



Implementation of School-Based Management as Perceived by Teachers and the Level of Participation of Parents of San Isidro Labrador Elementary School

¹Imelda S. Tuyay

²Ardrian D. Malangen, MAEd

¹Schools Division Office of Rizal, Region IV-A, Philippines
San Isidro Labrador Elementary School
imelda.tuyay@deped.gov.ph
Teacher 1

²School of Graduate Studies
Dr. Carlos S. Lanting College
Quezon City, Philippines
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5649-4359>
ardrianmalangen@lanting.ph.education
Associate Professor 2

Abstract: A quality education system's fundamental framework is one that is successful in meeting the desired goals and outcomes of individual schools; one that is relevant to the needs of students, communities, and society; and one that fosters students' ability to acquire knowledge and necessary 21st century skills. The purpose of this study is to examine the implementation of school-based management of San Isidro Labrador Elementary School based on the evaluation of teachers. This study will see how versed teachers in the different areas of SBM. Moreover, this study will scrutinize the level of participation of its external stakeholders on the different programs, projects, and activities initiated by the school. The study utilized descriptive correlational design and used survey questionnaire as the main data-gathering instrument, which was floated to 50 teacher-respondents and 50 school stakeholders (Parents). Based on the results of the study the adoption of school-based administration at San Isidro Labrador Elementary School has been rated as "Highly Implemented. The school stakeholders were extremely engaged in the many activities organized by the school. The level of participation of school stakeholders in the different school-initiated is High Participation. Hence, the school is advised to continue using school-based management's successful processes in the implementation of school-based management program. Teachers, parents and school administrators are encouraged to work collaboratively in carrying out rules and policies for the betterment of the learners.

Key words: Leadership and Governance, Curriculum and Learning, Accountability and Continuous Improvement, Management of Resources

INTRODUCTION

School-Based Management (SBM) is an effective organizational approach to improving education by delegating decision-making power to individual schools, rather than centralizing it at the state or district level. This model distributes the responsibility for financial, personnel, and curricular decisions among

the key stakeholders, including principals, teachers, students, and parents. By empowering these individuals, SBM promotes a collaborative educational process that leads to better student learning outcomes. SBM emphasizes the importance of enabling school communities to actively participate in the ongoing improvement of schools, with the ultimate goal of achieving better educational outcomes for students.

SBM's primary goals are to empower school leaders to lead their teachers and students through reforms that increase learning outcomes; to bring resources, including funds, under the control of the school to spur change in accordance with decentralization; to strengthen partnerships with communities to invest time, money, and effort to make the school a better place to learn; and to integrate school management and instructional reform for school improvement (Camacho, 2020).

Through School Based Management Validation, the SDO Rizal determines the degree of practice among schools on an annual basis. The validation of a school's SBM Level of Practice is based on four principles: leadership and governance, curriculum and learning, accountability and continuous improvement, and resource management.

Each stakeholder plays an important role that they should play in the implementation of school-based management to obtain success. Teachers, as internal stakeholders in the school, must understand their roles and responsibilities in implementing, monitoring, and mobilizing school-based management programs, projects, and activities (Lumanog, 2016).

External Stakeholders are individuals or groups who have an interest or concern for the school. They include parents, school administrators, board members, local government officials, alumni and socio-civic groups who contribute to the development of the school community. Thus, a solid relationship between teachers and stakeholders is critical, since it enables everyone to work together, which benefits the children (Bussinessmirror,2018).

Locally, it has been observed that, despite schools' best efforts to connect with various school stakeholders, schools have reported diminishing number of participations in school-initiated activities (Cabardo, 2016). With this, the purpose of this study is to examine the implementation of school-based management of San Isidro Labrador Elementary School based on the evaluation of teachers. The school receive the rating of level 2 or Maturing – School-Based Management level of practice from the recent SBM evaluation, it implies that the school should give more effort in Introducing and sustaining continuous improvement process that integrates wider community participation and improve significantly performance and learning outcomes. Furthermore, De Torre (2021), finding in her research Stakeholder's Involvement to School-Initiated Activities of District I Secondary Schools: Basis for Enhanced Community Partnership Program of Activities finding revealed that the vast majority of stakeholders were heavily involved as they lend moral support to the curriculum of the institution. When it comes to leadership efforts and governance in relation to the achievement of students, they enthusiastically participate in significant volunteer activity in their school community, for example, in terms of value creation a physical exercise or a sporting competition that fosters positive attitudes youth interaction to a large extent. In Additionally, studies indicated that, to a large extent, Respondents advocate for professional development and growth opportunities offered to all members of the when it comes to implementing the programs and improvements in schools.

This study will see how versed teachers in the different areas of SBM. Moreover, this study will scrutinize the level of participation of the parents on the different programs, projects, and activities initiated by the school. The result of this will serve as a guideline in crafting policies to improve the participation of teachers and the school stakeholders to improve the implementation of school-based management. The researcher is a firm believer that a solid collaboration between stakeholders and

schools is a critical component of the success of the Department of Education's educational reforms and school-led initiatives.

Statement of the Problem

This research will assess the Implementation of School-Based Management as Perceived by Teachers and the Level of Participation of Parents of San Isidro Labrador Elementary School, School Year 2021-2022. Specifically, respondents will answer the following questions:

1. What is the profile of the respondents in terms of the following?
 - 1.1 Stakeholders' Respondents
 - a. Age
 - b. Gender
 - c. Civil Status
 - d. Highest Educational Attainment
 - 1.2 Teacher Respondents
 - a. Age
 - b. Gender
 - c. Civil Status
 - d. Teaching Position
 - e. Highest Educational Attainment
2. What is the level of implementation of school-based management as perceived by the teachers relative to the following indicators:
 - 2.1 Leadership and Governance
 - 2.2 Curriculum and Learning
 - 2.3 Accountability and Continuous Improvement
 - 2.4 Management of Resources
3. What is the level of participation of school stakeholders in the different school-initiated activities?
4. Is there a significant difference on the perception of respondents on the level of implementation of school-based management when grouped to profile?
5. Is there a significant difference in the level of participation of school stakeholders in the different school-initiated activities when grouped according to profile?
6. Is there a significant relationship on the level of implementation of school-based management and the level of participation of school stakeholders?
7. What policies can be proposed to improve the implementation of school-based management and encourage participation of school stakeholders to school initiated activities?

Statement of Hypothesis

The null hypotheses that were tested and verified in this study were as follows:

Ho1: There is no significant difference on the perception of respondents on the level of implementation of school-based management when grouped to profile.

Ho2: There is no significant difference in the level of participation of school stakeholders in the different school-initiated activities when grouped according to profile.

Ho3: There is no significant relationship on the level of implementation of school-based management and the level of participation of school stakeholders.

METHODS

Research Design

The goal of this study is to assess the implementation of school-based management and the level of participation of school stakeholders of San Isidro Labrador Elementary School using the descriptive-

correlational design. According to Creswell (2012), descriptive correlational study is a study in which the researcher is primarily interested in describing relationships among variables, without seeking to establish a causal connection.

Research Respondents

The data below shows the data of teacher and school stakeholders' respondents in San Isidro Elementary school calculated using Slovins Formula.

Respondents	Total Number
Teachers	50
School Stakeholders	50
TOTAL	100

Table 1. The Respondents of the Study

Population and Sampling

The researcher used random sampling technique in selecting the participants in this study. Random sampling describes when every element in a population has an equal chance of being chosen for the sample. The total population of samples for each school was calculated using the Slovins formula.

Research Environment

This study took place in San Isidro Labrador Elementary School in Rodriguez II-Subdivision, Rizal Province. The researcher opted to conduct the study at her schools because it is critical for teachers to understand their roles in implementing school-based management and for stakeholders to be encouraged to participate in and be involved in various school-based projects, programs, and activities.

Research Instrumentation

The instrument that will be used in the study has three main parts:

The first will determine the profile, which includes the age, gender, teaching position, and educational attainment of the teacher respondents. For the stakeholders age, gender, civil status, and highest educational attainment.

The second part will help to analyze the level of implementation school-based management in terms of Leadership and Governance, Curriculum and Learning, Accountability and Continuous Improvement, and Management of Resources through the checklist using five-point Likert Scale.

The Third part will measure the level of participation of school stake holders in the school-initiated programs, projects, and activities. This will serve as a basis in crafting the proposed policies to improve the level of participation of school stakeholders of San Isidro Labrador Elementary School.

Validation of Instrument

Validation is a method of determining an instrument's accuracy by collecting and analyzing data. To assess the validity of quantitative instruments, a variety of statistical tests and measures are used, most of which include pilot testing. The validation team, made up of research panel members and led by the research director of the Graduate School of DCLC, will examine the instrument's face validity.

Field Out Testing or pilot testing will be used to assess the instrument's dependability, with Cronbach Alpha being used as a criterion. When the correlations between the items improve, Cronbach's alpha will usually rise. As a result, the coefficient is also known as the test's internal consistency or dependability of internal consistency.

Research Procedure

After approving and finalizing the title of this thesis, the researcher will begin collecting preliminary research from books, the internet, and literary sources. The researcher conducted a literature search for data and material pertinent to the study's context. After finishing chapters 1 through 3, the

researcher will seek out panelists with the assistance and advice of the adviser. After identifying the researchers' panelists, the researcher will create a letter of assignment, a letter requesting a panel chairman, and submitting the letter to the Division Office for permission, in order to conduct the study. The researcher will draft a letter authorizing the researcher to conduct the study and a letter authorizing the researcher to collect data, both of which will be signed by the research coordinator and graduate secretary.

Following that, the researcher will focus on the data collection instrument, which will include the respondents' letters and a checklist for the questionnaire. The experts must first approve the questionnaire checklist for legal reasons. After the Experts have examined the study, the researcher will be prepared to conduct it. Prior to distributing questionnaires to respondents, the researcher will write a letter to the school's principal requesting permission to collect data and conduct the study. After obtaining all relevant approvals, the researcher may begin the distribution of questionnaire by approaching the teachers who will serve as respondents and asking them to begin filling out the questionnaires. The researcher analyzes the records.

The researcher will strictly follow health and safety protocol. While waiting, the researcher will interpret and compute the data. When it is complete and all requirements have been completed, the researcher will participate in a colloquium to prepare for the final defense day. It will be submitted for approval and reproduction upon the completion of the final copy.

Data Gathering Technique

Documents about the profile of teachers in terms of age, gender, civil status, teaching position, and educational attainment will be verified through documents kept in the Human Resource Office.

The level of implementation school-based management in terms of Leadership and Governance, Curriculum and Learning, Accountability and Continuous Improvement, and Management of Resources through the checklist using five-point Likert Scale.

Another questionnaire will determine the level of participation of school stake holders in the school-initiated programs, projects, and activities.

Statistical Treatment

The data gathered from the questionnaires and were tallied properly and classified accordingly. The following statistical techniques were used to assemble data from the survey. The frequency determined the distribution and percentage of the respondents in each indicator to provide the general description of the respondents. The weighted mean is used to analyze every numerical response of the option.

Frequency and Percentage Distribution. To figure out the respondents' demographics. Average (Weighted) To find out how far school-based management has been implemented, as viewed by the respondents, Leadership and Governance, Curriculum and Learning, Accountability and Continuous Improvement, and Management of Resources.

Pearson Product – Moment Correlation Coefficient. The degree of association or closeness of relationship between two variables is measured by a correlation coefficient, denoted by r . It is a measure of linear association. It is designed for use with interval or ratio data. It utilized on the significant relationship on the implementation of school-based management as perceived by teachers and the level of participation of parents in San Isidro Labrador Elementary School.

ANOVA. Analysis of variance, or ANOVA, is a statistical method that separates observed variance data into different components to use for additional tests. A one-way ANOVA is used for three or more groups of data, to gain information about the relationship between the dependent and independent variables.

The independent t-test, also called the two-sample t-test, independent-samples t-test or student's t-test, is an inferential statistical test that determines whether there is a statistically significant difference between the means in two unrelated groups.

Results and Discussion

This section deals with the discussion of the data that has been gathered from the respondents of this research by means of textual, tabular and graphical form of presentation. The data will undergo through different statistical analysis that yields mathematical results will be as basis in answering the stated problems of this study.

The Demographic Profile of Respondents

The following are the quantitative value of demographic profile of the respondents under study:

Table 2: Frequency Percentage Distribution on the profile of the respondents Stakeholder (Parents)

Sample Characteristics	n	%
Age		
20-30 years old	9	18.0
31-40 years old	24	48.0
41-50 years old	15	30.0
50-above years old	2	4.0
Gender		
Male	5	10.0
Female	45	90.0
Civil Status		
Single	16	32.0
Married	34	68.0
Highest Educational Attainment		
Undergraduate	28	56.0
Vocational graduate	4	8.0
Bachelor's degree	18	36.0

Note. N-50

Table 2 shows the Frequency Percentage Distribution on the profile of the stakeholders of the school. As presented in the table, in terms of Age 9 respondents (18.0%) are 20-30 years old, 24 respondents (48.0%) are 31-40 years old, 15 respondents (30.0%) are 41-50 years old, and 2 respondents (4.0 %) are 51-above years old. Thus, majority of the respondents are 31-40 years old. In terms of gender majority of the respondents are female 45 (90.0%) while 5 (10.0%) male respondents. In terms of civil status 34 (68.0%) are married and 16 (32.0%) are single. Moreover, based on Highest Educational attainment there are 28 respondents (56.0%) who are undergraduate followed by 4 respondents (8.0%) who finish vocational courses and 18 respondents (36.0%) finished bachelor's degree.

Table 3: Frequency Percentage Distribution on the profile of the respondents (Teachers)

Sample Characteristics	n	%
Age		
20-30 years old	18	36.0
31-40 years old	22	44.0
41-50 years old	10	20.0
Gender		
Male	5	10.0

Female	45	90.0
Civil Status		
Single	24	48.0
Married	26	52.0
Teaching Position		
Teacher 1	47	94.0
Teacher 2	3	6.0
Highest Educational Attainment		
Bachelor's Degree	33	66.0
With Masteral degree units	15	30.0
Masteral Degree	2	4.0

Note. N-50

Table 3 presents the Frequency Percentage Distribution on the profile of the teacher respondents. As presented in the table, in terms of Age, 18 respondents (36.0%) are 20-30 years old, 22 respondents (44.0%) are 31-40, and 10 respondents (20.0%) are 41-50 years old. Thus, majority of the respondents are 31-40 years old. In terms of gender majority of the respondents are female 45 (90.0%) while 5 (10.0%) male respondents. In terms of civil status, 24 respondents (48.0%) are single and 26 (52.0) are married. Moreover, based on Highest Educational attainment there are 33 respondents (66.0%) Bachelor's Degree followed by 15 respondents (30.0%) Master's Degree with units followed, 2 (4.0%) with master's degree. Majority of the respondents are Teacher I, 47 (94.0%), and 3 (6.0%) Teacher II respondents

Table 4: The level of implementation of school-based management in terms of Leadership and Governance

Statement Items	Mean	Annotation
A. Leadership and Governance		
1. Effective leadership in setting goals, policies, priorities, plans and budgets.	3.76	Highly Implemented
2. There is in place a mechanism that allows for the development of a shared vision, mission, and goals.	3.72	Highly Implemented
3. Maintains the link between the school and the school Management Committee very well.	3.72	Highly Implemented
4. Staffs are given great opportunities to express their views.	3.72	Highly Implemented
5. Consultation and involvement of staff in major decisions and issues	3.65	Highly Implemented
Composite Mean	3.71	Highly Implemented

Table 4 presents the mean distribution of responses on the level of implementation of school-based management as perceived by the teachers of San Isidro Labrador Elementary school in terms of Leadership and Governance. Leadership and Governance, indicator 1 "Effective leadership in setting goals, policies, priorities, plans and budgets" got the highest mean rating of 3.76 verbally interpreted as "Highly Implemented". This implies that the school creates a solid leadership development plan. Followed by indicator 2 "There is in place a mechanism that allows for the development of a shared vision, mission, and goals", indicator 3 "Maintains the link between the school and the school Management Committee very well", and indicator 4 "Staffs are given great opportunities to express their views" got the rating of 3.72 (Highly Implemented). These results suggest that the school was successful in fostering an environment in which all staff members actively work and communicate to attain the

shared goal. Indicator 5 “Consultation and involvement of staff in major decisions and issues” got the mean rating of 3.65 (Highly Implemented). This result implies that the school administrator and staffs work collaboratively in making important decision.

The level of assessment on the implementation of school-based management in terms of Leadership and Governance have the over-all rating of 3.71 (Highly Implemented). This implies that school successfully executed leadership and governance as part of the school-based management. This supports Galigao (2019) achieving high-level performance and organizational value from any department involves a combination of functional abilities, knowledge, and expertise on the part of department personnel, as well as department leadership with strategic vision, cultural sensitivity, and moral fortitude.

Table 5: The level of implementation of school-based management in terms of Curriculum and Learning

B. Curriculum and Learning	Mean	Annotation
1. The curriculum is rights-based, inclusive, culturally, and developmentally appropriate, and responsive to the learners' needs and interests.	3.80	Highly Implemented
2. Regular monitoring of learning progress to ensure the learners' and community's holistic growth and development.	3.80	Highly Implemented
3. Methods and resources are learner and community-friendly, enjoyable, safe, inclusive, accessible, and aimed at developing self-directed learners.	3.80	Highly Implemented
4. Cultivate values and settings that are protective of all children, inclusive of all children, and consistent with the organization's vision, mission, and goals.	3.80	Highly Implemented
5. Learners are equipped with essential knowledge, skills, and values to assume responsibility and accountability for their own learning.	3.74	Highly Implemented
Composite Mean	3.79	Highly Implemented

Table 5 shows the mean distribution of responses on the level of implementation of school-based management as perceived by the teachers of San Isidro Labrador Elementary school in terms of Curriculum and Learning. Onto second category, the Curriculum and Learning, the table shows that this category has a composite mean of 3.79 with the verbal interpretation of “Highly Implemented”. It can also be noted that all 5 statements are deemed “Highly Implemented” by the respondents. Indicator 1 “The curriculum is rights-based, inclusive, culturally, and developmentally appropriate, and responsive to the learners' needs and interests” got the mean rating of 3.80 (Highly Implemented). These findings reveal that the school address the unique needs of the students from diverse background and equipped to be culturally sensitive to the learning styles and demands of their pupils.

Indicator 2 “Regular monitoring of learning progress to ensure the learners' and community's holistic growth and development” with the mean rating of 3.80 (Highly Implemented), this result implies that the teachers assist students in reflecting on and monitoring their progress toward reaching their learning objectives. indicator 3 “Methods and resources are learner and community-friendly, enjoyable, safe, inclusive, accessible, and aimed at developing self-directed learners”, and indicator 4 “Cultivate values and settings that are protective of all children, inclusive of all children, and consistent with the organization's vision, mission, and goals” got the mean rating of 4.80 as well

verbally interpreted as Highly Implemented. These findings reveal that the curriculum facilitates the development of all sorts of school community learners. The established curriculum is contextualized to make it more meaningful to students and useful to community life.

Indicator 5 “Learners are equipped with essential knowledge, skills, and values to assume responsibility and accountability for their own learning” got the mean rating of 3.74 verbally interpreted as Highly Implemented. This result This outcome demonstrates that the school empowers students to take responsibility for their own learning by designing engaging, open-ended projects that focus on real-world skills. Due to the pandemic, this is assisted by the adoption of several learning modalities. Learners become increasingly autonomous in their own learning.

The level of assessment on the implementation of school-based management in terms of Curriculum and Learning have the over-all rating of 3.79 (Highly Implemented). This imply that school successfully implemented curriculum and learning as part of the school-based management.

Table 6: The level of implementation of school-based management in terms of Accountability and Continuous Improvement

C. Accountability and Continuous Improvement	Mean	Annotation
1. Deployment of duties to team members is very fair and very appropriate. Their qualifications, experiences and skills have been greatly taken into account.	3.76	Highly Implemented
2. The school very clearly identifies roles and responsibilities of accountable person.	3.82	Highly Implemented
3. Achievement of goals is recognized based on a collaboratively developed performance accountability system: gaps are addressed through appropriate action	3.80	Highly Implemented
4. Accountability assessment criteria and tools, feedback mechanisms, and information collection and validation techniques and processes are inclusive and collaboratively developed and agreed upon.	3.82	Highly Implemented
5. Provides technical assistance for continuous improvement.	3.84	Highly Implemented
Composite Mean	3.81	Highly Implemented

Table 6 shows the mean distribution of responses on the level of implementation of school-based management as perceived by the teachers of San Isidro Labrador Elementary school in terms of Accountability and Continuous Improvement.

The third category, accountability and continuous improvement, indicator 5 “Provides technical assistance for continuous improvement” got the highest mean rating of 3.84 (Highly Implemented). This result suggests that the school effectively guides teachers and employees to improve their limitations. Indicator 2 “The school very clearly identifies roles and responsibilities of accountable person” and indicator 4 “Accountability assessment criteria and tools, feedback mechanisms, and information collection and validation techniques and processes are inclusive and collaboratively developed and agreed upon” got the mean rating of 3.82 (Highly Implemented). These results inferred that there is an existence of a clear, open, inclusive, and responsive accountability mechanism that continuously resolves shortcomings and provides a forum for feedback and remedy.

Moreover, indicator 3 “Achievement of goals is recognized based on a collaboratively developed performance accountability system: gaps are addressed through appropriate action” got the mean rating of 3.80 (Highly Implemented). Lastly, indicator 1 “Deployment of duties to team members is very fair

and very appropriate. Their qualifications, experiences and skills have been greatly taken into account” with 3.76 (Highly Implemented).

The level of assessment on the implementation of school-based management in terms of Accountability and Continuous Improvement have the over-all rating of 3.81 (Highly Implemented). This implies that school successfully implemented accountability and continuous improvement as part of the school-based management.

Table 7: The level of implementation of school-based management in terms of Management of Resources

Management of Resources	Mean	Annotation
1. There are guidelines and procedures for allocation of resources and space.	3.74	Highly Implemented
2. Access control over information resources is very well exercised.	3.70	Highly Implemented
3. Income and expenditure are very well monitored at both subject panel and school levels.	3.70	Highly Implemented
4. Resources and space are very fully utilized.	3.78	Highly Implemented
5. The apportionment of resources is fairly made according to the established priorities for implementing programmed plans.	3.76	Highly Implemented
Composite Mean	3.74	Highly Implemented

Table 7 shows the mean distribution of responses on the level of implementation of school-based management as perceived by the teachers of San Isidro Labrador Elementary school in terms of Management of Resources. Onto the last category, Management of Resources, indicator 4 “Resources and space are very fully utilized” got the mean rating of 3.78 (Highly Implemented). This data suggests that schools use their available resources and facilities, especially during the tough COVID 19 period. Followed by indicator 5 “The apportionment of resources is fairly made according to the established priorities for implementing programmed plans”. Indicator 1 “There are guidelines and procedures for allocation of resources and space” with mean of 3.74 (Highly Implemented). These results indicate that resources are allocated in areas of priorities. Moreover, indicator 2 “Access control over information resources is very well exercised” and indicator 3 “Income and expenditure are very well monitored at both subject panel and school levels” both got 3.70 rating verbally interpreted as Highly Implemented. These outcomes indicate that transparency and accountability are being utilized appropriately. The level of assessment on the implementation of school-based management in terms of Management and Resources have the over-all rating of 3.74 (Highly Implemented). This implies that school have transparent and proper allocation of school resources.

Table 8: The level of participation of school stakeholders in the different school-initiated activities

Statement Items	Mean	Annotation
1. Assist school community in sourcing out funds for students to be able to participate in new learning modalities.	3.92	High Participation
2. Volunteer in the different activities related to the health and nutrition of the school children especially during school feeding programs, activities in the nutrition month and the like.	3.90	High Participation

3. Willingly took part in the schools' maintenance week dubbed as Brigada Eskwela by extending some of the needed resources (financial, material, labor).	3.92	High Participation
4. Help convince civic community minded members to extend assistance to schools especially during special activities like teacher's month, scouting activities and others.	3.78	High Participation
5. Participate actively in the different activities initiated by the schools especially regarding PTA conferences, general assemblies, and Parents' Day activities.	4.02	High Participation
6. Answer the urgency of needs of the schools in terms of the unannounced activities that needs stakeholders' participation such as the coming of visitors and the conduct of evaluation related to school-based management.	3.98	High Participation
7. Support teachers and schools taking themselves as teaching partners to help create equitable learning environments that foster inclusion, learners' wellbeing, and distance learning methods.	4.10	High Participation
8. Prioritize health and hygiene education and protecting well-being of learners.	4.36	Very High Participation
9. Work collaboratively with teachers and other parents to assist struggling students.	4.20	High Participation
10. Involved in Training and webinars regarding child protection and children's rights.	4.02	High Participation
Composite Mean	4.02	High Participation

Table 8 presents the level of participation of school stakeholders in the different school-initiated activities. This demonstrates the contribution of school stakeholders to the school's success. Ranking the indicators, item 8 "Prioritize health and hygiene education and protecting well-being of learners" got the highest rating of 4.36 (Very High Participation). This result implies that stakeholders are highly participated with activities concerning the health and hygiene of learners. Followed by indicator 9 "Work collaboratively with teachers and other parents to assist struggling students" with mean rating of 4.20 (High Participation).

Indicator 7 "Support teachers and schools taking themselves as teaching partners to help create equitable learning environments that foster inclusion, learners' wellbeing, and distance learning methods" got the mean rating of 4.10 (High Participation). Indicators 5 "Participate actively in the different activities initiated by the schools especially regarding PTA conferences, general assemblies, and Parents' Day activities" and indicator 10 "Involved in Training and webinars regarding child protection and children's rights" both got 4.02 (High Participation) rating. Indicator 6 "Answer the urgency of needs of the schools in terms of the unannounced activities that needs stakeholders' participation such as the coming of visitors and the conduct of evaluation related to school-based management" got the mean rating of 3.98 (High Participation). This result indicates that stakeholders are supportive and ready to lend a helping hand when needed.

Indicator 3 "Willingly took part in the schools' maintenance week dubbed as Brigada Eskwela by extending some of the needed resources (financial, material, labor)" got the mean rating of 3.92 followed by indicator 2 "Volunteer in the different activities related to the health and nutrition of the school children especially during school feeding programs, activities in the nutrition month and the like" with

3.90 (High Participation). These findings suggest that stakeholders contribute support not just by actively engaging in activities, but also by offering financial assistance and donating materials and resources to the school. Meanwhile, indicator 4 “Help convince civic community minded members to extend assistance to schools especially during special activities like teacher’s month, scouting activities and others” got the lowest rating among all indicators with 3.78 rating (High Participation). This result suggests that the institution should interact more closely with organizations and other local government units in order to solicit support for civic activities.

The over-all response on level of participation of school stakeholders in the different school-initiated activities was rated with the composite mean of 4.02 verbally interpreted as High Participation. This means that the school should be able to develop policies that encourage the school’s stakeholders to participate in school-initiated activities.

Table 9: The significant difference on the mean level of participation of school stakeholders in the different school-initiated activities when grouped according to profile (Age and Highest Educational Attainment)

		ANOVA				
		SS	df	MS	F	Sig.
AGE	Between Groups	9.749	16	.609	.993	.486
	Within Groups	20.251	33	.614		
	Total	30.000	49			
HIGHEST EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	Between Groups	11.022	16	.689	.689	.784
	Within Groups	32.978	33	.999		
	Total	44.000	49			

Note N=50, SS- Sum of Squares, MS- Mean Squares, df- degrees of freedom, F-computed value, Sig.- Significant Value

Table 9 shows the significant difference on the mean level of participation of school stakeholders in the different school-initiated activities when grouped according to profile (Age and Highest Educational Attainment). From the data obtained, the study comprised of (N=50) respondents with the degrees of freedom between groups (dfBG=16) and degrees of freedom within groups (dfWG=33) and F-computed values are equal to (Age F= 0.993) and Highest Educational Attainment F=0.689). Since the probability/sig. values are (Age Sig.=0.486>0.05)and(Highest Educational Attainment Sig.=0.784>0.05). Therefore, there is no enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis and it implies that there is no significant difference on the mean level of participation of school stakeholders in the different school-initiated activities when grouped according to Age and Highest Educational Attainment. This indicates that regardless of the difference of school stakeholders in the aforementioned demographic dimensions, they participate at the same level in school-initiated activities.

Table 10: The significant difference on the mean level of participation of school stakeholders (Parents) in the different school-initiated activities when grouped according to Gender and Civil Status

Variables	N	df	Mean	t-value	α	Sig.
Gender						
Male	50	48	3.6000	-1.415	0.05	0.163
Female			4.0667			
Civil Status	50	48	3.7375	-1.998	0.05	0.051
Single			4.1529			
Married						

Note. N- Sample Size, df- Degrees of Freedom, t-computed value, α - level of significance, Sig.- significant value

Table 10 shows the significant difference on the mean level of participation of school stakeholders (Parents) in the different school-initiated activities when grouped according to Gender and Civil Status. From the data obtained, the sample size of the study comprised of (N=50) respondents wherein the mean level of participation of male is 3.6000 (High Participation), female is 4.0667 (High Participation), single is 3.7375 (High Participation) while married is 4.1529 (High Participation) with the degrees of freedom of (df=48) and the t-computed values are equal to (t=-1.415) and (t=-1.1.998). Since the probability /Significant Values are equal to (Sig.=0.163>0.05) and (Sig.=0.051>0.05) are greater than the level of significance. Therefore, there is no enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis and it implies that there is no significant difference on the mean level of participation of school stakeholders (Parents) in the different school-initiated activities when grouped according to Gender and Civil status. This indicates that regardless of the difference of school stakeholders in the aforementioned demographic dimensions, they participate at the same level in school-initiated activities.

Table 11: The significant difference on level of implementation of school-based management as perceived by the teachers at San Isidro Labrador Elementary school when grouped according to Gender, Civil Status and Teaching Position

Variables	N	df	Mean	t-value	α	Sig.
Gender						
Male	50	48	3.9000	0.865	0.05	0.391
Female			3.7464			
Civil Status	50	48	3.7479	-0.249	0.05	0.805
Single			3.7746			
Married						
Teaching Position						
Teacher 1	50	48	3.7466	-1.136	0.05	0.262
Teacher 2			4.0000			

Note. N- Sample Size, df- Degrees of Freedom, t-computed value, α - level of significance, Sig.- significant value

Table 11 shows the significant difference on level of implementation of school-based management as perceived by the teachers of San Isidro Labrador Elementary school when grouped according to Gender, Civil Status and Teaching Position. From the data obtained, the sample size of the study comprised of (N=50) respondents wherein the mean level of participation of male is 3.9000 (Highly Implemented), female is 3.7464 (Highly Implemented), single is 3.7479 (Highly Implemented) while married is 3.7746

(Highly Implemented), Teacher 1 is 3.7466 and Teacher 2 is 4.0000 with the degrees of freedom of (df=48) and the t-computed values are equal to (Gender, $t=0.865$), (Civil Status, $t=-0.249$) and (Teaching Position, $t=-1.136$). Since, the probability /Significant Values are equal to (Sig.=0.391>0.05), (Sig.=0.805>0.05), and (Sig.=0.262>0.05) respectively are greater than the level of significance. Therefore, there is no enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis and it implies that there is no significant difference on level of implementation of school-based management as perceived by the teachers of San Isidro Labrador Elementary school when grouped according to Gender, Civil Status and Teaching Position. This indicates that regardless of the difference of school stakeholders in the aforementioned demographic dimensions, they have the same perception on the implementation of school-based management.

Table 12: The significant difference on level of implementation of school-based management as perceived by the teachers of San Isidro Labrador Elementary school when grouped according to profile (Age and Highest Educational Attainment)

		ANOVA				
		SS	df	MS	F	Sig.
AGE	Between Groups	7.708	13	.593	1.123	.373
	Within Groups	19.012	36	.528		
	Total	26.720	49			
HIGHEST EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	Between Groups	3.482	13	.268	.784	.671
	Within Groups	12.298	36	.342		
	Total	15.780	49			

Note N=50, SS- Sum of Squares, MS- Mean Squares, df- degrees of freedom, F-computed value, Sig.- Significant Value

Table 12 shows the significant difference on level of implementation of school-based management as perceived by the teachers of San Isidro Labrador Elementary school when grouped according to profile (Age and Highest Educational Attainment). From the data obtained, the study comprised of (N=50) respondents with the degrees of freedom between groups (dfBG=13) and degrees of freedom within groups (dfWG=36) and F-computed values are equal to (Age, $F= 1.123$) and Highest Educational Attainment, $F=0.784$). Since, the probability/sig. values are (Age Sig.=0.373>0.05) and (Highest Educational Attainment Sig.=0.671>0.05). Therefore, there is no enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis and it implies that there is no significant difference on level of implementation of school-based management as perceived by the teachers of San Isidro Labrador Elementary school when grouped according to Age and Highest Educational Attainment. This indicates that regardless of the difference of school stakeholders in the aforementioned demographic dimensions, they have the same perception on the implementation of school-based management.

Table 13: The significant relationship on level of implementation of School-based management mean level of participation of school stakeholders

		Correlations	
		SBM	LOP
SCHOOL BASED MANAGEMENT	Pearson Correlation	1	-.001
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.995
	N	50	50

LEVEL OF PARTICIPATION	Pearson Correlation	-.001	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.995	
	N	50	50

Table 13 shows the significant relationship on level of implementation of School-based management mean level of participation of school stakeholders. From the data obtained, the sample size of the study comprised of 50 respondents with the degrees of freedom of ($df = 49$) and r -computed value is equal ($r = -0.001$) negligible correlation. Since the probability value is equal to ($Sig. = 0.995 > 0.05$) and it is greater than the level of significance 0.05. Therefore, there is no enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis and it implies that there is no significant relationship on level of implementation of School-based management mean level of participation of school stakeholders. The findings of Blank (2004) indicate that School-Based Management can encourage gains in student learning by fostering linkages between schools and various community institutions. Moreover, he claimed that establishing relationships between school, family, and community is intrinsically linked to student success, as combining schools and community resources enables the provision of services and support that meet the diverse needs of students. This notion is reinforced by Cabardo (2016), who assert that parental and community support for school-based management programs can enhance schools, the quality of education that children get, and the academic successes of students.

CONCLUSIONS

In the light of the statistical analysis and the finding of the study, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. Stakeholders are predominantly 31-40 years old, female, undergraduate, and married. The teachers are predominantly 31-40 years old, female, married, teacher 1, and finished bachelor's degree.
2. The assessment in the implementation school-based management in San Isidro Labrador Elementary School in is "Highly Implemented".
3. There are no significant differences on the respondents' assessment in the implementation of the school-based management when grouped according to profile.
4. The school stakeholders Highly Participated in the different school-initiated activities.
5. There are no significant differences the level of participation of school stakeholders when grouped according to profile.
6. The level of stakeholders' participation is not significantly related to the implementation of school-based management.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In light of the above facts and conclusions, the following recommendations are made:

1. The school is advised to continue using school-based management's successful processes in the implementation of school-based management program.
2. School authorities are encouraged to cultivate close ties with stakeholders in order to incorporate them in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of school activities directly related to their children's learning.
3. Teachers, parents and school administrators are encouraged to work collaboratively in carrying out rules and policies for the betterment of the learners.
4. Future researchers can undertake additional research on the roles of stakeholders in the success of SBM.

References

1. BusinessMirror. (2018). Teachers need to build strong relationships with school stakeholders. <https://businessmirror.com.ph/2018/07/19/teachers-need-to-build-strong-relationships-with-school-stakeholders/>
2. 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 and Action in Education*, 8(1), 81-94.
3. Camacho, R. (2020, 11 februari). School Based Management Validation of Schools. DepEd Olongapo. <https://deped-olongapo.com/school-based-management-validation-of-schools/>
4. Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Pearson Education, Inc.
5. De Torre, P. (2021). Stakeholder's Involvement to School-Initiated Activities of District I Secondary Schools: Basis for Enhanced Community Partnership Program of Activities. | *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*. <https://ijisrt.com/assets/upload/files/IJISRT21FEB143.pdf>
6. Galigao. (2019, October 30). (PDF) Systematic review on involved school leaders in governance and curricula. ResearchGate. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/336900528_Systematic_Review_on_Involved_School_Leaders_in_Governance_and_Curricula
7. Lumanog, G. (2016). *The Role of Teachers in SBM Program*. PressReader.
8. <https://www.pressreader.com/philippines/sunstarpampang/20160218/281672549003287>