



ISSUES AND CHALLENGES IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT: BASES FOR POLICY RECOMMENDATION

Eleanor A. Osea (EdD)^{1,2}; Dominick Christian S. Tabug^{1,3}; Mary Christine M. Agarin^{1,4}; Ramona R. Gata^{1,5}; Joan D. Sumpay^{1,6}; Gemma Luzentales^{1,7}; Marilou R. Molina^{1,8}; Joan B. Quipid^{1,9}; Andie G. Sario^{1,9}

¹School of Graduate Studies and Research, University of Northeastern Philippines, Iriga City, Philippines

²Vice President for Academic Affairs, University of Northeastern Philippines, Iriga City, Philippines

³Junior High School Teacher I, Rinconada National Technical Vocational School, Iriga City

⁴Elementary School Principal I, Bagumbayan Central School, Legazpi City

⁵Senior High School Teacher III, Buenaventura Alandy National High School, Quezon Province

⁶Senior High School Teacher II, Nabua National High School, Nabua, Camarines Sur

⁷Elementary School Teacher III, Colacling Elementary School, Lupi, Camarines Sur

⁸Elementary Master Teacher I, Tastas Elementary School, Tastas, Ligao City

⁹Public School District Supervisor, Ligao City

*corresponding email address: domtabug3@gmail.com ,

ABSTRACT

This study focused on the issues and challenges met by the School- Based Management (SBM) Team of the six schools within Albay and Camarines Sur. With the use of a survey-questionnaire distributed to the 48 respondents, it was found out that the issues encountered by the SBM Team include the availability, authenticity, and veracity of documents. On the other hand, the most significant challenge lies in the appreciation of documents by the validating team. Overall, the issues determined in this study are feasible. The continuous and improved cooperation of all stakeholders is deemed essential to establish an Advanced SBM Level of Practice.

Keywords: school-based management; issues; challenges; Albay, Camarines Sur

INTRODUCTION

School-Based Management is a structure that provides schools with enhanced flexibility and autonomy in managing their own operations and resources according to the needs of their students. The aim of school-based management is to improve the standard of teaching and students' learning outcomes through the joint efforts of the educators, students, key stakeholders, and the support of the government (Oswald, 2020).

According to Bandur, (2008) as stated by (Grauwe, 2005; Mulyasa, 2004; Gamage & Sooksomchitra, 2004; 2 Munn, 2000; Schlegel, 2000; Maksymjuk, 2000; Belk, 1998; Hancock, 1998; Oswald, 1995; Herman & Herman, 1993), researches for the past years have revealed a variety of issues and challenges in the implementation of SBM. Many researchers states that the issues and challenges encountered by different school in the implementation of school based management include lack of resources in schools, the need of professional development in terms of leadership for school leaders, misconception on the part of school governance in terms of new roles and responsibilities, lack of coordination, decision-making authority and insufficient funds provided by the governments. As supported by Vigayan (2017) School-based management is determined by the level of practice in terms of





stakeholder's participation, school plans for improvement, school funds, school accountability, transparency, and cooperation among key persons.

The effort initiated by the different researchers for the past years, shows that school-based management should come up with an alternative program for managing schools in order to attained autonomy, flexibility, participation, effectiveness, responsiveness, satisfaction, leadership solidity, productivity and accountability. In relation to these, issues and challenges need to be recognized in order to explore it appropriately, so that SBM policy can be properly modify for its implementation. Allowing schools heads and district superintendents to formulate decisions on various concerns and issues will lead to the speedier resolution of the problems (Tacay,2022).

Furthermore, in response to the Department of Education towards the entire realization of DepEd Order No. 12 s. 2014 and DepEd Order No. 13. S. 2016, the provisions states that schools are provided with financial resources for the implementation of programs, projects, and activities in their school improvement plan. Through the school-base management (SBM), teachers and school heads have the authority to implement their own professional development plans congruent with the organization's goals and standards. School-based management (sbm) becomes a concern towards autonomy for shared-decision making and a partnership within the school community for its objectives of achieving school improvements (Cheng & Mok, 2007).

This study aims to determine the role of school heads, principals, teachers, and stakeholders as the key persons in improving the school and bringing it to its best performance as mandated by the Department of Education. They are all involved in all aspects of the implementation of school-based management, through planning, monitoring, and mobilizing the community for school-funded projects (Algonos, 2019). The need to use the SBM monitoring educational tools to ensure that the objectives in terms of students' performance are met. It is essential that they know their functions and are accountable for them. Since we are amid the COVID-19 pandemic, there are a lot of "Issues and Challenges in the Implementation of School Based Management". Moreover, the researcher wants to present meaningful policy recommendation in the hope of enhancing the organization and management concerning the School-Based Management program.

METHOD

The descriptive survey methodology has been adopted in the study to describe the status of the challenges and issues encountered by schools in the implementation of the school based management. It assesses how the respondents view the extent of implementation; hence, the study can also be called combined descriptive-assessment research through using survey technique.

The subjects consisted of 48 respondents drawn from 8 public schools. The entire sample was distributed equally by roles in the school-based management implementation program, which were the following: eight (14%) school heads, eight



(14%) SBM coordinators, and 32 (72%) chairmen for the 4 principles. The instrument is a 5-point Likert type scale, which was critically analyzed as to objective, content, results, and timeliness for the purpose of improving the content and format of the questionnaire in terms of appropriateness of the content, comprehensiveness, logical steps in dealing with variables, representativeness of the items, and forms. The responses on personal profile were analyzed using descriptive statistics such as frequency, mean and percentage. It was interpreted using the following scale: Issues and Challenges Met 5- Greatest Challenge (GsC), 4- Greater Challenge (GrC), 3- Great Challenge (GtC), 2- Moderate Challenge (MC), 1- Lesser Challenge (LC). While for the Implementation of School Based Management 5- Very Highly Implemented (VHI), 4- Highly Implemented (HI), 3- Moderately Implemented (MI), 2- Slightly Implemented (SI), 1-Not Implemented at all (NIAA).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Extent of Issues and Challenges Met by the School-Based Management (SBM) Team in the Implementation of School Based Management

Availability of Artifacts. Table 1 shows the extent of Issues and challenges met by the school SBM Team in terms of Availability of Artifacts.

Table 1
Availability of Artifacts

Issues and Challenges Met on Availability of Artifacts	Extent of Issues and Challenges	
	Weighted Mean	Description
1. Artifacts are not readily available	2.46	Moderately Encountered
2. Artifacts are available but not original and complete	2.48	Moderately Encountered
3. Artifacts are not filed religiously	2.27	Moderately Encountered
4. Artifacts are destroyed by calamities	2.90	Greatly Encountered
5. No proper turnover of artifacts from the outgoing to the incoming SH	2.98	Greatly Encountered
Average	2.62	Greatly Encountered

Among the indicators mentioned, Artifacts are not filed religiously ranked the least with 2.27 Weighted Mean with a description of Moderately Encountered. The highest weighted mean of 2.98 with a description of Greatly Encountered is No proper turnover of artifacts from the outgoing to the incoming school head. The general average of which is 2.62 with a description greatly encountered among the five indicators in the issues and challenges met on the availability of SBM Artifacts.

Table 2 shows the significant difference in the Extent of Issues and Challenges Encountered met by the School SBM Team in the Implementation of School Based Management in Terms of Availability of Artifacts.





Table 2
Significant Difference on the Availability of Artifacts

On Availability of Artifacts	Extent of Issues and Challenges
	χ^2
1. Artifacts are not readily available	11.523
2. Artifacts are available but not original and complete	4.039
3. Artifacts are not filed religiously	11.629
4. Artifacts are destroyed by calamities	8.773
5. No proper turnover of artifacts from the outgoing to the incoming SH	5.191
Total	41.154

Data revealed that the computed χ^2 value is higher than the tabular χ^2 value thus making the null hypothesis rejected and the alternative hypothesis accepted. This means that there is significant difference in the extent of issues and challenges in the implementation of SBM in terms of Availability of Artifacts. According to Mella & Peña, (2019) as stated by (Gregg,2013) when there is only one copy of file, managing its printed documents is difficult and it becomes a physical challenge. With the advocacy for transparency and accessibility, a linked to the Wix.com site becomes an advantage as it would be easier to accessed important file and artifacts anytime and anywhere as long as there is an internet connection within the area. Which is necessary for those organization who are in remote areas.

Table 3
Authenticity and Veracity of Documents

Authenticity and Veracity of Documents	Extent of Issues and Challenges	
	Weighted Mean	Description
1. Documents are not authentic.	2.06	Moderately Encountered
1. DOCUMENTS ARE JUST COPIED FROM OTHER SCHOOLS	1.90	Moderately Encountered
3. Documents are available but not duly signed	2.17	Moderately Encountered
4. Documents were crafted for the purpose of SBM evaluation	2.31	Moderately Encountered
5. Missing terminals/elements/parts of the documents were just supplied/ reckoned for the purpose of SBM validation	1.98	Moderately Encountered
Average	2.08	Moderately Encountered

Table 3 shows that Documents were crafted for the purpose of SBM evaluation has the highest weighted mean with 2.31 and a description of moderately encountered. The



least weighted mean is Documents are just copied from other schools with 1.90 and a description of moderately encountered. Although all the Indicators are all Moderately Encountered it should be noted that they still vary from one another.

Table 4 shows the significant difference along Authenticity and Veracity of Documents.

Table 4
Significant difference along Authenticity and Veracity of Documents

Authenticity and Veracity of Documents	Extent of Issues and Challenges
	x ²
1. Documents are not authentic.	6.183
2. Documents are just copied from other schools	5.862
3. Documents are available but not duly signed	8.218
4. Documents were crafted for the purpose of SBM evaluation	3.603
5. Missing terminals/elements/parts of the documents were just supplied/reckoned for the purpose of SBM validation	1.295
Total	25.160

It is noted that the Computed x² value of 25.10 is lower than the Tabular x² value of 26.296 thus accepting null hypothesis and rejecting the alternative hypothesis. It means that there is no significant difference in the extent of issues and challenges along veracity and authenticity of documents.

Appreciation of Documents. Table 5 shows the extent of issues and challenges of the SBM team along Appreciation of Documents.

Table 5
Appreciation of Documents

Appreciation of Documents	Extent of Issues and Challenges	
	Weighted Mean	Description
1. Documents are not authentic.	3.46	Highly Encountered
2. Documents are just copied from other schools	3.50	Highly Encountered
3. Documents are available but not duly signed	1.67	Moderately Encountered
4. Documents were crafted for the purpose of SBM evaluation	1.79	Moderately Encountered
5. Missing terminals/elements/parts of the documents were just supplied/reckoned for the purpose of SBM validation	1.38	Less Encountered
Average	2.36	Slightly Encountered

Documents are just copied from other schools got the highest weighted mean of 3.50 with a description of Highly encountered, followed by Documents are not authentic.





with 3.46 weighted mean. The least is Missing terminals/elements/parts of the documents were just supplied/reckoned for the purpose of SBM validation, with a weighted mean of 1.38 and a description of less encountered. A total of 2.36 as the general average which is verbally described as slightly encountered on the SBM Appreciation of Documents.

Table 6
Significant Difference on the Issues and Challenges Met on Appreciation of Documents

Issues and Challenges Met on Appreciation of Documents	Extent of Issues and Challenges
	χ^2
1. Team appreciated documents vis-a-vis within the SBM tool	33.820
2. Different perception of the team in appreciating documents	35.458
3. The evaluators are not considerate despite of appeal among the SBM team	13.007
4. The evaluators are not trained properly to appreciate the documents	10.008
5. Focal persons are not aware of the process of SBM evaluation	27.482
Total	119.775

Table 6 shows the issues and challenges met by the team along Appreciation of documents. It is noted that the Computed χ^2 value of 41.154 is lower than the tabular χ^2 value of 119.775. The null hypothesis is rejected, thus the alternative hypothesis is accepted. There is a significant difference in the issues and challenges met by the SBM team along appreciation of documents.

Implementation of School-Based Management (SBM)

SBM Level of Practice. Table 7 shows the implementation of SBM on the Level of Practice of schools.

Table 7
SBM Level of Practice

on SBM Level of Practice	Level of Implementation	
	Weighted Mean	Description
1. The school performs according to its level of practice	4.10	Highly Implemented
2. The school is religious in updating artifacts	3.96	Highly Implemented
3. The school is always ready for validation	4.00	Highly Implemented
4. The school integrates the values of	4.44	Highly Implemented



cooperation and motivation, and the worth of collaboration and delegation among the team		
Average	4.30	Highly Implemented

It is noted that the highest weight means of 4.44 is The school integrates the values of cooperation and motivation, and the worth of collaboration and delegation among the team and the least is The school is religious in updating artifacts with 3.96. All the indicators got Highly implemented description with an average of 4.30. Though they got the same description it is noted that they still differ from one another.

Table 8
Significant Difference on SBM Level of Practice

On SBM Level of Practice	Level of Implementation	
	x ²	
1. The school performs according to its level of practice	0.422	
2. The school is religious in updating artifacts	5.104	
3. The school is always ready for validation	5.072	
4. The school integrates the values of cooperation and motivation, and the worth of collaboration and delegation among the team	4.767	
Total	15.365	

Table 8 shows the implementation of SBM along the Schools level of practice. It is noted that the computed x² value of 15.365 is lower than the Tabular Computed x² value of 16.909. The null hypothesis is accepted thus the alternative hypothesis is rejected. This means that there is a significant difference in the implementation of School Based management along the SBM Level of Practice of Schools.

School Performance. Table 9 shows the implementation of School based management along the schools' level of SBM Practice.

Table 9
School Performance

On School Performance	Implementation of SBM	
	Weighted Mean	Description
1. School performance vary from its SBM level of practice	4.30	Highly Implemented
2. Implementation of SBM has a positive impact on school effectiveness and school quality improvement	4.10	Highly Implemented
3. SBM improves educational planning and	4.23	Highly Implemented





management		
4. SBM is a strategy to improve school performance by transferring significant decision-making authority from education offices to individual schools.	4.21	Highly Implemented
Average	4.21	Highly Implemented

It is noted that school performance vary from its SBM level of practice got the highest weighted mean of 4.30 and the lowest implementation of SBM has a positive impact on school effectiveness and school quality improvement of 4.10 weighted mean, both with a descriptive rating of highly implemented. It is also noted that though all the indicators have the same description as Highly Implemented with a general average 4.21, still they differ from one another as shown by the results.

Table 10
Significant Difference on School Performance

on School Performance	Level of Implementation
	χ^2
1. School performance vary from its SBM level of practice	11.220
2. Implementation of SBM has a positive impact on school effectiveness and school quality improvement	4.513
3. SBM improves educational planning and management	4.048
4. SBM is a strategy to improve school performance by transferring significant decision-making authority from education offices to individual schools.	4.592
Total	24.372

Data shows that the Computed χ^2 value of 24.373 is higher than the tabular computed χ^2 value of 16.372. The null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. This means that there is no significant difference in the level of implementation along the schools level of practice.

CONCLUSION

The researchers were able to determine the issues and challenges in the implementation of school-based management. The issues involved include the availability, authenticity, and veracity of documents. On the other hand, the most significant challenge lies in the appreciation of documents by the validating team. Given enough time preparation and guidance, the school SBM team are willing to



compile all the indicators in each principle. Summing up all the gathered data, it mostly narrows down to the continuous and improved cooperation of all stakeholders ensuring the production of intended outputs/outcomes and meeting all standards of a system fully integrated in the local community and is self-renewing and self-sustaining which is Advanced - Level III SBM of Practice.

Acknowledgment

The researchers would like to acknowledge the Office of the University Research Director who helped them in transforming this research to publishable format. Also, they are thanking the Office of the University President, Office of the Graduate Studies, and their Professor Dr. Ernie Avila for all the guidance and support extended to the group. Special thanks to the respondents who answered the survey forms.

REFERENCES:

- Algonos, B.S. (2019). enabling role of the stakeholders in the school-based management process. Vol7 Issue 1
<https://cdrj.ssu.edu.ph/index.php/CDRJ/article/view/169/125>
- Avila, E. A. (2021). *Exploring the Teacher's Utilization of ICT Resources in Schools and their Student's Competence in Basic Computer Applications*.
<https://iopscience.iop.org/Article/10.1088/1742-6596/1933/1/012122/Meta>. Retrieved July 30, 2022, from <https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1742-6596/1933/1/012122/meta>
- Avila, E. C., & Cabrera, H. I. (2020). the Use of Facebook Group in Distance Learning During the Time of Covid-19 Pandemic. *PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology*, 17(6), 1859–1871.
- Avila, E. C., & Cabrera, H. I. (2021). ICT Competence, Organizational Culture, Motivation, and Task Performance among the Employees of One Polytechnic University Branch. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 1933(1), 012121. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1933/1/012121>
- Avila, E. C., Abin, G. J., Bien, G. A., Acasamoso, D. M., & Arenque, D. D. (2021). Students' Perception on Online and Distance Learning and their Motivation and Learning Strategies in using Educational Technologies during COVID-19 Pandemic. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 1933(1), 012130. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1933/1/012130>
- Bandur, A. (2008). a Study of the Implementation of School-Based Management in Flores Primary Schools in Indonesia, <https://ogma.newcastle.edu.au/vital/access/services/Download/uon:3124/ATTACHMENT02?view=true>
- Bermundo, C.B., et al Simplified Statistics for Beginners, 2004
- Cheng, Y.C., & Mok, M.M.C. (2007). School-Based Management and Paradigm Shift in Education: An Empirical study. *International Journal of Educational* com/index.php/spupgsrj/article/download/438/89



