 –3.40 | Satisfactory (S) | Knowledge and skills acquired are applied in school governance needing more support and guidance from superiors |
| 1.81 –2.60 | Fair (F) | Knowledge and skills acquired are not much applied needing greater support and guidance from superiors. |
| 1.00 –1.80 | Not Applied (NA) | Knowledge and skills acquired are not applied. |

Table 2
Scale Used in Interpreting the School Heads' Perception on the Impact of SMB Skills on the School Governance (adopted from Lubrica et al., 2011; SBM Framework, 2001)

| Scale | Extent of application acquired knowledge and skills in SBM | Degree of capability of school heads in school governance |
|------------|--|---|
| 4.21–5.00 | Very high (VH) | Exemplary (E) |
| 3.41 –4.20 | High (H) | Very satisfactory(VS) |
| 2.61 –3.40 | Moderate (M) | Satisfactory (S) |
| 1.81 –2.60 | Needs Improvement (NI) | Fair (F) |
| 1.00 –1.80 | Not applied (NA) | Not Applied (NA) |



Results and Discussion

The distinctive characteristics of school-based management (SBM) are classified into three themes: ⁽¹⁾capability of the school heads in the different management areas such as Instructional Supervision, Leadership and Administration, Fiscal Management, Human Resource Development, Monitoring and Evaluation, and Planning and Development; ⁽²⁾developmental needs and corresponding interventions employed; and, ⁽³⁾effects of school-based management on school governance. The results and discussion of the data are presented accordingly.

School Heads' Capability in Applying their School-based Management (SBM) Knowledge and Skills

The capability of school heads in applying acquired knowledge and skills in school-based management is determined along six domains: instructional supervision, leadership and administration, fiscal management, human resource development, monitoring and accountability, and planning and development. Results, as shown in Table 3, reveal that the principals are very satisfactory in their capability of applying their knowledge and skills in all areas of school governance with mean values ranging at 3.41 to 4.20. On the other hand, the teachers-in-charge were also rated very satisfactory in leadership and administration, human resource development, monitoring and accountability and planning and development while satisfactory in instructional supervision and fiscal management.

Comparatively, the principals are significantly more capable than their counterpart in instructional supervision as manifested by the observed mean values at 3.51 and 2.98, respectively. This could be attributed to the following reasons: years of tenure in being a school head is not enough to gain the management experience; rotation of school heads in school assignments, limited function of teachers-in-charge, item of being a teacher-in-charge connotes their limited functions. In other domains, however, the principals and teachers-in-charge are not significantly different as manifested by the p-values being higher than 0.05. Such results imply that the school heads are empowered to perform their role in

school governance. Further, the leadership and administrative skills of the principal and teachers-in-charge were brought to the fore and were greatly highlighted with the autonomy ushered in by the decentralization of authority and powers through SBM. This is one of the desired results of SBM (Gamage & San Antonio, 2006; Waters et al., 2003).

Developmental Needs among School Heads and the Interventions Employed

The developmental needs and interventions employed by school heads are of the context specificity of SBM experiences. The experiences of the school heads were group and discussed into major themes. There are also experiences that are school-specific and so are presented as follows:

Instructional supervision. Of the schools surveyed, public secondary schools in the province have different classifications, which also speak of the school status: independent, annex, pilot, and extension. Schools are further classified according to length of existence, and data show that the older the school, the better are its terms. Independent schools, for instance, enjoy better terms of benefits such as access and control over resources, e.g. number of personnel, MOOE, status/tenure of teachers, etc. Extension schools, on the other hand, have more difficult challenges, particularly in terms of funds and workloads. The instructional functions come with other tasks such as serving as a trainer or coach, as subject or activity coordinator, etc. Likewise, school heads have to perform other tasks that include monitoring, instructional supervision, as supply officer, and even clerical tasks such as packaging of reports.

A fundamental supervisory task that is part of SBM's framing of decentralized system of management is the classroom observation where mechanisms are clearly laid down. The scheme of 'pre-conference and post-conference' has the view of encouraging communication between the supervisor and the teacher. For this scheme to work, there is really a need for constant meetings and 'communication' to level off on what is being targeted. However, instead of appreciating the rationale of the scheme, it has become a major source of tension between supervisors and teachers.



Table 3

Degree of Capability of School Heads in Applying their Acquired Knowledge and Skills in School-Based Management to School Governance

| Domain | Principal | | Teacher-in-charge/ head teacher | | P- value |
|-------------------------------|-----------|----|------------------------------------|----|--------------------|
| | Mean | DE | Mean | DE | |
| Instructional Supervision | 3.51 | VS | 2.98 | S | .029 ^s |
| Leadership and Administration | 3.74 | VS | 3.46 | VS | .225 ^{ns} |
| Fiscal Management | 3.64 | VS | 3.31 | S | .149 ^{ns} |
| Human Resource Development | 3.87 | VS | 3.78 | VS | .776 ^{ns} |
| Monitoring and Accountability | 3.72 | VS | 3.71 | VS | .844 ^{ns} |
| Planning and Development | 3.63 | VS | 3.42 | VS | .260 ^{ns} |
| Weighted Mean | 3.68 | | 3.44 | | |

On the other hand, it was revealed that school heads are being challenged because of resistance to 'new ideas' and in terms of implementing 'certain rules as per instructions above'. Nonetheless, other school heads are creative enough to take advantage of the pre-conference scheme to level off with the teachers' expectations.

Leadership and administration. With the restructuring of the school system brought about by SBM, the school heads identified some developmental needs under leadership and administration. These include the establishment of School Governing Council (SGC) and getting the commitment of the SGC members, the need to enhance their leadership skills through training on management and supervisory skills, outsourcing skills because they lack funds to operationalize their projects, how to make oneself fully empowered as provided in the SBM Manual, and lastly, the need to review the SBM as a framework for development. These results imply a dire need to provide a continuous review and training on what SBM would really want to achieve.

In the context of the identified developmental needs, the following interventions such as observing transparency and proper communication were identified to address the gap between the school head and teachers. This implies that transparency connotes the importance of communication in any process in the school system.

Under leadership and administration, the

school heads highlighted the need to develop their leadership and management skills. This can be done through exposures in conferences for both school heads and teachers. Exposing them to such activities provides an opportunity to learn from speakers and also brings them into benchmarking on the best practices of other school heads.

Fiscal management. The principals are adamant in claiming the following: prompt release and increased amount of MOOE to meet the needs and requests of teachers, improve facilities and purchase of needed equipment, fiscal transparency, trainings on fiscal management such as utilization of funds, allotments, disbursement, liquidation, and on the existing policies of the government. To address these needs, the different school heads have sourced funds through forging linkages with stakeholders. To address the issue on transparency, all schools are required to established transparency boards.

When asked to sum up or assess their grasp on fiscal management, many school heads lamented that they are relatively lacking in this aspect and, thus, the common clamor is for more capability building opportunities for them. When this was relayed to the SMB representative, she claimed that orientations/seminars/trainings on SBM vis-a-vis fiscal management have been conducted since 2002. However, she perceives that the continuing "lack" of fiscal management skills among school heads who have already attended these activities can be attributed to any of the



following: ⁽¹⁾frequent rotation of school heads which leads to skills that are never fully practiced, established, or realized; ⁽²⁾high population of participants, which leads to lack of time or exposure to individualized hands-on skill development; ⁽³⁾distance of schools' location from training venue/s, which causes great difficulty on the part of the school heads to attend/participate; or ⁽⁴⁾indifference, lack of participation and/or commitment to learn, and lack of initiative of school heads to get in touch with the Division Office for assistance/information.

Notwithstanding the above issues, the school heads generally seem to find a workaround to meet their schools' needs, or, at least, to stay afloat in spite of the many challenges to their schools' finances. To that, and as also often mentioned, the support of stakeholders and the contributions (or donations) from other sources are highly-valued, highly-sought lifesavers.

Human Resource Development. In view of the great relevance of capability building development to school-based quality improvement, it is imperative for school's front liners, particularly the principal and the teachers, to build their capacity to perform their new roles. The developmental need identified along with human resource development by the respondents is the capability of upgrading their teachers in areas such as ICT, behavior management, teaching strategies, and skills needed in the k-12 curriculum. For the principals and school heads, expressed needs are in the area of personnel management, emotional quotient, social/human relation skills, dealing with stress and burnout, and assessment or appraisal of teachers' strengths and weaknesses. There is a perceived inadequacy of the coverage of the trainings provided for professional growth. Other perceived needs are additional items for teachers, promotion guidelines in hiring teachers, and capacity building.

Monitoring and Accountability. The school heads are one in claiming the need to update the procurement process. There is also a claim on the need to have a standard tool to properly monitor and evaluate the different programs and/or activities that they are doing in their respective schools.

On the part of activities conducted, an

evaluation tool is needed to see whether learning took place, whether there were improvements or enhancements on the skill of learners or on the skills of teachers as they introduce innovations in their teaching through hands-on activities. Documentation and recording of activities are not given importance simply because of the absence of a process to see to it that all are noted down. Because of these, the strengths and weaknesses of past activities are hardly remembered because teachers tend to forget them through time, implying the repetition of mistakes.

Planning and Development. One of the developmental needs of the respondents in the area of planning and development is on the adherence to the plans particularly in the School Improvement Plan (SIP) or Annual Improvement Plan (AIP). Accordingly, there are activities not implemented or objectives not obtained. One respondent said that,

“there are tendencies for us to come up with plans for the school year, but because of some constraints financially, and then sometimes even the weather (suspension of classes)...the percentage of accomplishment at the end of the school year is also reduced.”

Another constraint is the time element considering the workload of school personnel. Some objectives are long terms such as teacher items, buildings, and textbooks. Unmet or unimplemented plans are usually integrated in the following year. Respondents also encouraged themselves to really plan and include only doable activities with strict monitoring.

Since the inception of SBM, the school heads in Benguet Province were documented to have improved and became more responsible for ensuring efficient school governance. While developmental needs were expressed by school heads and validated by their respective faculty, it is evident that interventions were provided—showing the improved capability among all school heads along the six domains. The researcher initially determined the development needs of school heads in 2007 (see Lubrica et al., 2011), but these are different with ones determined in this study. This implies a substantial enhancement in the performance of the principals because the needs identified in 2007 were already met and new needs are



arising. This implies also the need to continue monitor and evaluate the training needs of the school heads to further assist them in implementing SBM. Likewise, this may consider the importance of shared governance where all stakeholders play a key role in the school. Nelly (2008) further supported that running a school is a collective responsibility and all stakeholders have to ensure its effective management.

Effect of School-Based Management on School Governance

As shown in Table 4, results revealed that through the five-year application of the knowledge and skills in SMB by the school heads, their capability in school governance was significantly impacted. The higher the extent of application of the acquired knowledge and skills in SBM, the higher the degree of the school heads' capability in school governance. This shows the significance of implementing school-based management.

The training in SBM had remarkably improved the capability of school heads in using the school-based management. It becomes clear to the school heads that SMB building initiatives are as effective, if not more advantageous, to have the acquired knowledge and skills applied in whatever the nature of the work. This is evident in the significant correlation ($p < 0.05$) between the extent of SMB application and the school heads' capacity in school governance. It can be inferred from this result that the knowledge and skills in SMB

is a significant factor in influencing the capability of principals and teachers-in-charge in school governance.

These results showed that the principal is the key figure in school improvement with emphasis on high expectations, quality teaching, and concern for students. It shows that since the school heads work with teachers and students, they have the most informed and credible opinions as what educational arrangements will be most beneficial to the students. Our results showed that SMB is beneficial in improving the secondary school system in Benguet province and the critical role played by a capacitated school head in it. However, this does not mean that the school head can single-handedly bring about the results desired in SMB. The success of the school in this undertaking can only be realized with the participation of stakeholders. As Barrera-Osorio et al. (2009) stressed, the need for more parent, and community participation could bring more input and resources from parents; more effective use of resources; a more open, and welcoming school environment; improved student performance; and, eventually better learning outcomes.

Table 4

The Application of Acquired Knowledge and Skills in School-Based Management Vis-a-Vis the Degree of Capability of School Heads in School Governance

| Domain | Extent of application of the acquired knowledge and skills in SBM | | Degree of Capability of school heads in school governance | |
|-------------------------------|---|------|---|------|
| | Mean | Desc | Mean | Desc |
| Instructional Supervision | 3.14 | M | 3.24 | S |
| Leadership and Administration | 3.03 | M | 3.60 | VS |
| Fiscal Management | 3.02 | M | 3.48 | VS |
| Human Resource Development | 3.04 | M | 3.87 | VS |
| Monitoring and Accountability | 3.02 | M | 3.65 | VS |
| Weighted Mean | 3.05 | M | 3.56 | VS |

p-value 0.006^s

Legend: s- significant, ns- not significant, alpha= .05



Conclusions

The results of this study showed that the school head's job is diverse in school governance. In secondary school of Benguet, Philippines, the value of school-based management has taken shape along all the management areas namely instructional supervision, leadership and administration, fiscal management, human resource management, monitoring and accountability, and planning and development. The training in SBM has significantly improved the management skills of school heads but they are clamoring for more capability building particularly in fiscal management. Further, the study showed that the higher the extent of application of SBM, the higher the degree of the school heads' capability in school governance. This shows that the importance of school-based management is slowly but surely being recognized in the province. The study is part of the growing literature documenting the impact of school-based management in East Asia nations.

Recommendations

Based on findings of the study, the following are recommended: ⁽¹⁾encourage public secondary school heads to continuously use school-based management as a means of improving the school conditions; ⁽²⁾continuous needs assessment may be administered to find out the areas needing improvement anchored in the school context or environment; ⁽³⁾a monitoring scheme may be developed to determine the extent of implementation of identified indicators in the school-based management of secondary schools; and, ⁽⁴⁾benchmarking may be done by schools to find out the best practices on SBM to be emulated.

Acknowledgment

We wish to acknowledge many people who had made important contribution in the completion of this research. These include the Director of Department of Education and Division Superintendent, Supervisors for allowing the Research Team to conduct the research; the

secondary school heads at the Division of Benguet for providing the necessary data which were incorporated in the content of this paper; Mr. Percival Q. Palope, Research Assistant, who participated in the preparation and completion of the draft; and, Ms. Zippora Angiwan, for editing the manuscript.

We also thank most sincerely, the Commission on Higher Education and Benguet State University for the financial support provided in the completion of this study.

References

- AusAID ERF. (2011). "Current Issues in Education: School Grants and School-based Management." Canberra; Bruns, B., D. Filmer, and H. Patrinos (2011) "Making Schools Work: New Evidence on Accountability Reforms" World Bank, Washington, D.C.; and Carr-Hill, R., C. Rolleston, T. Pherali, and R. Schendel (2014). "The Effects of School-based Decision-making on Educational Outcomes in Low- and Middle-income contexts: A Systematic Review" Institute of Education, London.
- Abulencia, A.S. (2013). School-based management: A structural reform intervention. Retrieve from: http://www.pnu.edu.ph/page/journal/School-Based_Management_A-Structural_Reform_Intervention.pdf
- Adams, J.E., Jr., & Kirst, M.W. (1999). New demands and concepts for educational accountability: Striving for results in an era of excellence. In J. Murphy (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration*, 463-489. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Barrera-Osorio, F., Fasih, T., Patrinos, H.A., & With-Santibañez, L. (2009). *Decentralized decision-making in schools: The theory and evidence on school-based management*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- Basic Education Sector Reform Agenda (BESRA). (2009). *Moving Forward in the Implementation of the Basic Education Sector Reform Agenda (BESRA)*. <http://www.deped.gov.ph/2009/04/13/do-34-s-2009-moving-forward-in-the-implementation-of-the-basic-education-sector-reform-agenda-besra/>



- Blase, J., & Blase, J. (2001). *Empowering teachers: What successful principals do* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Bryke, A.S., & Schneider, B. (2002). *Trust in schools: A core resource for improvement*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Caldwell, B.J. (2005). *School-based management, education policy series*. The International Institute of Educational Planning and the International Academy of Education, Paris: UNESCO.
- Cameron, K.S., & Whetten, D.A. (1981). Perceptions of organizational effectiveness over organizational life cycles. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26: 525-544.
- Daft, R.L. (2008). *Management*. Thomson Learning Asia, Singapore. Thomson Asian edition, 8th edition. pp. 2- 10.
- Forsyth, P.B., Barnes, L.L.B., & Adams, C.M. (2006). Trust-Effectiveness Patterns In Schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 44(2): 122-141.
- Gamage, D., & San Antonio, D. (2006). Effective participatory school administration, leadership, and management: Does it affect the trust levels of stakeholders? Retrieved from <http://cnx.org/content/m14112/1.2/>
- Gertler, P., Patrinos, H., & Rubio-Codina, M. (2007). Methodological issues in the evaluation of school-based management reforms. Draft, World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Goertz, M.E. (2000, April). Local Accountability: The role of the district and school in monitoring policy, practice and achievement. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana. Retrieved from the ERIC database. (ED445032)
- Hallinger, P. (1991). Instructional leadership in secondary schools: Developing a framework. In P. George & E.C. Potter (Eds.), *School-Based Management: Theory and Practice*, 46-51. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.
- Hallinger, P., & Heck, R.H. (1996). Reassessing the principal's role in school effectiveness: A review of empirical research, 1980-1995. *Education Administration Quarterly*, 32(1): 5-44.
- Itika, J.S. (2011). *Fundamentals of human resource management: Emerging experiences from Africa*. Leiden, Netherlands: African Studies Centre.
- Khattari, N., Ling, C., & Jha, S. (2010). "The Effects of School-based Management in the Philippines: An Initial Assessment Using Administrative Data" Policy Research Working Paper Series. No. 5248, World Bank, Washington, D.C. and Yamauchi, F. (2014) "An Alternative Estimate of School-based Management Impacts on Students' Achievements: Evidence from the Philippines." *Journal of Development Effectiveness*. 6, no. 2: 97-110.
- Leithwood, K., & Riehl, C. (2003). What we know about successful school leadership. Paper prepared for the AERA Division A Task Force for the Development of an Agenda for Future Research on Educational Leadership. Retrieved from <http://dcsimpson.com/randd-leithwood-successful-leadership.pdf>
- Lubrica, P., Alvaro, M., Montemayor, M., Carino, E., & Namuhe, M. (2011). School-based management competencies among school heads in the secondary public school systems in Benguet and Ifugao: An Assessment. Research and Educational Development Training Institute, Philippines. ISSN 1656-166. Volume 8: pp.338-345
- Mulford, B. (1996). Do school principals make a difference? Recent evidence and implications. *Leading and Managing*, 2(3), 155-170.
- Nelly, T. (2008). Roles, duties and responsibilities of school management team. Training manual for secondary school managers. Kigali, Africa: Mineduc School Management.
- Santibañez, L. (2006). *What is school-based management*. Washington, DC: Education, Human Development Network.
- Sharma, S., & Kannan, S. (2012). Instructional supervision: A tool for improvement or weapon for punishment. *The International Research Journal of Social Science & Management*, 2(8): 29-35.



- Siegall, M., & Worth, C. (2001). The impacts of trust and control on faculty reactions to merit pay. *Personnel Review*, 30(6): 646-656.
- Spear, J.P. (1983). School site budgeting/management: The state of the art. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED231082>
- Tschannen-Moran, M. (2001). Collaboration and the need for trust. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 39(4): 308-331.
- Walker, A., & Dimmock, C. (2000). Mapping the way ahead: leading educational leadership into the globalised world. *School Leadership & Management*, 20(2): 227-233.
- Wallace Foundation. (2013). The school principal as a leader: guiding schools to better teaching and learning (2nd ed.). New York, USA: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/school-leadership/effective-principalleadership/Pages/overview-the-school-principal-as-leader.aspx>
- Waters, T., Marzano, R.J., & McNulty, B. (2003). Balanced leadership: What 30 years of research tells us about the effect of leadership on student achievement. Denver, CO: Mid-Continent Regional Education Laboratory.
- Weng, F.Y. (2003). Centralization and decentralization in educational governance in Taiwan, in Mok, K.H, centralization and decentralization: Educational reforms and changing governance in Chinese societies. Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research centre, the University of Hong Kong.
- World Bank & AusAID (2013). "School-based Management in the Philippines: An Empirical Investigation." World Bank and AusAID, Manila.
- World Bank & AusAID (2016). "Assessing School-based Management in the Philippines". *Philippine Education Note*, 5: 1-16.

