

# The Impact of the Implementation of the School-Based Management (SBM) Framework in Improving the School Performance in the Public Secondary Schools in Goa 1 And 2 Districts, Division of Camarines Sur

Rosemarie R. Miraña<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Graduate Studies, University of Northeastern Philippines

| ARTICLE INFORMATION                                                                                                                                                                             | ABSTRACT                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Article history:</b><br>Published: October 2026<br><br><b>Keywords:</b><br>School-Based Management<br>School Performance<br>School Heads<br>SBM Focal Persons<br>Wilcoxon Signed-Rank<br>Goa | The study examined school-based management implementation and perceived contributions to school performance in public secondary schools in Goa 1 and Goa 2 Districts, Division of Camarines Sur, during School Year 2025–2026. A descriptive-evaluative-inferential design involved 15 school heads and 16 SBM focal persons and used a researcher-made questionnaire. Weighted means, frequencies, percentages, ranks, and the Wilcoxon signed-rank test were reported, with significance set at 0.05. All indicators in the six implementation domains were classified as Very Much Implemented. Indicators in the five perceived school-performance domains were classified as Very Much Evident. All reported group-comparison probability classifications were $p > 0.05$ . These results describe favorable perceptions and no statistically significant differences under the reported analysis; they do not establish equivalence or causal improvement. The unequal respondent-group sizes and unspecified pairing limit assessment of the signed-rank procedure. Recommendations emphasized stakeholder participation, professional support, resource management, and continuous monitoring. Objective performance measures and clarification of the comparison structure are necessary before stronger impact claims can be supported. |

## 1. Introduction

School-based management brings instructional priorities, leadership, stakeholder participation, and resource decisions into a shared school-level framework. Its practical meaning depends on how schools plan, implement, monitor, and improve their work. An assessment of implementation can describe how respondents view those processes, while an assessment of school performance asks a separate question about results. Favorable judgments about both cannot, without further evidence, establish that the management framework caused improvement.

The Department of Education (2024) issued revised school-based management guidelines emphasizing school-level decision-making and continuous improvement. This policy provides a contextual basis for examining implementation in public schools; it does not establish which policy edition was used to construct the study's questionnaire. The study's six implementation domains cover curriculum, environment, leadership, governance, personnel development, and resources. Their interpretation should remain tied to the stated indicators until instrument alignment is documented.

The study also examined perceived contributions to leadership and governance, stakeholder collaboration, curriculum and learner environment, resource mobilization, and accountability. These domains are conceptually related to implementation processes. Such overlap is useful for describing school operations, but it can make it difficult to distinguish a reported management practice from an independently measured performance outcome. The distinction matters when interpreting the word impact in the research title.

The study focused on public secondary schools in Goa 1 and Goa 2 Districts and compared rank orders between school heads and SBM focal persons. It sought to describe implementation, perceived school-performance contributions, and group differences, and to formulate policy recommendations. Collaborative professional development, including Learning Action Cells, offers one setting for examining instructional and organizational needs (Department of Education, 2016). The study's contribution is descriptive and comparative rather than an evaluation using objective performance trends.

## 2. Methods

### 2.1 Research design and scope

The study used a descriptive-evaluative-inferential research design in public secondary schools in Goa 1 and Goa 2 Districts, Division of Camarines Sur. The stated study period was School Year 2025–2026.

The study assessed reported practices and perceived outcomes through questionnaire responses. Allocation to an intervention, a comparison condition, and repeated outcome measurement were not reported. The findings are interpreted as descriptive evaluations and rank-order analyses; the design label alone does not establish a tested relationship or a causal effect.

### 2.2 Participants and setting

The respondents comprised 15 school heads and 16 SBM focal persons from public secondary schools in Goa 1 and Goa 2 Districts. The basis for pairing observations in the reported signed-rank analysis was not specified. The unequal group sizes are retained

without assuming exclusions or matched school pairs.

The sampling frame, selection procedure, eligibility criteria, number invited, and response rate were not specified. Consequently, the representativeness of the respondents and the extent to which their judgments describe all schools in the setting cannot be established. No unreported school-level or respondent-group sample sizes were inferred.

### 2.3 Instrument and measures

The main data-gathering instrument was a researcher-made questionnaire. It assessed the domains presented in the Results, using indicator-level weighted means and verbal classifications. The response anchors, full scoring rules, interpretation cutoffs, validation procedures, pilot testing and reliability estimates were not reported. Category labels are therefore presented as the study's classifications rather than assigned from an assumed rating scale.

The unit represented in each descriptive table is the stated questionnaire indicator. Reported item means are retained without calculating new domain composites. Duplicate statements remain separate reported entries, and an unreported item value is identified as such where applicable. The ratings do not constitute independently scored learner assessments or administrative measures of school performance.

### 2.4 Data collection and analysis

Questionnaire administration was the stated data-collection approach. The administration mode, collection dates, instructions to respondents, procedures for incomplete responses, and evidence used by raters were not specified. Ethics review, institutional permission, consent and confidentiality procedures were not reported; no approval or consent process is asserted.

The reported analyses were weighted means, frequency counts, percentages, ranks and the Wilcoxon signed-rank test. The significance level was 0.05. The statistical tables retain the computed *z* values, associated probabilities and *p*-value classifications. The analysis unit, matching mechanism, number of paired observations, sidedness and treatment of ties were not specified, limiting independent assessment of the procedure.

### 2.5 Results

The tables present the reported findings by domain, with interpretation immediately after each presentation. Item statements and values remain in their reported order. Uniform verbal classifications appear in table notes; mixed classifications are displayed by item. No missing numerical results or composite scores have been imputed.

Table 1. SBM implementation in Curriculum and Teaching

| Indicator                                                                                                                    | Weighted mean |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| Teachers engage in continuous professional development to improve pedagogical knowledge and instructional skills             | 4.96          |
| Parents, stakeholders, and community members are involved in supporting curriculum implementation and learning activities    | 4.96          |
| Teaching strategies are adapted to address the diverse learning needs and abilities of learners                              | 4.95          |
| Data from learner assessments are analyzed and utilized in planning interventions and improving instruction                  | 4.95          |
| Assessment practices are aligned with learning competencies and are used to improve learner performance                      | 4.95          |
| Learner-centered approaches are consistently practiced in classroom instruction                                              | 4.95          |
| The school regularly reviews and improves curriculum implementation based on learner outcomes and feedback from stakeholders | 4.94          |
| Learning resources, instructional materials, and technologies are effectively utilized to enhance teaching and learning      | 4.94          |
| Teachers collaboratively develop and implement learning plans aligned with the K to 12 curriculum standards                  | 4.93          |
| Classroom instruction is regularly monitored and supported to ensure quality teaching and learning                           | 4.93          |

Note. All reported indicators were classified as "Very Much Implemented."

Table 1 shows reported item means from 4.93 to 4.96. Professional development and stakeholder support were prominent, while planning and monitoring occupied the lower end of a very narrow profile. The ratings suggest broad endorsement of instructional management. They do not establish the quality of lessons or the accuracy of assessment-informed decisions without supporting records or observations.

Table 2. SBM implementation in Learning Environment

| Indicator                                                                                          | Weighted mean |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| The school provides a safe, secure, and child-friendly learning environment for all learners       | 4.99          |
| Classrooms and learning spaces are clean, organized, and conducive to learning                     | 4.97          |
| School facilities, equipment, and instructional resources are adequately maintained and accessible | 4.96          |

## RESEARCH ARTICLE

| Indicator                                                                                                             | Weighted mean |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| Health, nutrition, and sanitation programs are effectively implemented to support learner well-being                  | 4.96          |
| Inclusive education practices are promoted to accommodate learners with diverse needs and backgrounds                 | 4.96          |
| The school implements policies and programs that promote positive discipline and learner protection                   | 4.96          |
| Stakeholders actively participate in maintaining and improving the school learning environment                        | 4.96          |
| The school establishes programs and activities that enhance learners' social, emotional, and psychological well-being | 4.95          |
| Regular monitoring and assessment of the learning environment are conducted to ensure continuous improvement          | 4.95          |
| The school promotes environmental awareness and sustainability practices among learners and staff                     | 4.94          |
| technology and digital resources are available and utilized to support teaching and learning activities               | 4.94          |

Note. All reported indicators were classified as “Very Much Implemented.”

Table 2 shows reported item means from 4.94 to 4.99. Safety and a child-friendly environment were particularly prominent. Digital-resource availability was relatively lower, although still favorably classified. The small numerical spread limits prioritization, and the ratings do not substitute for a facilities, accessibility or learner-well-being assessment.

Table 3. SBM implementation in Leadership

| Indicator                                                                                                                          | Weighted mean |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| The school head demonstrates effective leadership in achieving the school's vision, mission, and goals                             | 4.96          |
| The school leadership promotes transparency and accountability in the management of resources and school operations                | 4.96          |
| Stakeholders are meaningfully involved in school planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation activities                   | 4.96          |
| The school head provides opportunities for teacher leadership and professional growth                                              | 4.96          |
| The School Governing Council (SGC), PTA, and other stakeholder groups actively support school improvement initiatives              | 4.96          |
| School personnel actively participate in shared decision-making processes related to school programs and activities                | 4.95          |
| School policies and procedures are clearly communicated to teachers, learners, parents, and other stakeholders                     | 4.95          |
| The school leadership effectively establishes partnerships with community members, local government units, and other organizations | 4.95          |
| continuous monitoring and evaluation of school programs are conducted to ensure the attainment of school improvement goals         | 4.95          |

Note. All reported indicators were classified as “Very Much Implemented.”

Table 3 shows reported item means from 4.95 to 4.96. The leadership profile emphasizes vision, accountability and participation. Nearly identical values suggest limited differentiation among the listed practices. The table describes respondent judgments, rather than demonstrating that decision-making authority was meaningfully shared or that leadership practices improved learner outcomes.

Table 4. SBM implementation in Governance and Accountability

| Indicator                                                                                                          | Weighted mean |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| The school adheres to DepEd policies, standards, and regulations in managing school operations                     | 4.98          |
| Mechanisms for feedback, grievance management, and conflict resolution are established and effectively implemented | 4.98          |
| The school maintains transparent systems and procedures for managing financial, material, and human resources      | 4.96          |
| School plans, programs, and accomplishments are regularly communicated to stakeholders                             | 4.96          |

## RESEARCH ARTICLE

| Indicator                                                                                                                                         | Weighted mean |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| Stakeholders actively participate in the planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of school programs and projects                     | 4.96          |
| School leaders and personnel demonstrate ethical practices, integrity, and accountability in the performance of their duties and responsibilities | 4.96          |
| Financial reports and resource utilization records are properly documented and made accessible to concerned stakeholders                          | 4.95          |
| Decision-making processes are guided by data, evidence, and stakeholder consultations                                                             | 4.95          |
| The school ensures accountability for the use of resources through regular monitoring and reporting mechanisms                                    | 4.94          |
| school improvement goals and targets are clearly defined, monitored, and evaluated                                                                | 4.93          |

Note. All reported indicators were classified as “Very Much Implemented.”

Table 4 shows reported item means from 4.93 to 4.98. Policy adherence and feedback mechanisms were prominent, with target monitoring relatively lower. These findings suggest attention to formal governance systems. The existence of a mechanism and its effective use are distinct questions, so documentary and stakeholder evidence would be needed to establish how accountability operated in practice.

Table 5. SBM implementation in Human Resources and Team Development

| Indicator                                                                                                                | Weighted mean |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| Teachers and personnel are encouraged to participate in seminars, trainings, workshops, and learning action cells (LACs) | 4.98          |
| Teachers and staff actively participate in decision-making processes related to school improvement and development       | 4.98          |
| The school implements a systematic performance monitoring and coaching program for personnel                             | 4.97          |
| School leaders support mentoring and coaching initiatives to enhance teachers' competencies and professional growth      | 4.97          |
| The school recognizes and rewards exemplary performance and contributions of personnel                                   | 4.97          |
| Roles and responsibilities of school personnel are clearly defined and communicated                                      | 4.97          |
| The school provides opportunities for leadership development and succession planning among personnel                     | 4.97          |
| Programs and activities are implemented to promote employee well-being, motivation, and job satisfaction                 | 4.97          |
| The school provides regular professional development opportunities aligned with the needs of teachers and staff          | 4.96          |
| the school promotes a culture of continuous learning, innovation, and professional excellence                            | 4.95          |

Note. All reported indicators were classified as “Very Much Implemented.”

Table 5 shows reported item means from 4.95 to 4.98. Participation in professional learning and decision-making were prominent. Continuous learning culture occupied the lower end of the narrow profile. The findings describe favorable perceptions of personnel development, but they do not show changes in teacher practice or the extent to which coaching addressed identified needs.

Table 6. SBM implementation in Finance and Resource Management and Mobilization

| Indicator                                                                                                                                      | Weighted mean |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| The school prepares and implements financial plans aligned with the School Improvement Plan (SIP) and Annual Implementation Plan (AIP)         | 4.96          |
| Stakeholders are informed and consulted regarding the allocation and utilization of school resources                                           | 4.96          |
| The school actively mobilizes support and resources from parents, alumni, community members, local government units, and partner organizations | 4.96          |
| Financial resources are managed efficiently, transparently, and in accordance with DepEd policies and guidelines                               | 4.95          |
| School funds are utilized effectively to support teaching, learning, and school improvement programs                                           | 4.95          |

## RESEARCH ARTICLE

| Indicator                                                                                                                                        | Weighted mean |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| Partnerships and linkages are established to supplement available resources and support school programs and projects                             | 4.95          |
| Available school resources, facilities, and materials are properly monitored, maintained, and accounted for                                      | 4.95          |
| Regular monitoring and evaluation of resource utilization are conducted to ensure accountability, sustainability, and attainment of school goals | 4.95          |
| the school maintains accurate, updated, and accessible financial records and reports                                                             | 4.94          |

Note. All reported indicators were classified as “Very Much Implemented.”

Table 6 shows reported item means from 4.94 to 4.96. Planning alignment, consultation and resource mobilization received favorable ratings. Financial-record accessibility was relatively lower. These processes are important to resource stewardship, but the table does not provide an audit or evidence that allocations met the needs of different learners and classrooms.

Table 7. Rank-order differences for SBM implementation

| Domain                                           | z    | Associated probability | Reported classification |
|--------------------------------------------------|------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Curriculum and Teaching                          | 0.87 | 0.1922                 | $p > 0.05$              |
| Learning Environment                             | 1.16 | 0.1446                 | $p > 0.05$              |
| Leadership                                       | 0.75 | 0.2266                 | $p > 0.05$              |
| Governance and Accountability                    | 0.79 | 0.2148                 | $p > 0.05$              |
| Human Resources and Team Development             | 1.38 | 0.0838                 | $p > 0.05$              |
| Finance and Resource Management and Mobilization | 0.79 | 0.2148                 | $p > 0.05$              |

Note. Wilcoxon signed-rank results are retained as reported; significance level = 0.05.

Table 7 addresses the research question on rank-order differences. Every comparison was classified as  $p > 0.05$ . Under the reported procedure, the study did not identify a statistically significant difference in the implementation rank orders. This is not a demonstration of equivalence. The unequal respondent-group sizes and missing pairing description also limit assessment of the signed-rank test. The z statistics and associated probabilities are retained without selecting a new test or recalculating results.

Table 8. Perceived school performance in School Leadership and Governance

| Indicator                                                                                                       | Weighted mean |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| Strengthened the school head’s ability to lead and manage the school effectively                                | 4.99          |
| Improved participatory decision-making among school personnel and stakeholders                                  | 4.99          |
| Increased transparency and accountability in school operations and management                                   | 4.99          |
| Enhanced communication and information dissemination within the school community                                | 4.97          |
| Increased stakeholder participation in school governance and policy development                                 | 4.97          |
| Improved collaboration among teachers, parents, community members, and other stakeholders                       | 4.96          |
| Strengthened the implementation and monitoring of school improvement plans                                      | 4.96          |
| Improved the responsiveness of school leaders to the needs and concerns of learners, teachers, and stakeholders | 4.96          |
| Contributed to the overall effectiveness and quality of school leadership and governance                        | 4.96          |

Note. All reported indicators were classified as “Very Much Evident.”

Table 8 shows reported item means from 4.96 to 4.99. Leadership capacity, participation and transparency were prominent perceived contributions. These outcomes resemble several implementation indicators, which may contribute to the consistently favorable pattern. The table should therefore be interpreted as perceptions of organizational functioning rather than independent evidence of improved school performance.

Table 9. Perceived school performance in Stakeholder Collaboration

| Indicator                                                                                    | Weighted mean |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| Promoted shared responsibility and accountability for achieving school goals and objectives  | 4.94          |
| Enhanced stakeholder participation in monitoring and evaluating school programs and projects | 4.94          |

## RESEARCH ARTICLE

| Indicator                                                                                                                       | Weighted mean |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| Strengthened partnerships with local government units, non-government organizations, and private institutions                   | 4.93          |
| Improved community involvement in addressing school needs and learner concerns                                                  | 4.93          |
| Strengthened partnerships between the school and the local community                                                            | 4.93          |
| Enhanced collaboration among teachers, parents, learners, and community stakeholders                                            | 4.93          |
| Contributed to the development of a strong and sustainable support system for improving learner outcomes and school performance | 4.93          |
| Improved communication and information sharing between the school and stakeholders                                              | 4.92          |
| Increased stakeholder support for the implementation of school improvement initiatives                                          | 4.92          |
| increased the participation of parents in school programs, projects, and activities                                             | 4.91          |

Note. All reported indicators were classified as “Very Much Evident.”

Table 9 shows reported item means from 4.91 to 4.94. Shared responsibility and participation in monitoring were prominent, while parental participation occupied the lower end. The profile suggests that different forms of stakeholder involvement may receive different emphasis. It does not establish how representative participation was or whether less-visible families had opportunities to influence decisions.

Table 10. Perceived school performance in Curriculum, Instruction, and Learner Environment

| Indicator                                                                                                  | Weighted mean |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| Fostered the use of learner-centered and innovative teaching strategies                                    | 4.95          |
| Strengthened the alignment of classroom instruction with curriculum standards and learning competencies    | 4.94          |
| Optimized the utilization of instructional materials, learning resources, and educational technologies     | 4.94          |
| Expanded the provision of interventions and support programs for learners with diverse needs and abilities | 4.93          |
| Cultivated a safe, inclusive, and child-friendly learning environment                                      | 4.93          |
| Stimulated learner engagement, participation, and motivation in classroom and school activities            | 4.93          |
| 2. Enhanced the effectiveness of teaching practices and instructional delivery                             | 4.93          |
| Refined the assessment and monitoring of learner progress and achievement                                  | 4.92          |
| elevated learner performance, academic achievement, and overall learning outcomes                          | 4.92          |

Note. All reported indicators were classified as “Very Much Evident.”

Table 10 shows reported item means from 4.92 to 4.95. Learner-centered teaching was prominent, while progress monitoring and learner performance occupied the lower end of the narrow profile. The distinction between instructional processes and learning results remains important. The reported values do not provide direct evidence of academic change or isolate an SBM contribution.

Table 11. Perceived school performance in Resource Management and Mobilization

| Indicator                                                                                                                                          | Weighted mean |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| School facilities and infrastructure have been enhanced through effective resource management and stakeholder collaboration                        | 4.99          |
| Partnerships with parents, community organizations, local government units, and private institutions have strengthened resource generation efforts | 4.97          |
| The school demonstrates transparency in the management and reporting of financial and material resources                                           | 4.97          |
| Stakeholders actively participate in planning, budgeting, and decision-making related to resource utilization                                      | 4.97          |
| Available resources are aligned with and contribute to the achievement of the School Improvement Plan (SIP) goals and learning outcomes            | 4.97          |
| Resource management practices promote accountability and responsible stewardship among school personnel and stakeholders                           | 4.97          |
| The school sustains fundraising, income-generating, and resource-mobilization activities that support long-term development                        | 4.96          |

## RESEARCH ARTICLE

| Indicator                                                                                                              | Weighted mean |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| The availability of instructional materials, equipment, and learning resources has improved through SBM implementation | 4.96          |
| School resources are utilized efficiently to support teaching, learning, and school improvement initiatives            | 4.96          |
| the school effectively allocates financial, material, and human resources based on identified priorities and needs     | 4.95          |

Note. All reported indicators were classified as “Very Much Evident.”

Table 11 shows reported item means from 4.95 to 4.99. Facility improvement and partnerships were prominent perceived contributions. Allocation by priorities was relatively lower, though still favorably classified. The table describes perceptions of resource management and does not establish expenditure efficiency, equitable access or the sustainability of resource generation.

Table 12. Perceived school performance in Accountability and Continuous Improvement

| Indicator                                                                                                 | Weighted mean |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| Institutionalized the use of data and evidence in planning, decision-making, and problem-solving          | 4.99          |
| Streamlined the documentation and reporting of school accomplishments and outcomes                        | 4.98          |
| Encouraged regular review and assessment of school policies, programs, and practices                      | 4.98          |
| Nurtured a culture of continuous learning, innovation, and improvement among school personnel             | 4.98          |
| Expanded stakeholder participation in monitoring school performance and providing feedback                | 4.98          |
| Promoted transparency and accountability in the implementation of school programs and projects            | 4.98          |
| Reinforced the monitoring and evaluation of school performance and achievement of targets                 | 4.98          |
| Addressed school challenges and performance gaps through appropriate interventions and corrective actions | 4.98          |
| Sustained improvements in school effectiveness, efficiency, and overall performance                       | 4.96          |
| ensured adherence to DepEd policies, standards, and accountability requirements                           | 4.96          |

Note. All reported indicators were classified as “Very Much Evident.”

Table 12 shows reported item means from 4.96 to 4.99. Use of evidence in planning received the highest rating, while sustained effectiveness and policy adherence were relatively lower. The findings suggest favorable perceptions of improvement routines. Demonstrating improvement would require documented baseline conditions, follow-up indicators and evidence that decisions responded to identified gaps.

Table 13. Rank-order differences for the perceived outcome domains

| Domain                                           | z    | Associated probability | Reported classification |
|--------------------------------------------------|------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| School Leadership and Governance                 | 1.50 | 0.0668                 | p>0.05                  |
| Stakeholder Collaboration                        | 0.27 | 0.3936                 | p>0.05                  |
| Curriculum, Instruction, and Learner Environment | 0.17 | 0.4325                 | p>0.05                  |
| Resource Management and Mobilization             | 0.79 | 0.2148                 | p>0.05                  |
| Accountability and Continuous Improvement        | 0.79 | 0.2148                 | p>0.05                  |

Note. Wilcoxon signed-rank results are retained as reported; significance level = 0.05.

Table 13 addresses the research question on rank-order differences. All perceived-performance comparisons were reported as nonsignificant. This indicates no detected difference under the reported analysis, rather than identical perceptions or objective confirmation of school improvement. The pairing mechanism and probability calculations remain unspecified. These limitations are particularly relevant because the study’s impact language should not be interpreted as a causal estimate from group similarity.

#### 4. Discussion

The implementation findings describe highly favorable judgments across nearly every aspect of school operations. Their narrow numerical spread makes broad endorsement more apparent than differentiated priorities. The perceived-performance ratings show a similar pattern. This consistency may reflect respondents’ positive assessments, but it also limits the ability of the questionnaire summaries to distinguish schools or identify specific implementation weaknesses.

The revised SBM policy provides a relevant context for examining participatory decisions and continuous improvement (Department of Education, 2024). The study’s indicators discuss these kinds of processes, but policy relevance is not proof of measurement validity or policy compliance. The instrument’s precise mapping to the applicable framework, the evidence respondents consulted,

and the criteria used for classifications need documentation before the ratings can serve as an institutional assessment.

The group comparisons were all reported as nonsignificant. A nonsignificant difference does not establish that school heads and focal persons held identical views, nor does it demonstrate equivalent implementation across schools. The Wilcoxon signed-rank test ordinarily requires paired observations, yet the study reports unequal respondent counts and no pairing mechanism. Without knowing whether the analysis paired people, school summaries, or indicator ranks, its inferential basis cannot be fully assessed.

The recommendations emphasize stakeholder engagement, monitoring, resource coordination, and professional learning. These proposals fit the organizational focus of the study. Learning Action Cell sessions offer a setting for linking staff development to instructional concerns (Department of Education, 2016). Future monitoring should distinguish evidence of a completed management process from evidence of an improved school outcome, using independently defined indicators and documented follow-up.

### 5. Implications for practice and further research

The study supports using the indicator-level pattern as a starting point for local review. Decisions should connect a stated need with a feasible response and a criterion for judging progress. Relative positions within a favorable profile are not equivalent to measured deficits, and a significant ranking result is not evidence that a proposed policy will work. Recommendations should be implemented with attention to context and evaluated rather than assumed effective.

Further research should use clearly defined outcomes and document how they are measured. Direct performance tasks, observations, or independently recorded school indicators could complement questionnaire ratings. A longitudinal or comparative evaluation could examine change over time, provided the design addresses baseline differences and alternative explanations. These are proposed directions for future work, not procedures undertaken in the study.

### 6. Conclusion

The study characterized SBM implementation as Very Much Implemented and perceived contributions to school performance as Very Much Evident. All reported group comparisons were classified as nonsignificant at the 0.05 level. These findings support recommendations for sustained participatory management and continuous monitoring, but they do not establish respondent-group equivalence or a causal improvement in school performance. The signed-rank pairing structure and reported probability calculations require clarification.

### References

- [1] Department of Education. (2016). The Learning Action Cell (LAC) as a K to 12 Basic Education Program school-based continuing professional development strategy for the improvement of teaching and learning (DepEd Order No. 35, s. 2016). [https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/DO\\_s2016\\_035.pdf](https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/DO_s2016_035.pdf)
- [2] Department of Education. (2024). Policy guidelines on the implementation of the revised School-Based Management (SBM) system (DepEd Order No. 007, s. 2024). [https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/DO\\_s2024\\_007.pdf](https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/DO_s2024_007.pdf)